RESEARCH ON THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION, 2026, 1(2), 86-102 e-ISSN: 3149-9341

Research Article

The Relationship Between Individualism, Collectivism, and Religiosity in Young Adults

Genç Yetişkinlerde Bireycilik, Kolektivizm ve Dindarlık Arasındaki İlişki

Ayşe Aydar
Res. Asst., Şırnak University, Faculty of Theology, Department of Psychology of Religion, Türkiye.
E-mail: aaydar34@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-6711-506X

Abstract

Culture, society, religion, and the individual are deeply interconnected, constantly influencing one another and driving change and transformation. To understand these variables better, this research investigated the relationships between individualism, collectivism, and religiosity in young adults aged 18 to 30. In the study, theoretical frameworks for these constructs were presented, along with an analysis of their interconnections. The quantitative approach was employed, utilizing a correlational design to explore the relationships between the variables. The "Individualism and Collectivism Scale in Young Individuals" developed by Kahveci and Sever and the "Religiousness Scale" developed by Gülmez were applied as measurement tools. Data were collected from 359 young adults aged 18-30 residing in Türkiye via convenience sampling. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 22.0. The findings revealed a positive correlation between religiosity and collectivism, indicating that higher levels of religiosity are associated with stronger collectivist tendencies. On the other hand, a negative correlation was observed between religiosity and individualism, suggesting that higher religiosity is associated with lower individualistic tendencies. These results align with previous studies, which suggest that religiosity often reinforces community-oriented values over self-centered ones. However, no significant relationship was found between individualism and collectivism, indicating that, contrary to common assumptions, these values are not inherently oppositional but rather reflect their complexity and potential independence.

Keywords: Psychology of Religion, Individualism, Collectivism, Religiosity, Culture

Article History: Received: 16 May 2026 | Accepted: 21 Sep 2026 | Published: 30 Sep 2026

Suggested Citation
Aydar, A. (2026). The relationship between individualism, collectivism, and religiosity in young adults. *Research on the Psychology of Religion, 1*(2), 86-102.

Özet

Kültür, toplum, din ve birey, birbiriyle yakından ilişkili olup sürekli olarak birbirlerini etkileyerek değişim ve dönüşüme neden olmaktadır. Bu değişkenleri daha iyi anlamak amacıyla, bu araştırmada 18-30 yaş arası genç yetişkinlerde bireycilik, toplumculuk ve dindarlık arasındaki ilişkiler incelenmiştir. Çalışmada, bu kavramlara ilişkin teorik çerçeveler sunulmuş ve aralarındaki bağlantılar analiz edilmiştir. Araştırmada ilişkisel tarama deseni kullanılıp nicel bir yaklaşım benimsenmiştir. Ölçüm araçları olarak Kahveci ve Sever tarafından geliştirilen "Genç Bireylerde Bireycilik ve Toplumculuk Ölçeği" ile Gülmez tarafından geliştirilen "Dindarlık Ölçeği" uygulanmıştır. Veriler, Türkiye'de ikamet eden 18-30 yaş arasındaki 359 genç yetişkinden kolayda örneklem tekniği ile toplanmıştır. Elde edilen veriler, SPSS 22.0 istatistik paket programı kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular, dindarlık ile toplumculuk arasında pozitif bir korelasyon olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Buna göre, daha yüksek düzeyde dindarlık daha güçlü toplumcu eğilimlerle ilişkiliyken, dindarlık ile bireycilik arasındaki negatif korelasyon ise dindarlık düzeyi arttıkça bireyci eğilimlerin azaldığını göstermektedir. Bu sonuçlar, dindarlığın genellikle toplum odaklı değerleri birey merkezli değerlere kıyasla daha fazla güçlendirdiğini öne süren önceki araştırmalarla uyumludur. Ancak, bireycilik ile toplumculuk arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmamıştır. Bu durum, iki kavramın sanılanın aksine birbirlerinin karşıtı olmadığını ve bağımsız yapılar olarak da değerlendirilebileceğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Din Psikolojisi, Bireycilik, Toplumculuk, Dindarlık, Kültür

Introduction

Culture, society, religion, and the individual are inseparable concepts. They affect each other and cause change and transformation. As social creatures, people are affected by the cultural norms of the other individuals they live with and the cultural norms of their society, which create thinking and behaving patterns, which, in other words, is *mind software*, as defined by Hofstede. Individualism and collectivism are cultural doctrines that demonstrate whether individual or social values prevail in societies. Depending on which doctrine a person has, the individual's lifestyle, perception, and values in that society are shaped. Similarly, religion, which cannot be thought of independently from culture, surrounds the individual and creates certain attitudes, behaviors, beliefs, and value judgments.

Individualism and collectivism studies, which left their mark in the 80s and 90s, broke new ground in psychology, especially in cultural psychology. Kağıtçıbaşı, a prominent scholar in the field of cross-cultural psychology, argues that individualism is associated with values such as modernity, personal autonomy, and gender equality, whereas collectivism is more closely linked to traditionalism and conservatism (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2012). These two concepts are related to whether group or individual interests are prioritized. Individualism is a system of thought that accepts each person as an autonomous, independent, and self-sufficient entity, prioritizing individual goals and desires over societal expectations, and rejecting the subordination of individual identity to the collective identity of society (Ağçoban, 2020). Religion, like culture, shapes individuals' attitudes, values, and behavioral patterns. Accordingly, religiosity and individualistic - collectivistic values appear to be mutually influential, each shaping and being shaped by the other.

The concept of "individualism" that emerged in France in the nineteenth century was met with significant reactions. It was accepted as a dangerous system of thought that "destroys the social foundations", "spreads spiritual and civil anarchy", "lays the foundations of selfishness", and "divides the society". Nevertheless, later, with Durkheim, it started to be accepted and defended in Europe by referring to the sanctity and freedom of individual values (Steven, 1995).

Tocqueville, who first introduced the concept, observed during his early nineteenth-century travels in America that affluent and highly educated bourgeois groups tended to withdraw from broader society. He described this tendency using the term "individualism" (Elliott & Lemert, 2011). From an individualistic perspective, collectivist values are accepted as authoritarian and disregarding individual autonomy. However, for individualism and its philosophy, no authority has the right to interfere with people, nor does it have the right to blame them for their choices and desires. Individuals are described as independent, autonomous, self-sufficient, and self-centered in individualistic societies, while collectivist people describe themselves as community-centered, holistic, and altruistic.

The transformation and shaping of individualism began with the United States in today's sense. The concept, which began to be associated with capitalism, democracy, and liberalism, has become a symbolic word in the West. Individualism, which promises equal individual rights, spiritual and moral development, provincial authority, and justice, has been accepted as a concept that aims to protect and glorify the person's interests (Steven, 1995).

Kahveci and Sever examined individualism in 5 sub-dimensions in their studies: openness to criticism, libertarianism, uniqueness, personal interest and competition, and consumerism (Kahveci & Sever, 2016). Libertarianism emphasizes the removal of restrictions on human choices and prioritizes respect for individual freedom as a cornerstone of justice (Brennan, 2015). In line with this perspective, individualistic thought expects individuals to accept criticism without resentment, reflecting a commitment to personal autonomy and self-confidence. Moreover, although people often gravitate toward others who share similar characteristics, individuality and uniqueness are regarded as qualities that strengthen self-concept and enhance self-esteem (Lynn & Snyder, 2002). In matters of self-interest and competition, individuals prioritize personal benefit when determining their actions or behaviors. Acts that serve societal welfare may conflict with personal happiness or interests, and in such cases, individuals are not necessarily obliged to subordinate personal benefit to the collective good. Competition, in this sense, refers to the pursuit of an advantage or superiority over others, with the aim of maximizing personal gain. Finally, consumerism serves as a salient indicator of individualism in modern society, as the extent of an individual's consumer behavior reflects their level of individualistic tendencies.

Collectivism, often regarded as the conceptual counterpart to individualism, is a framework that posits that individuals are inherently interconnected and that collective goals take precedence over individual interests. As Fromm argues, the desire to overcome loneliness is accompanied by a powerful need for relatedness, which constitutes the foundation of both family and society. One

way to escape from this undesired feeling for a person looking for a solution to the uneasiness arising from their loneliness is to come together with other people and identify with them. Individuals who internalize the goals and values of society as their own become members of that society and develop a sense of belonging (Ağçoban, 2020).

According to collectivist scholars, individuals are not sacrificed despite being secondary to society, as human progress is achieved through prioritizing the collective good. Collectivism does not imply the dissolution of individual identity. Rather, it maintains that personal identity is constructed within a social context, as individuality itself cannot be realized independently of others. Accordingly, individual identity cannot be meaningfully understood in isolation from the social environment. It is constituted through social interaction and finds meaning within society, where this interdependence fosters social harmony (Altıntaş, 2012).

In their developed scale, Kahveci and Sever conceptualized collectivism through three subdimensions: devotion to authority and tradition, sharing, and loyalty to the group. One of the most distinctive features of human beings is that they are social beings, being influenced by others and influencing others. Individuals living within a society resemble one another in various respects and tend to sustain these similarities through social processes. Through social influence, norms, and conformity, patterns of group behavior emerge. What is particularly noteworthy here is the degree to which individuals internalize, adhere to, and reproduce the norms that both shape and are shaped by their interactions with others. In this sense, social support prevails in collectivist cultures as well. Individuals prioritize the group's needs to which they belong in line with the understanding of togetherness and strive to realize them. People, by nature, establish, to a certain extent, a relationship with the group to which they belong. Kağıtçıbaşı posits that individualistic societies, where personal interests are prioritized, exhibit a "culture of disunity," whereas collectivist cultures, which emphasize group interests, demonstrate a "culture of unity" (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1999).

When reviewing the literature, several internationally recognized works stand out as foundational contributions to the study of individualism and collectivism. Among these, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* and *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values* is considered one of the most comprehensive studies on individualism and collectivism. Authored by Geert Hofstede, these studies reached hundreds of participants from diverse cultures and countries, significantly contributing to the field (Hofstede et al., 2010). Building on this foundational framework, in his 1995 publication *Individualism & Collectivism*, Harry Triandis argued that individualism and collectivism are integral components of subjective culture, reflecting in an individual's behavior, personality, and attitudes (Triandis, 2018). Within the Turkish context, Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı has played a particularly influential role. Her works sought to move beyond Western-centric approaches to individualism and collectivism by tailoring research to the Turkish demographic (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1999, 2012).

In the broader literature, studies addressing collectivism and individualism while explicitly considering religiosity, such as *Religion as Culture: Religious Individualism and Collectivism Among*

American Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, and *Religion and Culture: Individualism and Collectivism in the East and West* have explored the relationship between religiosity and individualism-collectivism (A. Cohen et al., 2016; A. B. Cohen & Hill, 2007). While Cohen and Hill conceptualize religious traditions through the cultural frameworks of individualism and collectivism, their analysis is confined to religious groups in the United States. Likewise, although Cohen, Wu, and Miller explore the individualistic and collectivistic dimensions of religion across cultures, the Turkish context remains largely unexplored in their research.

Within the Turkish context, however, a master's thesis, titled *The Relationship Between Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism, Religiosity, and Parenting Styles from the Perspective of Parents and Their Children*, has been published, addressing this field. By examining individualism, collectivism, and religiosity within the context of parenting, the study extends beyond a singular focus on religiosity, incorporating individualistic and cultural values into a broader framework (Taşdemir, 2006). Another notable study, titled *Religiosity, Values, and Horizontal and Vertical Individualism-Collectivism: A Study of Turkey, the United States, and the Philippines*, examines the interplay of these three variables within the Turkish context. However, the study approaches the subject comparatively, incorporating samples from other countries, including the United States and the Philippines, to provide a cross-cultural perspective (Cukur et al., 2005).

Accordingly, the present study seeks to address the following research question: What is the relationship between individualism, collectivism, and religiosity among young adults aged 18-30 in Türkiye? Based on the existing literature and the purpose of the study, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H1. There is a significant relationship between individualism and religiosity among young adults in Türkiye.

H2. There is a significant relationship between collectivism and religiosity among young adults in Türkiye.

Given the limited number of studies examining the interplay between individualism, collectivism, and religiosity among young adults in Türkiye, further empirical investigation is needed. This research aims to examine the relationships among individualism, collectivism, and religiosity in young adults aged 18 to 30. Besides, it is thought that this study will make significant contributions to the literature by demonstrating that in Türkiye, which is stuck between modernity and tradition, collectivism and individualism are in constant negotiation.

Method

This study employed a quantitative research approach using a correlational design to examine the relationships among collectivism, individualism, and religiosity. The research was conducted with young adults aged 18 to 30 residing in Türkiye. A total of 359 individuals participated in the study, comprising 225 women (62.7%) and 134 men (37.3%). The sample included a diverse group of young adults to ensure a comprehensive analysis. The participants were reached through survey

forms created and distributed via Google Forms, using a convenience sampling method. Finally, ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University (Date: 14.06.2021, No: 96).

Data were collected using a Personal Information Questionnaire, the Individualism and Collectivism Scale in Young Individuals, and the Religiosity Scale. The Personal Information Questionnaire gathered demographic information, including age, gender, educational background, region of residence, and marital status.

The Individualism and Collectivism Scale consists of five individualism dimensions (openness to criticism, libertarianism, uniqueness, personal interest and competition, and consumerism) and three collectivism dimensions (devotion to authority and tradition, sharing, and loyalty to the group), comprising 18 items in total. The Religiosity Scale (Gülmez, 2014) includes 24 items across four dimensions: belief, experience, practice, and consequences.

Skewness and kurtosis values indicated that both scales demonstrated acceptable normality. For the Religiosity Scale, skewness was -1.340 and kurtosis was 1.449, while for the Individualism and Collectivism Scale, skewness was .363 and kurtosis was .086. All values fell within the acceptable range of -1.5 to +1.5, indicating that the data were approximately normally distributed.

Data were analyzed using SPSS 22.0. Pearson product–moment correlation analyses were conducted for normally distributed data. To assess construct validity, exploratory factor analyses were performed for both the Individualism and Collectivism Scale and the Religiosity Scale. Items with factor loadings below .50 were considered for removal. Accordingly, five items from the Group Loyalty subdimension of the Individualism and Collectivism Scale were excluded due to low factor loadings. Reliability analysis of the revised 23-item-scale yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .734, indicating acceptable internal consistency. Similarly, four items from the Religiosity Scale were removed because they had factor loadings below .50. Reliability analysis of the revised 20-item-scale produced Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .817, indicating satisfactory internal consistency.

Findings

The socio-demographic characteristics of the sample group and the frequency distributions of these characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of individuals participating in the research

Variable	*n*	%
Gender		
Female	225	62.7
Male	134	37.3
Age		
18–20	107	29.8
21–23	173	48.2
24–30	79	22.0

Variable	*n*	%
Marital status		
Married	37	10.3
Single	322	89.7
Socioeconomic status		
Lower	12	3.3
Lower middle	36	10.0
Middle	245	68.2
Upper middle	60	16.7
Upper	6	1.7
Education status		
High school	38	10.6
University	285	79.4
Postgraduate	36	10.0
Total	359	100.0

As shown in Table 1, the sample consisted of 359 participants, of whom 62.7% were women and 37.3% were men. Most participants were single (89.7%), undergraduate students or graduates (79.4%), and reported a medium socioeconomic status (68.2%). The largest age group was 21-23 years (48.2%), followed by 18-20 years (29.8%) and 24-30 years (22%).

Table 2

Results of the Pearson Correlation Analysis between Collectivism and Individualism

	r	**p**
Collectivism x Individualism	.036	.493

Table 2 demonstrates the analysis results regarding the relationship between collectivism and individualism. The findings indicate that there is no significant relationship between collectivism and individualism overall (r = .036, p = .493). The sub-dimensions of collectivism and individualism were not included in the analysis, as their examination would extend beyond the scope of the research problem and potentially divert attention from the primary focus of the study.

Table 3

Results of the Pearson Correlation Analysis Between Individualism and Religiosity

Dimension	Belief		Experience		Practice		Consequences		Religiosity	
	r	*p*	*r*	*p*	*r*	*p*	*r*	*p*	*r*	*p*
Consumerism	.023	.667	.044	.408	.274	< .001	–.208	< .001	–.206	< .001

Dimension	Belief		Experience		Practice		Consequences		Religiosity	
	r	*p*	*r*	*p*	*r*	*p*	*r*	*p*	*r*	*p*
Personal Benefit and Competition	–.036	.491	–.048	.364	–.276	< .001	–.222	< .001	–.256	< .001
Libertarianism	–.064	.230	–.010	.843	–.125	.018	–.022	.677	–.078	.143
Uniqueness	.017	.749	.080	.130	–.147	.005	–.077	.144	–.069	.193
Openness to Criticism	–.071	.177	.001	.979	.037	.490	–.031	.561	–.003	.960
Individualism	–.029	.584	.026	.629	–.308	< .001	–.221	< .001	–.239	< .001

Table 3 presents the results of the analysis examining the relationship between individualism and religiosity. Overall, a weak but significant negative correlation was found between individualism and religiosity (r = -.239, p < .001). Regarding the subdimensions, no significant correlations were found between religious belief and consumerism (r = .023, p = .667), personal benefit and competition (r = -.036, p = .491), libertarianism (r = -.064, p = .230), uniqueness (r = .017, p = .749), or openness to criticism (r = -.071, p = .177). Similarly, no significant relationships were found between religious experience and consumerism (r = .044, p = .407), personal benefit and competition (r = -.048, p = .364), libertarianism (r = -.010, p = .843), uniqueness (r = .080, p = .130), or openness to criticism (r = .001, p = .979). Regarding religious practice, a significant relationship was found with several individualism dimensions. Practice was positively associated with consumerism (r = .274, p < .001), while it showed negative correlations with personal benefit and competition (r = -.276, p < .001), libertarianism (r = -.125, p = .018), and uniqueness (r = -.147, p = .005). No significant relationship was found between practice and openness to criticism (r = .037, p = .490). Additionally, whilst a negative relevant relationship between consequences and consumerism (r=-.208, p<001), personal benefit and competition (r=-.222, p<.001) is seen, no correlation between libertarianism (r=-.022, p =.677), uniqueness (r=-.077, p=.144), and openness to criticism (r=-.031, p=.561) was found.

Table 4

Results of the Pearson Correlation Analysis Between Collectivism and Religiosity

Dimension	Belief		Experience		Practice		Consequences		Religiosity	
	r	*p*	*r*	*p*	*r*	*p*	*r*	*p*	*r*	*p*
Sharing	.132	.012	.127	.016	.093	.079	.074	.159	.144	.006
Devotion to Authority and Tradition	.099	.060	.241	< .001	.188	< .001	.141	.007	.264	< .001
Collectivism	.151	.004	.244	< .001	.186	< .001	.143	.007	.270	< .001

Table 4 shows a positive and significant relationship between collectivism and religiosity (r = .270, p < .001), indicating that higher levels of collectivism are associated with higher levels of religiosity. Regarding the sub-dimensions, belief is positively related to sharing (r = .132, p = .012) but not to

devotion to authority and tradition ($r = .099$, $p = .060$). Religious experience is positively associated with both sharing ($r = .127$, $p = .016$) and devotion to authority and tradition ($r = .241$, $p < .001$). While practice is not significantly related to sharing ($r = .093$, $p = .079$), it is positively related to devotion to authority and tradition ($r = .188$, $p < .001$). Similarly, consequences are not significantly associated with sharing ($r = .074$, $p = .159$) but are positively related to devotion to authority and tradition ($r = .141$, $p = .007$).

Discussion

The values of collectivism and individualism are generally considered to be opposite to one another. However, an important point that should be emphasized is that individualism and collectivism should not be regarded as two mutually exclusive or opposing poles. No society can be characterized as entirely individualistic or entirely collectivistic; rather, both orientations coexist to varying degrees within all societies (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2012).

One study found that the distribution of collectivist and individualist values in Türkiye reflects a complex cultural structure, with no clear predominance of either collectivism or individualism (Göregenli, 1995). Societies may simultaneously exhibit both collectivist and individualistic characteristics; however, one orientation typically tends to be more dominant than the other (Hofstede et al., 2010). Previous research indicates that individualistic and collectivistic tendencies can vary considerably among different regions and social groups within the same national context (Tassell et al., 2010). The coexistence of individualistic and collectivistic values may explain the absence of a significant relationship between these two orientations in the present study. As a society that has undergone rapid modernization, Türkiye displays a complex cultural structure in which both collectivist and individualist tendencies are evident in different social contexts. Although participants in this study exhibited higher levels of collectivism ($X = 3{,}835$, $X = 2{,}933$), the lack of a significant association between individualism and collectivism may reflect the simultaneous acceptance and expression of both value orientations within Turkish society. While Hofstede classified Türkiye as a predominantly collectivist culture, subsequent studies have pointed to the increasing presence of individualistic values (Şah & Eroğlu-Şah, 2022). Consistent with this view, another study showed that Turkish employees demonstrate greater ambivalence between individualistic and collectivistic values than their Korean counterparts, suggesting that both orientations continue to coexist within contemporary Turkish society (Öztürk & Altundağ, 2023).

The negative relationship between religiosity and individualism observed in this study may be explained by the tension between individualistic values and the emphasis of religious traditions on adherence to shared norms, authority, and collective moral frameworks. While individualism prioritizes personal autonomy, self-determination, and independent decision-making, religiosity often encourages individuals to align their beliefs and behaviors with religious teachings and established moral principles. Consequently, stronger individualistic orientations may be associated with lower levels of religiosity, as the emphasis on personal autonomy can reduce the perceived

importance of external religious authority in guiding individual choices (Ağçoban, 2020). On the other hand, religion provides individuals with structured value systems that guide how to live, prioritize, and interpret life experiences. In the Western context, historical processes such as the Protestant Reformation contributed to the weakening of the Catholic Church's institutional authority and played a significant role in shaping contemporary forms of individualism. In addition, processes of secularization have reduced the visibility and influence of institutional religion in many societies, not only in Western contexts but also globally. As a result, religious institutions and norms might have become less directly influential in regulating individual behavior in everyday life; at the same time, religion might have increasingly been confined to the private sphere, where individuals selectively engage with religious teachings (Bahovec, 2015). Within this framework, it is often argued that individualism, which emphasizes personal autonomy and self-determination, may come into tension with religious traditions that prioritize shared moral frameworks and prescribed ways of living.

When it comes to the sub-dimensions of religiosity and individualism, the negative relationship between personal benefits and competition and the level of religious practice may be attributed to the tendency of religious practice to encourage individuals to moderate excessive ambitions and to recognize the transient nature of worldly pursuits. Even if religious teachings do not significantly influence an individual's daily life, the regular practice of religious rituals can facilitate the internalization and reinforcement of these teachings in a person's mind. When religious rituals are understood as a form of meditation and introspection, increased engagement in such practices may lead individuals to move away from self-centeredness, persistent dissatisfaction, and constant competitive striving. Instead, they focus more on being present in the moment and move away from utilitarian behaviors. In line with this perspective, one study has shown that individuals who regularly engage in certain rituals, such as meditation, tend to exhibit less competitive and individualistic behaviors. Instead, they develop a stronger sense of community and form deeper interpersonal connections (Loser et al., 2009).

The study further revealed that the sense of uniqueness decreases as the level of religious practice increases. This finding may be explained by a principle emphasized in Islamic thought, the predominant religious tradition in Türkiye, that superiority among individuals is determined solely by taqwa (piety) and that all human beings are fundamentally equal before God, which may reduce emphasis on individual uniqueness as conceptualized within the individualism dimension. The idea of "one of a kind and unique human being" that emerged with modernization is a message that individuals are constantly exposed to in today's world. Advertisements commonly emphasize individual uniqueness, portraying individuals as distinct and deserving of special recognition, attention, and privileges, which may reinforce individualistic values. On the other hand, while religions emphasize the uniqueness of the individual, which is a humbler form, they oppose the over-exalted understanding of the human being and the discourse of uniqueness addressed in individualistic values. Similarly, the act of regularly performing religious rituals as a continual

reminder may contribute to individuals moving away from thoughts of uniqueness and unifying with the members of the group (Stein et al., 2021). As certain rituals are performed collectively, an increase in the frequency of worship may foster a sense of unity and closeness to others. This may also help explain the negative relationship between religious practice and libertarianism. Through strengthening feelings of belonging, religious rituals may encourage individuals to perceive themselves as part of a broader community, thereby promoting group harmony (Sosis, 2004). In this regard, as an individual's level of religious practice increases, the tendency toward collective orientation may become more prominent than the emphasis on individual freedom.

In this study, a positive relationship was found between religious practice and consumerism. The relationship between consumption and religiosity is, however, complex and not clearly defined in the existing literature. Although religious teachings generally encourage moderation, simplicity, and avoidance of excess and ostentation, it would be expected that higher levels of religiosity would be associated with lower levels of consumerism. Contrary to this expectation, the findings indicate that increased engagement in religious practices is associated with higher levels of consumption. This relationship may be better understood by examining whether participants exhibit intrinsically or extrinsically oriented religiosity. Although the present study did not differentiate between intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity and was not intended to investigate these dimensions, the findings may still allow for some tentative interpretations in this regard. In cases of extrinsic religiosity, where religious involvement is shaped by instrumental, social, or status-related motivations, consumerist tendencies may align with and even reinforce religious practice. In contrast, intrinsic religiosity, where individuals internalize religious teachings and are primarily motivated by spiritual commitment, would be expected to relate negatively to consumerism. Therefore, future research employing a multidimensional approach to religiosity may provide a more nuanced understanding of its relationship with consumer behavior. In this regard, a limited number of studies have identified a relationship between levels of religiosity and consumption habits, including purchasing behavior. Accordingly, it has been observed that individuals with higher levels of religiosity may engage in greater purchasing activity. However, a key point highlighted in the literature is that purchasing behavior varies depending on whether religiosity is intrinsically or extrinsically oriented. Individuals with high extrinsic religiosity tend to exhibit more demand-driven and innovative consumption attitudes, whereas those with intrinsic religiosity are generally more conservative and less inclined toward consumption-related innovation (Yener, 2015).

The consequences dimension, which reflects the extent to which religion shapes an individual's life, was found to be negatively related to personal benefit and competition. As individuals put religion into practice and integrate it into their daily lives, they may become less oriented toward worldly ambitions, competition, and "me-first" attitudes. Accordingly, to the extent that religion increasingly shapes one's life, corresponding attitudinal changes are expected to emerge.

A negative correlation was also found between consumerism and the consequences dimension in this study. Many religious traditions discourage excess and extravagance, and individuals are often

reminded to refrain from excessive attachment to worldly goods due to their transient nature. Individuals who seek to maintain consistency between their religious beliefs and daily life may therefore tend to avoid excessive consumption, as it may conflict with their value system. However, a surprising finding of the study is the positive relationship between the level of religious practice and consumerism. That is, while consumerism increases with higher levels of practice, it decreases as the consequences dimension increases. This may suggest that although individuals engage in religious practices, these practices might not necessarily translate into a comprehensive transformation of daily life behaviors, whereas deeper internalization of religious teachings, captured by the consequences dimension, may be more effective in shaping consumption-related attitudes. Moreover, in the context of a modern consumer society, continuous demand and purchasing behaviors are often encouraged to keep pace with social and economic expectations, making resistance to such patterns increasingly difficult. Under these conditions, consumption may become a normalized aspect of everyday life, regardless of individuals' level of religiosity. The findings therefore may indicate that controlling consumption behavior might be more closely related to the extent to which religious beliefs are integrated into daily life rather than mere ritual practice.

This study also found no significant relationship between religious belief and the sub-dimensions of individualism (consumerism, personal benefit and competition, libertarianism, uniqueness, and openness to criticism). Similarly, no significant relationship was observed between religious experience and the sub-dimensions of individualism. One possible explanation is that the participants' overall levels of religiosity were relatively high (X = 4,3940), with belief emerging as the most dominant dimension. This emphasis on belief may have reduced variability, thereby obscuring potential relationships between belief and individualism or its sub-dimensions.

Regarding the experience dimension, it is assumed that the dynamic interaction between the individual and God may discourage behaviors that are inconsistent with religious teachings. However, the lack of significant findings might suggest that the participants' religious experiences may not have been sufficiently profound to produce observable changes in individualistic tendencies. In addition, the absence of significant correlations between libertarianism, uniqueness, and the religiosity dimensions may indicate that these values can operate relatively independently of religiosity in this sample. Another possible explanation is that the levels of religious belief and experience might not have been strong enough to bring about substantial transformations in aspects such as libertarianism and uniqueness.

Finally, no significant relationship was found between openness to criticism and the religiosity sub-dimensions. Openness to criticism is generally considered a personality trait associated with self-confidence. Across different cultural and religious contexts, individuals are often encouraged to respond constructively to criticism and to view it as an opportunity for personal development. In this respect, openness to criticism may function more as a stable personality characteristic rather than a value dimension directly shaped by religiosity.

The present study also examined the relationship between religiosity and collectivism, revealing a significant positive association between these two variables. Religion is not only a phenomenon that regulates individuals' relationships with the sacred and promotes personal moral development, but also a social institution that shapes and regulates the relationship between individuals and society. Through its norms, values, and practices, religion encourages individuals to align their behaviors and attitudes with the expectations of the broader community. Participation in congregational worship, religious activities, and charitable organizations is considered to foster social interaction, cooperation, and a sense of belonging, thereby strengthening collectivist orientations. Increased religiosity might therefore be associated with greater emphasis on group solidarity, mutual support, and collective well-being. Moreover, religion is believed to contribute to social integration by establishing shared goals, values, and purposes among its members. Collective rituals and communal worship might reinforce group cohesion and strengthen social bonds, which in turn may promote social stability. In this respect, the influential role of religion in society serves as a key mechanism for maintaining group harmony, fostering collective identity, and ensuring social order (Abuzar, 2011). Consequently, the positive association between religiosity and collectivism can be understood through religion's capacity to encourage cooperation, social cohesion, and commitment to collective interests.

Furthermore, religion might facilitate individuals' adaptation to and integration within society by reinforcing shared norms, values, and collective identities. Through these mechanisms, it can contribute not only to social cohesion but also to the continuity of social groups. Supporting this view, research conducted in the United States examining religious communities between 1776 and 1900 found that groups characterized by a unified religious belief system tended to survive longer than groups with more diverse belief structures (Argyle et al., 2004). This finding suggests that religion can play a significant role in promoting group stability, cohesion, and long-term continuity. In line with this perspective, the findings reveal positive relationships between sharing and the dimensions of belief and religious experience. However, no significant relationship was found between sharing and the dimensions of religious consequences and religious practice. One possible explanation is that individuals may perceive religious practices and the incorporation of religion into daily life primarily as matters of personal faith and individual choice, while placing less emphasis on the social functions of religion and worship. Consequently, the communal and prosocial aspects of religious participation may not necessarily translate into higher levels of sharing behavior among individuals who focus predominantly on the personal rather than the social dimensions of religiosity.

Religiosity can provide individuals with a social identity and a sense of belonging. Hence, individuals with higher levels of religiosity might tend to identify strongly with their religious group, adhere to its values and norms, and strive to live according to its teachings, which may strengthen group cohesion and social integration. Supporting this view, findings from the World Values Survey indicate that individuals who are proud of their country and who consider honoring

their family as a primary life goal tend to be more religious (Hofstede et al., 2010). This sense of belonging can also promote individuals with social support. Through participation in religious communities, individuals might gain access to social networks that can enhance their psychological well-being. Supporting this view, studies have shown that individuals who regularly attend church tend to report better psychological well-being than those who do not (Argyle et al., 2004). In addition, religious individuals are often argued to be more inclined to obey authority (Sevinç, 2017), exhibit greater conformity to social norms (Yapıcı, 2020), and support existing social structures and regulations rather than social change (Argyle et al., 2004).

Religions include established rules and rule-makers, and individuals who share the same faith often follow religious leaders such as imams or other figures of authority, to whom obedience is generally expected. In this respect, the findings of the present study are consistent with previous research suggesting that religious individuals tend to exhibit higher levels of obedience and compliance. However, the results also showed no significant relationship between the level of belief and devotion to authority and tradition. This suggests that knowledge or belief alone might not be sufficient to produce behavioral change, as internalization is also required. Accordingly, the absence of a relationship may indicate that belief does not necessarily translate into obedience and conformity unless it is deeply internalized in daily life.

However, the positive relationship found between the dimensions of experience, consequences, and practice and devotion to authority and tradition may be explained by the fact that individuals who internalize their beliefs and integrate them into daily life are more likely to engage in obedience and conformity behaviors. As religiosity becomes more deeply embedded in lived experience, individuals may tend to develop stronger attachments to traditions and authority structures.

Conclusion

Taken together, the findings indicate that religiosity is associated with both individualistic and collectivistic value orientations, although the nature and strength of these relationships vary across dimensions. While no significant relationship was found between individualism and collectivism, religiosity was negatively associated with individualism and positively associated with collectivism. At the subdimensional level, religiosity demonstrated positive associations with sharing, devotion to authority and tradition, and consumerism, while showing negative associations with uniqueness, libertarianism, personal benefit, and competition. These findings indicate that religiosity is associated with value orientations that prioritize social cohesion, adherence to social norms, and collective interests, while showing a weaker association with individualistic orientations characterized by personal distinctiveness, competition, and self-interest.

Ethics Committee Approval

Ethics approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University (Date: 14.06.2021, No: 96). This article is derived from the author's master's thesis entitled "18-30 Yaş Arası Genç Yetişkinlerde Bireycilik, Toplumculuk ve Dindarlık İlişkisi" [The relationship between individualism, collectivism, and religiosity in young adults aged 18–30], completed at the Institute of Islamic Studies, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Türkiye, in 2021.

Conflict of Interest

The author serves as a language editor of Research on the Psychology of Religion. In accordance with COPE guidelines, she was excluded from all editorial decisions concerning this manuscript, and the review process was handled independently by the editor under double-blind peer review. The author declares no other conflict of interest.

Article History

Received: 16.05.2026
Accepted: 21.09.2026
Published: 30.09.2026

Author Information

Ayşe Aydar
Res. Asst., Şırnak University, Faculty of Theology,
Department of Psychology of Religion, Türkiye.
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6711-506X
aaydar34@gmail.com

References

Abuzar, C. (2011). Dinin toplumsal yaşam üzerindeki etkisi. *Harran Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, *26*(26), 143–153. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/harranilahiyatdergisi/article/276467

Ağçoban, S. (2020). "İslam'da bireyselleşme"nin teorisini yazmak ne kadar mümkün? *Rumeli İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (5), 132–146. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/rumeli/article/702760

Altıntaş, M. E. (2012). Bireycilik ve toplumculuk tartışmaları bağlamında değerler eğitimi yaklaşımları. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, *10*(24), 31–52. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ded/article/312430

Argyle, M., Beit-Hallahmi, B., Kuşat, A., Korkmaz, M., & Güllü, İ. (2004). Dini davranış teorileri. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *1*(16), 247–280. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/erusosbilder/article/253029

Bahovec, I. (2015). Christianity in confrontation with individualism and crisis of Western culture: Person, community, dialog, reflexivity, and relationship ethics. *75*, 335–346.

Brennan, J. (2015). *Liberteryanizm* (A. Yayla, Trans.). Liberte Yayınları.

Cohen, A. B., & Hill, P. C. (2007). Religion as culture: Religious individualism and collectivism among American Catholics, Jews, and Protestants. *Journal of Personality, 75*(4), 709–742. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2007.00454.x

Cohen, A., Wu, M., & Miller, J. (2016). Religion and culture: Individualism and collectivism in the East and West. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 47*, 1236–1249. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116667895

Cukur, C., De Guzman, M. R., & Carlo, G. (2005). Religiosity, values, and horizontal and vertical individualism—collectivism: A study of Turkey, the United States, and the Philippines. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 144*, 613–634. https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.144.6.613-634

Elliott, A., & Lemert, C. (2011). *Yeni bireycilik: Küreselleşmenin duygusal bedelleri* (Y. Sel, Trans.). Sel Yayıncılık.

Göregenli, M. (1995). Kültürümüz açısından bireycilik-toplulukçuluk eğilimleri: Bir başlangıç çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 1–14.

Gülmez, Ç. (2014). *Kadına yönelik aile içi şiddet, ahlaki çözülme ve dindarlık* [Doktora tezi]. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind, third edition*. McGraw Hill Professional.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1999). *Yeni insan ve insanlar*. Evrim Yayınları.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2012). *Benlik, aile ve insan gelişimi: Kültürel psikoloji* (3rd ed.). Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Kahveci, H., & Sever, M. (2016). Genç bireylerde bireycilik ve kolektivizm ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2*(3), 73–90. https://doi.org/10.29065/usakead.256380

Loser, R., Hill, E., Klein, S., & Dollahite, D. (2009). Perceived benefits of religious rituals in the Latter-day Saint home. Faculty Publications. https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/facpub/4043

Lynn, M., & Snyder, C. R. (2002). Uniqueness seeking. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 395–410). Oxford University Press.

Öztürk, C., & Altundağ, P. (2023). Kültürel boyutlar teorisi bağlamında Türkiye ve Güney Kore'de organizasyon kültürünün incelenmesi. *Doğu Dilleri Dergisi, 8*(2), 65–95. https://doi.org/10.61134/audodilder.1400906

Şah, U., & Eroğlu-Şah, D. (2022). Kültürel bir boyut olarak "bireycilik-toplulukçuluk" ve Türkiye'deki çalışmalar. *13*, 108–121.

Sevinç, K. (2017). *İnançsızlık psikolojisi* (1st ed.). Çamlıca Yayınları.

Sosis, R. (2004). The adaptive value of religious ritual: Rituals promote group cohesion by requiring members to engage in behavior that is too costly to fake. *American Scientist, 92*(2), 166–172. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27858365

Stein, D. H., Hobson, N. M., & Schroeder, J. (2021). A sacred commitment: How rituals promote group survival. *Current Opinion in Psychology, Religion, 40*, 114–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.09.005

Steven, L. (1995). *Bireycilik* (İ. Serin, Trans.). Ark Yayıncılık.

Taşdemir, N. (2006). *The relationship between vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism, religiosity, and parenting styles from the perspective of parents and their children*. METU.

Tassell, N. A., Flett, R. A., & Gavala, J. R. (2010). Individualism/collectivism and academic self-enhancement in New Zealand Māori university students. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology, 4*(2), 138–151. https://doi.org/10.1375/prp.4.2.138

Triandis, H. C. (2018). *Individualism and collectivism*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429499845

Yapıcı, A. (2020). *Toplumsal cinsiyet din ve kadın* (2nd ed.). Çamlıca Yayınları.

Yener, D. (2015). Tüketici etnosentrizmini etkileyen bir faktör olarak dindarlık. *Uluslararası İktisadi ve İdari İncelemeler Dergisi*, (12). https://doi.org/10.18092/ijeas.08004