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Mentalizing, Personal Prayer, the Presence of God, and Evil

Abstract
People who believe in a relational, personal deity, conceptualize god(s) as intentional agents with mental states. Hence it follows that mentalizing or theory of mind may be one of the cognitive foundations of religious belief and behavior. This study examined this relationship as it corresponds to reported prayer experiences, intimacy with god, and experience of agentic evil.
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Abstract
People who believe in a relational, personal deity conceptualize god(s) as intentional agents with mental states. Hence it follows that mentalizing or theory of mind may be one of the cognitive foundations of religious belief and behavior. This study examined this relationship as it corresponds to reported prayer experiences, intimacy with god, and experience of agentic evil.

Methods & Procedure
The Prayer Intimacy Scale: Seven items rated on a continuum from 1 (never) to 5 (always) (Edman et al., 2016). Questions concern participants’ experience in prayer, e.g., “When I pray, I hear God speak to me.”

The Multidimensional Prayer Inventory (MPI): Twenty-one items rated on a continuum from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Questions concern prayer frequency and duration and assess frequency of different types of prayer, including adoration, confession, thanksgiving, supplication, and reception (Laird, Snyder, Rapoff, & Green, 2004).

The Empathy Quotient (EQ): Twenty-two items that assess the degree to which participants are able to vicariously identify with the perspectives and emotions of others (Wakabayashi et al., 2006).

The Autism-Spectrum Quotient (AQ): Fifty items assessing autistic characteristics in adults who have normal IQ scores (Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Skinner, Martin, & Chabley, 2001).

The Mind in the Eyes Test – Revised: Thirty-six pictures that assess the presence of autistic traits in adults within a normative range. Sensitivity to subtle social cues is measured by a participant’s ability to accurately detect a person’s emotion based on an image of a pair of eyes (Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Hill, Raste, & Plumb, 2001).

The Supernatural Evil Scale: Five items modified from the Religious and Spiritual Struggle Scale (Exline, Pargament, Grubbs, & Yali, 2014). Questions assess participants’ belief in and experience with a devil or demons (Vermeir & Edman, 2016).

Hypotheses
Ability to mentalize will be related to personal prayer, in that:
1. Differences in mentalizing will be related to relational, personal prayer practices.
2. Differences in mentalizing will be related to more intimate personal experiences with god(s).
3. Differences in mentalizing will be related to belief in and experiences of agentic evil.

Results
H1: Mentalizing will be related to relational, personal prayer practices

2-step hierarchical multiple regression, predicting Mind in the Eyes scores:
Step 1: Thanking, Adoration, Reception
R²=0.02, F (7, 1290)=9.939, p<.001
Step 2: add Supplication, Confession
R²=0.03, F (7, 1290)=8.374, p<.001

2-step hierarchical multiple regression, predicting Empathy Quotient scores:
Step 1: Thanking, Adoration, Reception
R²=0.01, F (3, 1380)=5.080, p<.001
Step 2: add Supplication, Confession
R²=0.02, F (5, 1380)=5.080, p<.001

There was no relationship among AQ and MDPI scores. The final model for Mind in the Eyes, only Prayers of Reception resulted in a non-statistically significant β (.121, t=1.90, p=.058).

Final model for AQ, only Prayers of Reception and Supplication resulted in statistically significant βs (-.215, t=-3.577, p<.001 and .117, t=-2.522, p=.012).

H2: Mentalizing will be related to more intimate personal prayer experiences

Supported

H3: Mentalizing will be related to higher scores on Supernatural Evil Scale

Supported

Discussion
Mentalizing may be related to personal prayer practices in predicting Mind in the Eyes and EQ scores, but not AQ scores. However, this relationship accounted for only a very small percentage of score variance. Further analysis should include examination of subsets of participants in order to account for varying levels of religiosity and different religious traditions. It may be that the large number of “nones” in the data set (and hence the large number of people who do not pray) may have diluted this potential relationship. The relationship of mentalizing to the experience of intimacy with god during prayer and with belief in and experience of agentic evil are more compelling. These results lend support to the theory that mentalizing is one of the cognitive foundations of religion and is an important component in understanding differences in religiosity. The results indicate that the relationship of mentalizing with belief in and experience of supernatural evil is stronger than that with one’s experience of god(s). The results also support the notion that MET scores are actually negatively related to supernatural experiences. This implies that mentalizing is a multi-dimensional construct.

More research is needed to examine the nature of mentalizing.

Conclusion
The research connecting theory of mind and religious belief has met with controversy. The present study clarifies this—it may be that mentalizing is implicated in the intensity and kind of relationship a believer has with supernatural agents, both benevolent and malevolent. This may reveal why some researchers have found the connection and others have not: it may depend upon how religious belief is measured. It also may reveal one of the reasons why some people have intense or very personal experiences with God and others don’t—it may be related to the cognitive ability to mentalize. If this is true, it also may have implications for faith leaders. This may explain why older prayer practices that involve imagining oneself into a scene and experiencing what the characters in the scene are experiencing is a powerful way to “feel” the presence of God—it increases one’s ability to and propensity to mentalize.
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Method Highlights
Sample (data from 4 studies)
622 Men
757 Women
2 unreported
Age Range
17 – 77
(M=28.53, SD=11.41)
Ethnicity
561 White/Non-Hispanic; 430 Asian; 199 Other; 192 Hispanic/Latino; 54 African-American

Reported Religion
307 Protestant; 307 None; 193 Hindu; 143 Catholic; 102 Other; 81 Muslim;
24 Buddhist; 3 Mormon; 3 Jewish

Example question from Mind in the Eyes Test - Revised.
Correct Answer: Regretful