

## The Relationship Between Institutional Internalization and Organic Solidarity

### **Abstract**

This paper will focus on the relationship between institutional internalization and organic solidarity. Being that there is a wide verity of different institutions, this writing will focus primarily on only religion, politics, and education. The internalization of the individual from each of these institutions greatly effects their beliefs, desires, and action, which as a result branches out into society from a mechanical solidarity operation into a more organic solidarity operation. Organic solidarity will depend on individuals in their respected association, to internalize their specific role. A control variable was used in this research to detect any spurious relationships that may change the final data and to avoid a type I or II error. The controlled variables used were five different categorizes of religious affiliation. Without the controlled variable the significance of the relationship between Institutional Internalization and Organic Solidarity was only .179. With the five controlled variables applied there was no significance found. With an additional Regression Analysis calculated there was minimal significance found with specific variables.

## **Introduction**

Finding out how a community might work together is an important and critical aspect for a methodologist. The research in this paper looks into that, specifically by looking at institutional internalization and organic solidarity. These two concepts are generally recognized under the theory of functionalism, inspired by Emile Durkheim.

By defining both the relationship between each other and what they are when standing alone, there would be a better understanding that could help guide their relevance and application to society today. Although they are older concepts that Durkheim never addressed in any memorable quotes, they are still a part of the sociological foundation. By evaluating examples and other previous research it will allow access for a better comprehension in this paper.

After knowing how they may affect each other it is also important to look at the other variables that could play apart in both developing and affecting institutional internalization and organic solidarity. Variables such as race and social economic status are meaningful and will be explained why. By doing so, prior research of the relationships between these variables and concepts are necessary.

Finally in order to reduce possible new and wrong information between institutional internalization and organic solidarity it is important to come up with both accurate and ethical ways to measure the relationship in a quantitative way. Key ways to measures these concepts and variables have already been given by the General Social Survey. Although it would help to keep in mind that it is crucial to locate a measurement within the survey that is valid, accurate and reliability consistent with what is trying to be measured. The link between these two is laid out that institutional internalization causes and affects organic solidarity.

### **Institutional Internalization**

Dependency within a society has grown along with both the population, and advancing institutions. This idea will be explained by looking at institutional internalization and organic solidarity. Before understanding the bond between these two concepts it is important to first understand what they are individually and how they are applied to society. It is also important to explain and understand how and why organic solidarity cannot be the independent variable that affects institutional internalization, that the relationship between these two concepts cannot be reverse.

Institutional internalization is where the people in a particular institution take on their individual roles and internalize them along with the overall goals, rules, and beliefs of that organization. The individuals take their roles seriously and realize how others depend on them. Institutions essentially are any business or organization that contains a population of any amount, and willing to work together towards the same goal. For example any work place, such as a fast food restaurant. Even though there are mini goals for the individuals that work there such as prepping the food, count the till, and wiping down the tables, the main goal for everyone is the same, sell food, and make money.

Political campaign institutions also contain the same functional ideals. Some members are in charge of scheduling the candidate for different meetings. There are people that compose the campaign advertisements, and then volunteers who do different odd jobs that are necessary to keep the campaign running to its fullest potential. Regardless of how many positions or people are needed, the main goal is the same for every individual. That is to have their candidate win the election. Even though they may only have small roles to fulfill they are still aware of the significance of their job and know that the other people depend on them working to the best of

their abilities.

Internalizing these institutions is an idea that focuses more on the individual. With each organization there are different roles that must be played out. Each role has a set of rules, expectations, and goals attached to them. When internalizing a role, that specific individual is accepting those rules, expectations, and goals as a part of who they are for the amount of time they are involved in that institution.

When it comes to internalizing a specific role, a person can take on their new found places in their institution as a social and moral obligation to fulfill that role to the best of their abilities. In Durkheim's words;

Man's characteristic privilege is that the bond he accepts is not physical but moral; that is, social. He is governed not by a material environment brutally imposed on him, but by a conscience superior to his own, the superiority of which he feels. Because the greater, better part of his existence transcends the body, he escapes the body's yoke, but is subject to that of society (Durkheim).

Take a religious institution for example. One of the roles that must be filled in a religious organization is the role of a religious leader. In general the rules and expectation to this position is fairly the same. They are to uphold that religious organization's doctrine, be a spiritual leader for the congregation, and make sure the overall integrity of that religious organization stays intact. The individual goal for a religious leader is to convert more members to the religion. There can also be other minor goals that they may set in place, such as expanding the religious organization.

Another role that takes place in a religious institution is the role of a congregation member. The basic rules of a congregation member falls along the lines of arriving to service on time, praying when instructed to do so, and stay silent when a sermon is being given. General expectations are to adhere to the dress code; if there is one, be a good example according to their

specific doctrine for others that are around, and be willing to participate in extended activities that the organization may be involved in. The main difference between the rules and expectations are that by breaking the expectations, the individual may just not be taken seriously as a member, whereas by breaking the rules that are set in place could potentially lead to being exiled from the organization completely. The individual goal for a congregation member can vary significantly. Some may want to make sense for why bad things happened in their lives, where others may want closure, or understanding. Connecting back to the idea of institutions, there is always a shared goal between the religious leader and the congregation.

### **Organic Solidarity**

Organic solidarity is the distribution of labor in a society or institution. Each individual is dependent on everyone else in order to function. The thought of organic solidarity can be taken from the wide perspective of the cultures as a whole, to institutions, all the way down to the basic family household. It holds such a weight in our culture that Parsons, an authority on Durkheim, states that organic solidarity is one of the things that differentiate “the modern phase of societal development.” (Tiryakian 2000).

In a simpler way of living there is the concept of a village. In the village every family is more or less independent from each other. Each family can make their own cloths, hunt and gather their own food, and fashion their own tools. Besides the individuals need for social interaction or being allowed to occasionally barter, these families have no real reason to interact with the village because they have no dependencies on them. This is an example of mechanical solidarity.

To properly illustrate organic solidarity, it's easiest to look towards a more industrialized civilization. Here the individual families are very much dependent on the village, or more

appropriately the town/city. Families are dependent on grocery stores for their food; they look to the school systems to educate their children. Even their basic necessities like clothes and water are heavily dependent of other businesses. Organic solidarity ultimately depends on the people within the society or institution to not be able to cope on their own, in terms of supplying their basic day to day needs without having to go to a second or third party member.

### **The Relationship**

In order for organic solidarity to work within a community, or institution, everyone within that group must accept their individual roles otherwise that operating society would crumble. Example; if students decided to no longer act as students, not attending class, not do work, try to be the boss, that school will ultimately fail. Organic solidarity relies on division of labor; hence there will always be a positive correlation between institutional internalization and organic solidarity (Cheung 2011).

As described organic solidarity relies heavily on the people within an institution to internalize their roles. They are aware that their contribution is important and others depend on them. As a result they are able to recognize they're equally dependent on the contribution of their colleges, superiors, workers, etc. Without this recognition the dependency would not occur. It is therefore impossible for institutional internalization to be post organic solidarity.

As institutions have grown and advanced in today's society, the general populations have been forced to become more dependent within and between these institutions. By observing and understanding these two concepts it is easier to understand why. Ultimately by understanding these two ideas it is expected to realize that organic solidarity is caused by institutional internalization. Prior to seeing this specific relationship it is imperative to see how they stand on their own in in both relating and affecting society. With these steps the ability to comprehend

how and why organic solidarity does not create institutional internalization, although it could have the potential to affect it given that it is already taking place.

Although it is important to see the positive correlation from institutional internalization into organic solidarity, it is also pressing to recognize that there are other variables that assisted in both creating and altering the results of this relationship. Other variables such as race, social economic status and whether a person falls in the minority or majority of their groups can predict how they see themselves in their institution and how dependent they become.

### **Researching Institutional Internalization and Organic Solidarity**

Looking for the tie between institutional internalization and organic solidarity is not unprecedented. In fact this type of research was even addressed in Durkheim's well known book *Division of Labor* while addressing the problem of anomie (Müller 1994).

As straight forward as these concepts may be, the application and conventional role that they play a part in may not always be as clear when looking at an institution from a distance. For example in a university there are given key roles to each member. There are professors, who in general all take on the role of teaching, helping students, and expanding ideas in their respected subject. Then there are students, who accept and play out the role of the learner. Their basic responsibilities are to go to class, do their assignments, and potentially pass with good grades. Then there are the others like staff faculty, and the government. They are responsible for making sure that the university functions and is fulfilling their main objective, which is to accept and graduate students. The roles in these individuals are important but so is the interdependent relationship between them that is created by this division of labor (Koomen, Spilt, Thijs, 2011).

When seeing an educational system run properly with these roles in place it's easy to see a clear cut link between the internalization of everyone's individual responsibilities and how they

profoundly become dependent on each other as a result. This is why when something like a student strike that causes an entire institution to shut down may seem like a failure of this bond, however leading by example of the 2011 student strikes in South America for more equality (Olavarria 2000) it would be fair to say that student strikes also exhibits this relationship, only from another institutional view point.

When the students refused to go to school until their demands were met, the teacher's main goal was no longer to teach, but to have a job again. This was dependent on the students. In order to proceed with the educational system the government in particular were now at the mercy of what the students were and were not willing to compromise with what they wanted. When looking at it as an education institution, the various roles and dependencies are changed and seemingly reversed. But when looking at it as a more political institution and those roles are renamed, the direct relationship between these two main concepts still stands positive.

Even though Durkheim was concern with the positive relationship between institutional internalization and organic solidarity, he was never able to fully discover or explain that relationship (Müller 1994).

### **Research of Race and Institutional Internalization**

Race is something that in America has pre-determined on how a lot of the population will be treated, looked at, or trusted. Depending on a person's location and their race it can ultimately decide on how they will internalize their given roles in an institution. It isn't the idea of being treated fairly or unfairly that would detour a racial group from committing themselves and internalizing their own value to an institution. It is the feeling of either being part of the group or feeling stigmatized that plays a bigger role (Dovidio, Gaertner, Niemann, Snider 2001).

An extreme example of taking on a role based on race would be the attack on the Twin



Towers in New York on September 11<sup>th</sup>. Even though it was Muslims that attack that day, and that is a type of religion, it is still locally centralized in the Middle East, which is why the words, Muslim, Arab, and Islam become interchangeable in a general conversation. Because of that intense exposure to the Muslim religion, it was viewed that the races that came from the Middle East were the ones that attacked the U.S that day. The attackers specifically internalized their role in what they were doing so much, that they were willing to sacrifice their lives for it (Dudziak 2011).

Even with significant evidence of race and ethnicity being a prime motivation taking on a given institution's role, it is not always 100% predictable. It has the ability to make accurate predictions for how a person may act but it isn't guaranteed to always be right.

For example, given the last citation, it would be an accurate assumption to believe that all Muslims that hailed from the Middle East were fully behind the attack on September 11. When out to get the point of view from Lebanese Muslims, a journalist was surprised by the way how most of them responded. Even though out of the 337 respondents from their survey only 30% claimed to have actually supported the attack back in 2001. These were Muslims respondents that were born, raised and, lived in the Middle East (Haddad 2002).

When looking at the dependency of a certain race in a society it is also important to take into account which race is the majority. In 1993 a study showed that in Great Britain people of Caribbean decent, i.e. people with black skin over a period of time, were two times more likely to become dependent on the government than by whites, who are also the majority of the population (Blakemore 1999). Being dependent on the government to meet one's basic needs for survival may not be the ideal example for organic solidarity but in essence it is what this concept comes to. Not specifically to relying on the government but on other people and organizations,

however minorities being more dependent may not always be the case when taking a look at a smaller population, e.g. Detroit, Texas, or Utah.

### **Research of Race and Organic Solidarity**

One historical example of race determining the interdependence of a certain group of people would be the 1956 Montgomery bus boycott. Back when Martin Luther King Jr. was still ruling over the civil rights movement, Rosa Parks was arrested for not giving up her seat to a white man on a city bus. This causing a great stir in the African American community led to the pursuing of the Montgomery Improvement Association to create a bus boycott until they were given the same riding rights as white people. The African Americans became interdependent to each other in several ways. One way was being for emotional support, but also for carpooling (Coleman, Nee, and Rubinowityz 2005). Even though they were no longer riding the bus they still had errands to run, families to take care of, and for some a job to get to. Carpooling was a huge social networking system in their group and it caused for a lot of communication to happen, and for them to rely on one another.

As much as race can be relevant to how people may depend on each other to get by on a day to day basis, it can also in some cases have little to no importance whatsoever. In New York, New York, immigrants travel from all over the world to live in America. They come from places like Poland, Ghana, Korea, or India (Hempstead 2002). New York is a melting pot of different races, ethnicities, and beliefs, however because of the complexity and busyness of this global icon, the people cannot afford to depend on each other purely by their race. The necessity for organic solidarity to take place in this city is taken on simply by the sheer number of people in that population that can't survive by their own means.

## **Research of Social Economic Status and Organic Solidarity**

Where a person stands in their social hierarchy begins the day they are born. Although in some cases difficult, a person can change their social economic status based on their individual choices when growing up. Depending on where someone stands in their society and the expectations for how that social status is meant to react to members of a different social status can greatly affect how organic solidarity will be formed. It can be hindered by one status group being socially discouraged to work with the other social groups unless they are in a high level of need (Nadler 2002). In this case, interdependency have become one sided. The overall thought is that the lower someone is economically the more dependent they are.

One way of showing the dependency of a certain economic class with others is by looking at the homeless. Panhandling is a drawn out picture of organic solidarity. The homeless people work, or beg towards anyone of a higher economic status for money (Miller 1988). Their basic hope for survival in most cases fully depends on the charity of others. For this economic class, without some type of organic solidarity, they would not be able to live.

Even though when at the bottom of the economic ladder it is easy to see interdependence, it may not always result to upper classmen in America to be 100% independent. They may depend on other families, perhaps not for their own good, but for the promising futures of their children (Keller 1991). In order to keep the same status for their lineage, there is a certain dependency on other families that share that status. Hopes for their children to marry into a certain family, or providing them with good connection as they grow older are all taken into account and without these things they risk their children falling into a lower social class.

Knowing these other variables is important to fully grasp the concept of the focus relationship. As displayed there are numerous unknown factors that can determine how an

institution and the members that are involved within that institution may act. Race has the potential under the right circumstance to draw out a positive interdependency and allow certain system to function in a way that could truly make a difference in a government. With that variables like social class can also be the back bone to things like segregation.

## **Methods**

In order to find out how to measure these concepts and variables with society there was a need to first see how it was done in the past effectively. By this, it was highly beneficial to dive into the General Social Survey, G.S.S., which was last conducted in 2010 to see how the questions relating to this topic could be efficiently formed. The G.S.S. is a survey that is given to a part of the American population. The questions that are given vary a range from demographic to special interest topics. The respondents are meant to represent the U.S as a whole even though only a small percent of the population actually respond.

## **Measuring Institutional Internalization**

The main five questions surrounding the idea of institutional internalization in the G.S.S specifically look at religion. There were several questions that fell hand in hand with the other that allowed for a better understanding of the cause and effect of a person's association with religion.

The first question chosen was "How often attend religious services?" The two most selected options out of a long list was Never at 22.3% and Every Week at 19.2%. This gives the impression that even though there was some middle ground between these two extremes a majority will fall into one category or the other.

The next question used to display institutional internalization is "How often do you take part in the activities and organizations of a church or place of worship other than attending

services?” An overwhelming 41% responded at Never. Only 17.8% of the respondents accounted between Once a month and Once a day.

The third question used was “I try hard to carry my religious beliefs over into all my other dealings in life.” Only 7.2% responded yes, while 23.2% said no. over half answered Inapplicable.

For the fourth question “Would you call yourself a strong [RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE] or a not very strong [RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE]?” was used. Even though the last question showed a disproportion between carrying religious beliefs, the split between strong and not very strong was fairly equal at 35.4% and 36.8%.

Finally the last question used was ” To what extent do you consider yourself a religious person? Are you very religious, moderately religious, slightly religious, or not religious at all?” Very religious and Not religious at all was reported with only a difference of .1%. A majority of 41.5% was reported as Moderately religious.

After running these five questions though the SPSS program, a Cronbach’s Alpha of .788 was given.

### **Measuring Organic Solidarity**

One of the statements used for Organic Solidarity in the G.S.S was “The people I work with can be relied on when I need help”. 50.1% responded with either “Very true” or, ”Somewhat true”, when only 5.9% responded with “Not too true” or, ”Not at all true.” This suggests that in this current society, people are more prone to have a stronger sense of organic solidarity in a working institution than not.

The second question for this concept used was “Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?” Out of the respondents

that didn't choose to not answer the question 52.7% said that they would be fair. Only 38.3% felt like people would take advantage of them, followed by a small .08% of people believing that it depends on the situation. These results suggest that a majority of the population generally have faith in their respected culture, that they can be true, and again rely on the people that they are surrounded by.

The third question used was "would you say you have a great deal of confidence, only some confidence, or hardly any confidence at all in them? Executive branch of the federal government?" Over 50% either responded with Only some or Hardly Any.

When these three were run together through the SPSS the Cronbach's Alpha was .271.

## **Univariate**

In order to measure between these two concepts, it was necessary to use more than one variable. By doing so it allowed for more accurate data as an ending result.

As a controlled variable As shown in Table 1, Religious Affiliation was given five different categories so that a majority of religions could be represented in a way that didn't they weren't categorized incorrectly or left out.

Between the three variables used to measure Organic Solidarity the Standard Deviation ranged from .621-.766. Since the deviation is minimal there wasn't a great variation between all of the respondent's answers. The skew is ranged from -.301-1.227.

Between the five variables used to measure Institutional Internalization the Standard Deviation ranged from -.89-.735. Since the deviation is minimal there wasn't a great variation between all of the respondent's answers. The skew is ranged from -.947-.735.

Between the five variables used to measure Religious Affiliation the Standard Deviation ranged from .25-.431. Since the deviation is minimal there wasn't a great variation between all of

the respondent's answers. The skew is ranged from 1.183-3.465.

Each variable is given a mean score. The mean is to give a general idea of what the average responds was out of everyone that participated in that particular question. The minimum and maximum show what the range is that anyone could have responded with a cap on either end. For example when measuring Institutional Internalization with the variable of how strong is a person's affiliation with a church, no one could have received a score greater than 4 or less than 1, and still been used in that data.

### **Bivariate**

As shown in Table 2, to compute the data in an organized form, Institutional Internalization was broken down into three groups, low, medium, and high, while Organic Solidarity was split into a dichotomous of low and high. As hypothesized the pattern throughout the table grouped more people with low Institutional Internalization with having low Organic solidarity than with high. All be it the difference was only by two. On the other side of the spectrum People with high Institutional Internalization had a greater amount categorized with high Organic Solidarity than with low, with a greater difference of 30.

Even though there is a positive correlation being displayed, the significance level is only at a .179. In order for there to be any significance to confidently claim between these two concepts the P-Value would have had to decrease by at least .129. The Chi<sup>2</sup> score is stating that based on the variables used to measure these concepts, the relationship shown is better explained by chance than by there being an actual relationship.

Table 3 shows that after standardizing the variables used to measure these two concepts a T-test was ran. Using a cut point of -.161 the results showed that there was no significance.

Meaning that with these variables alone interacting, the relationships displayed are likely due to chance and chance alone.

### **Multivariate**

To check for a possible spuriousness within the relationship, controlled variables were put into place with the original variables measured. Since the main variables used to measure Institutional Internalization circulated around the institution of religion, the controlled variables consisted of five different religious affiliations. The five categories were strategically organized by Brian Steensland in order to accurately represent all religions. Each religion was categorized with other religions in a way that would best fit according to their doctrine.

When processing the data, the significance between each of the controlled variable's effect on the independent and dependent variables ranged from .071-.999. Even though none of the scores reached a value to be deemed significant, there was still a significant range difference in between the five categories, suggesting that there is a spurious relationship occurring. All of this data can be seen in Table 4.

### **Ethics**

The participants were fully informed of what it is that they were expected of for this survey. If at any point they felt uncomfortable with the survey or had any questions, they were given the option to either not answer any chosen question, or stop taking the survey. These participants were fully voluntary and were not compensated in any way that could be viewed as coercive to complete this survey. They are guaranteed full anonymity and will not risk having their personal information to be released to the general public or corporations, although, the results of this survey were released to the general public. After the survey was completed, they



were given a debriefing of the experiment, and offer different resources that they may require after taking this survey. This survey did abstain from leading questions; however there were a few unavoidable clutter questions when asking for information of religious denominations.

### **Missing Data**

One of the major problems with taking data for the G.S.S is that there is a section of missing information. For example the question about the general public feeling they had confidence in the Executive branch and the federal government, use to display organic solidarity (CONFED), 34.1% of the responses was either “Inapplicable”, “Don’t know”, or “No answer”. If those people decided to choose “A great deal”, ”Only some” or, ”Hardly any” the results could have changed significantly.

One way to compensate for this information would be the hot decking method. That is to input data information where there was none based on the actual data that was given. It is the most accurate way to compensate for missing data, although some researchers lead more towards simply throwing away all cases with the missing data.

### **Conclusion**

Even though theoretically Organic Solidarity would be dependent on Institutional Internalization, after running the analyses with and without the controlled variables there is a seemingly insignificant relationship. The variable that came closest to having a significant relationship between these two concepts was Evangelist, at a significance of .071, only .021 away from having the minimum amount of significance required to reject the null hypothesis.

Before however, denying the hypothesis that there is a relationship between these two concepts fully, it is important to observe the limitations of this experiment. First would be that the variables to test Organic Solidarity were few, and faulty at best. Out of the entire GSS only

three questions were useable to measure this concept, and these questions only had a Cronbach's Alpha of .271. For a better ending result an idea Chronbach's is at least .65. If the GSS had produced a better set of questions to measure Organic Solidarity, perhaps the relationship would have been represented better.

As a methodologist, the main goal is to not only find out how cultures and societies work together but also why they do. The search for understanding is a key to what fuels and drives their research. By taking a look at institutional internalization and organic solidarity, it is possible to complete another piece to that puzzle. It wasn't until after the functionalist theorist, Emile Durkheim came around in the late 1800's that these notions were even created in order to study them.

Before completing this piece and applying it to the relevance of society, it was first necessary to define both of these concepts as they stood alone, along with how and why they had a relationship with each other. They're important ideas to understand and a part of the foundation of sociology despite the fact that they are over a century old and Durkheim was never quoted about their significance. Being able to see how others address this relationship in other research has allowed for a better ability to have a tighter grasp on this paper.

Along with knowing the relationship between institutional internalization and organic solidarity, great importance is held on the fact that there are other variables that could, and in some cases do, affect each of these notions, such as religious affiliation.

To make sure that these variables and ideas are measured throughout society it is paramount to quantify this research in the most accurate and ethical way in order to prevent any wrong data from slipping into the conclusion of this research. A considerably accurate way to do this has already been given by the General Social Survey. While trying to find a measurement

within this survey it is vital to ensure that the questions are parallel to what is actually trying to be measured.

In ending, in order for the GSS to supply qualitative questions that properly measure Organic Solidarity, it would be interesting to find out what those measurements are. Even though there are at three examples given in the GSS, since their correlation wasn't strong, it would be assumed that there are better measurements to determine Organic Solidarity. Before being able to accurately measure the relationship between the two main concepts of this paper, it would be essential to first find those measurements.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Analysis

Survey Item	N	Mean	(Std Dev)	Skew	Min	Max
<b>Organic Solidarity</b>						
Coworkers can be relied on when needing help	1155	1.63	.766	1.227	1	4
People do not try to take advantage	1365	-1.705	.621	-.301	-3	-1
Feels confident in the Executive branch in the Federal Gov.	1346	2.2	.706	-.308	1	3
<b>Institutional Internalization</b>						
How often attend religious services	2036	-3.484	2.785	-.89	-8	0
How often take part of religious activities	2031	-3.026	2.309	-.947	-10	-1
Tries to carry beliefs into other dealings	2003	2.14	.952	.497	1	4
Strength of affiliation	1945	2.08	1.082	.735	1	4
Consider self a religious person	2020	2.43	.976	.242	1	4
<b>Religious Affiliation</b>						
Evangelist	2044	.231	.423	1.275	0	1
Mainline	2044	.124	.329	2.286	0	1
Black Protestant	2044	.067	.250	3.465	0	1
Catholic	2044	.239	.425	1.246	0	1
Other	2044	.246	.431	1.183	0	1

Table 2: Chi Square Test for Independence Between Organic Solidarity and Institutional Internalization

Survey Item	Levels of Institutional Internalization			$\chi^2$	P-Value
	Low II	Med II	High II		
Low OS	65	75	88	3.437	.179
High OS	95	83	86		

Table 3: T-Test for Mean Between Organic Solidarity and Institutional Internalization

Organic Solidarity	Institutional Internalization			df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	F	Sig.	t		
Equal variance assumed	1.405	.238	1.080	699	.281
Equal variance not assumed			1.083	691.89	.279

Table 4: Chi Square Test for Independence Between Organic Solidarity and Institutional Internalization when Controlling for Religious Affiliation

Survey Item	Levels of Institutional Internalization			$\chi^2$	P-Value
	Low II	Med II	High II		
<b>Evangelist</b>					
Low OS	21	15	6	5.282	.071
High OS	42	11	5		
<b>Mainline</b>					
Low OS	9	16	9	.985	.611
High OS	9	12	12		
<b>Black Protestant</b>					
Low OS	10	4	0	3.303	.192
High OS	6	8	1		
<b>Catholic</b>					
Low OS	14	31	18	1.616	.446
High OS	20	37	14		
<b>Other</b>					
Low OS	5	4	50	.002	.999
High OS	5	4	49		

Relationship Between Institutional Internalization and Organic Solidarity Regression Table

	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	B	SIG	B	SIG	B	SIG
Constant (Ref White, West)	3.36E-15		-0.174		-.0.458	***
Institutional Internalization	0.002		0.004		0.017	
Age			0.004	*	0.004	*
Sex 1=Male 2=Female			0.016		0.001	
Black			-0.120		-0.084	
Other			-0.013		-0.018	
North					-0.037	
South					-0.040	
Size of Place					-4.33E-05	*
SEI					0.006	***
R <sup>2</sup>	0.000		0.011		0.054	

## Descriptive Statistics

<b>Organic Solidarity (DC)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Skew</b>
<b>Coworkers Help</b>	708	3.375	.744	-1.166
<b>Coworkers are Fair</b>		2.145	.942	-.294
<b>Trust Executive Gov.</b>		1.806	.706	.293
<b>Organic Solidarity Index</b>		0.000	.795	.124

<b>Institutional Internalization (IC)</b>				
<b>Attend Church</b>	708	3.398	2.750	.267
<b>Active in Church</b>	708	1.994	2.254	1.056
<b>Carry Beliefs in Life</b>	708	2.807	.937	-.424
<b>Affiliation</b>	708	2.774	1.1903	-.742
<b>Instit. Intern. Index</b>	708	0.000	.795	.124

<b>Controls</b>				
<b>Race</b>	708			
<b>Region</b>	708			
<b>Age</b>	708	43.88	13.914	.289
<b>SEI</b>	708	50.951	19.098	.326
<b>Size of Place</b>	708	372.11	1251.805	5.151



## Work Cited

- Blakemore, Ken. 2000. "Health & Social Care in the Community." *Health and the Social Care Needs in Minority Communities: An Over-Problematised Issue*, 22. Retrieved February 27, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/a8kIW>)
- Cheung, Ma. 2011. "Social Indicators Research" *Coupling Social Solidarity and Social Harmony in Hong Kong*. 145-167. Retrieved February 6, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/RHdGz>)
- Coleman, Christopher, Nee, Laurence, and Rubinowitz, Leonard. 2005. "Law & Social Inquiry." *Social Movements and Social-Change Litigation: Synergy in the Montgomery Bus Protest*, 663-736. Retrieved March 5, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/tWJax>)
- Durkheim, Emile. 1893. *Division of Labor in Society*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press
- Dovidio, John, Samuel, Gaertner, Samuel, Niemann, Yolanda Flores, and Snider, Kevin. 2001. "Journal of Social Issues." *Racial, Ethnic, and Cultural Differences in Responding to Distinctiveness and Discrimination on Campus: Stigma and Common Group Identity*, 167-188. Retrieved February 27, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/Sde45>)
- Dudziak, Mary. 2011. "OAH Magazine of History." *How 9/11 Made History*, 5-7 Retrieved March 5, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/puzcr>)
- Haddad, Simon, and Khashan, Hilal. 2002. "Journal of Conflict Resolution." *Islam and Terrorism: Lebanese Muslim Views on September 11*, 812-828. Retrieved March 5, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/iUVEK>)
- Hempstead, Katherine. 2002. "Policy Studies Journal." *Immigration and Net Migration in New York City 1980-1990: A Small Area Analysis*, 92-107. Retrieved March 5, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/bezm6>)
- Keller, Suzanne. 1991. "Journal of Comparative Family Studies." *The American Upper Class Family: Precarious Claims on the Future*, 159-182 (<http://goo.gl/16eO3>)
- Koomen, Helma, Split, Jantine, and Thijs, Jochem. 2011, "Teacher Wellbeing: The Importance of Teacher-Student Relationships" *Educational Psychology Review*, 457-477. Retrieved March 7, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/mTtAy>)
- Miller, Donald. 1998. "Journal of Contemporary Ethnography." *Something Left to Lose: Personal Relations and Survival Among New York's Homeless*, 422. Retrieved March 6, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/HI3Wr>)
- Müller. 1994. "Sociological Forum" *Social Differentiation and Organic Solidarity: The "Division of Labor"*, 73-86. Retrieved January 25, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/oEl3q>).

Olavarria, Margot. 2000. "NACLA Report on the Americas" *Student Activism in Chile's Universities*, 28. Retrieved April 9, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/rwQ2W>)

Nadler, Arie. 2002. "Journal of Social Issues." *Inter-Group Helping Relations as Power Relations: Maintaining of Challenging Social Dominance Between Groups Through Helping*, 487-502. Retrieved March 5, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/JlxUV>)

Steensland, Brian. 2000. "Social Forces" *The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art*, 291-318. Retrieved March 27, 2012 (<http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/2675572?uid=3739856&uid=2&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=56245968383>)

Tiryakian, Edwar. 2000. "Sociological Theory" *Parson's Emergent Durheim*. 60-83. Retrieved February 27, 2012 (<http://goo.gl/vq9ET>)