

Religiosity and Spirituality as Predictors of Subjectively Perceived Happiness in University Students in Slovakia

Peter Babincak, University of Presov, Slovakia
Adriana Parkanska, University of Presov, Slovakia

The Asian Conference on Psychology & the Behavioral Sciences 2014
Official Conference Proceedings 2014
0465

Abstract

Several research projects discuss the existence of weak to moderately strong positive relation between religiosity or spirituality on the one hand and subjective well-being, life satisfaction or quality of life on the other hand (see Kelley, & Miller, 2007). Variables related to religiosity and spirituality of a person may be perceived in two ways: as protective factors of attaining subjective well-being or as barriers limiting its attainment. The objective of this study is verification of mutual relationship between the indicators of religiosity and spirituality with regard to subjectively perceived happiness and verification of predictive strength of these indicators with regard to subjective happiness. The sample of research participants consisted of 194 university students aged 18 to 26. The research used 4 tools: The Expressions of Spirituality Inventory-Revised (MacDonald, 2000), The Salience in Religious Commitment Scale (Roof, & Perkins, 1975), Subjective Happiness Scale (Lyubomirsky, & Lepper, 1999) and The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (Hills, & Argyle, 2002). Using multiple hierarchical linear regression (stepwise), we registered 2 dimensions of spirituality as significant predictors of subjective happiness – Existential Well-Being and Experiential/Phenomenological Dimension. Demographic data and confession types were not proved as predictors of happiness.

Key words:

religiosity, spirituality, subjective happiness, quality of life

Theoretical background

The relationship between spirituality or religiosity and various dimensions of quality of life has been extensively examined during the recent decades (Sawatzky, Ratner, & Chiu, 2005). Several researchers discuss the existence of a weak to moderately strong positive relationship between various indicators of religiosity or spirituality on the one hand and subjective well-being, life satisfaction or quality of life on the other hand (see Kelley, & Miller, 2007). Several research findings may be quoted as an example. Diener and Clifton (2002) verified a mutual relationship between religiosity and happiness and also between religiosity and life satisfaction in two large samples (1,034 and 52,624 respondents). In both cases and in both samples a statistically significant but weak positive relationship was registered: $r = 0.07$ or 0.08 in the case of correlation between religiosity and life satisfaction and $r = 0.06$ in the case of religiosity and happiness. Thomas and Washington verified the relationship between „health-related quality of life“ and religiosity in patients with hemodialysis and they registered a weak but inverse relationship between them ($\beta = -0.15$). Kačmárová (2012) verified the relationship between quality of life and the concept of God which consisted of feelings towards God and ideas of God and she registered weak to moderately strong relationships (r from -0.08 to 0.416). This was a case of age-specific sample of seniors. McIntosh, Poulin, Silver, & Holman (2011) focused their attention on the affective component of subjective well-being in relation to religiosity and spirituality, in which religiosity and spirituality independently predicted higher positive affect ($\beta = 0.09$ for spirituality and $\beta = 0.12$ for religiosity). Sawatzky, Ratner and Chiu (2005) in their extensive meta-analytical study verified the relationship between quality of life and spirituality. They registered a moderate effect size in assessing simple bivariate correlations, which is a result that supports findings of the weak to moderately strong relationship between monitored variables. The result of regression analyses was interesting. On the basis of these analyses, variability of the relationships between monitored variables was influenced by different operational definitions of spirituality and quality of life. At the same time other potential mediators, such as age, gender, ethnicity or religious affiliation, were not proved in regression analyses. Therefore generally the existence of predominantly weak relationships between the indicators of religiosity and spirituality with regard to various indicators falling under the widely defined construct of quality of life may be predicted. However, it is necessary to pay special attention to the method of measuring (operational defining) spirituality and religiosity, since an identically named construct has different characteristics with a different way of measuring. It is not the intention of this study to dwell in detail on theoretical specification of the notions of spirituality and religiosity, or on the notions covered under the concept of quality of life. In the area of quality of life there is relative consensus regarding fundamental notions (Babinčák, 2013). In defining spirituality and religiosity several approaches may be found: a) those that perceive these notions as mutually exchangeable synonyms; b) approaches defining these notions as independent distinguishable constructs; and c) those that try to classify these notions into a hierarchical structure, most frequently in the sense of spirituality as a notion superior to religiosity which is a component of spirituality. In our study we will adhere to the pragmatic approach – and we will use these notions as they were defined by the authors of the methodologies used in our research (it is closest to the third approach).

Out of the great number of studies dealing with spirituality and religiosity in relation to quality of life, only some assess subjective happiness. In our research we decided to

focus in particular on this construct, which is primarily psychological, in contrast to the rather interdisciplinary notion of quality of life.

Objective

- 1) Verification of the mutual relationship between selected indicators of spirituality/religiosity and subjectively assessed happiness (as an independent construct).
- 2) Comparison of predictive strength of the indicators of spirituality/religiosity in relation to subjective happiness measured in two different ways.

Method

Sample

Research sample consisted of 194 university students majoring in Psychology, Social Work, Political Science and Philosophy. The average age of the students was 22.8 (from 18 to 26 years old). The division based on gender and faith is shown in table 1.

Table 1
Description of research sample

| Religious affiliation | Male | Female | Total |
|-----------------------|------|--------|-------|
| Catholic | 54 | 73 | 127 |
| Protestant | 8 | 9 | 17 |
| Atheist | 34 | 16 | 50 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 96 | 98 | 194 |

Measures

We used 2 measures to assess religiosity and spirituality independently from religious affiliation and 2 measures to examine subjective happiness (global assessment versus multidimensional assessment).

- 1) The Expressions of Spirituality Inventory-Revised (ESI; MacDonald, 2000) – methodology for determining experiences, attitudes, convictions and lifestyle concerning spirituality. Religiosity and spirituality are perceived as a multi-dimensional construct consisting of five areas: a) Cognitive Orientation towards Spirituality (COS), b) Experiential/Phenomenological Dimension (EPD), c) Existential Well-Being (EWB), d) Paranormal Beliefs (PAR) and e) Religiousness (REL). The ESI-R's α coefficients range from 0.788 for PAR to 0.933 for COS. Detailed description of the scales used is specified in the appendix.
- 2) The Salience in Religious Commitment Scale (SRC; Roof, & Perkins, 1975) – three-item scale measures „the importance an individual attaches to being religious“ (p.111). It is used to determine the extent to which adults consider their religious beliefs to be important. Measured construct is very similar to Allport's concept of internalized religiosity (Halama et al. 2006). The SRC's α coefficient is 0.913.
- 3) Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS; Lyubomirsky, & Lepper, 1999) – it is a 4-item measure of global subjective happiness which represents a global, subjective assessment of whether one is a happy or an unhappy person (p.139). The SHS's α coefficient is 0.791.
- 4) The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (OHQ; Hills, & Argyle, 2002). OHQ is a tool for measuring happiness as a multidimensional construct which includes frequent

experiencing of positive affects or joy, high average level of satisfaction and absence of negative feelings, such as depression and anxiety. It has 29 items and the OHQ's α coefficient is 0.898.

While SHS represents a one-dimensional measure, OHQ includes several dimensions and resembles the concept of subjective well-being (Diener, 1984). Other monitored variables were gender, age, domicile and self-classification into the categories of believer/unbeliever.

Results

Table 2
Descriptive statistics of scales used (N=194)

| Variable/Scale | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std.deviation | Skewness |
|----------------|---------|---------|-------|---------------|----------|
| Age | 18 | 26 | 22.80 | 1.78 | -0.356 |
| ESI - COS | 0.00 | 4.00 | 2.15 | 1.05 | -0.303 |
| ESI – EPD | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.47 | 0.93 | 0.128 |
| ESI - EWB | 0.83 | 4.00 | 2.63 | 0.76 | -0.006 |
| ESI – PAR | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.75 | 1.14 | 0.008 |
| ESI - REL | 0.00 | 4.00 | 2.09 | 1.05 | -0.338 |
| SRC | 1.00 | 7.00 | 3.46 | 1.89 | 0.218 |
| SHS | 1.75 | 7.00 | 4.95 | 1.05 | -0.216 |
| OHQ | 2.79 | 5.66 | 4.22 | 0.59 | 0.341 |

Note: COS - Cognitive Orientation towards Spirituality; EPD - Experiential/Phenomenological Dimension; EWB - Existential Well-Being; REL – Religiousness; SRC - Salience in Religious Commitment Scale; SHS – Subjective Happiness Scale; OHQ - Oxford Happiness Questionnaire

Simple matrix of bivariate correlations between the indicators of spirituality and two methodologies measuring happiness is shown in Table 3. Only Existential Well-Being significantly correlates with happiness ($r=0.694$ or 0.650).

Table 3
Correlations (Pearsons r) between monitored variables and happiness (SHS, OHQ)

| Variable/Scale | SHS | OHQ |
|--|---------|---------|
| Age | 0.017 | 0.008 |
| Domicile | -0.002 | 0.036 |
| Gender | 0.132 | 0.100 |
| Type of confession | -0.056 | -0.038 |
| ESI | | |
| Cognitive Orientation towards Spirituality | -0.043 | -0.035 |
| Experiential/ Phenomenological Dimension | 0.062 | 0.051 |
| Existential Well-Being | 0.694** | 0.650** |
| Paranormal Beliefs | -0.055 | -0.128 |
| Religiousness | 0.096 | 0.114 |
| The Salience in Religious Commitment Scale | 0.053 | 0.040 |

Note: ** znamená $p < 0.01$; SHS – Subjective Happiness Scale; OHQ - Oxford Happiness Questionnaire; ESI - The Expressions of Spirituality Inventory-Revised

We used multiple hierarchical linear regression analysis (stepwise method) to verify how the variables of gender, domicile, type of believer, religiosity and spirituality as predictors influence subjectively perceived happiness as a criterion. In both regression models Existential Well-Being and Experiential/Phenomenological Dimension of

Spirituality were identified as the predictors of happiness. EWB explains 42% or 48% variability of happiness values and EPD around 3% (Table 4).

Table 4

Regression models for indicators of spirituality (ESI), religiosity (SRC), age, gender, domicile and type of faith as predictors and subjectively assessed happiness (SHS, or OHQ) as a criterion (accepted models $p < 0.05$)

| Predictor | R | R ² change | b | T | p |
|--|-------|-----------------------|-------|--------|-------|
| Subjective Happiness Scale (F_{total} (2,191) = 101.499; p < 0.001) | | | | | |
| ESI - Existential Well-Being | 0.694 | 0.482** | 1.001 | 14.194 | 0.000 |
| ESI – Experiential/Phenomenolog. | | | | | |
| Dimension of Spirituality | 0.718 | 0.033** | 0.208 | 3.622 | 0.000 |
| (Constant) | | | 2.010 | | |
| Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (F_{total} (2,191) = 77.836; p < 0.001) | | | | | |
| ESI – Existential Well-Being | 0.650 | 0.422** | 0.531 | 12.440 | 0.000 |
| ESI – Experiential/Phenomenolog. | | | | | |
| Dimension of Spirituality | 0.670 | 0.027** | 0.106 | 3.045 | 0.003 |
| (Constant) | | | 2.670 | | |

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; gender, domicile and type of faith were dichotomic variables (man/woman, city/village, believer/non-believer)

Besides main findings we report also several additional results. When comparing respondents by classification into the category of believer/non-believer, we registered differences in correlations of spirituality/religiosity with happiness. In believers besides EWB also REL ($r=0.170$) significantly correlated with happiness. In non-believers ($N=54$) besides EWB also COS ($r= -0.286$) correlated with happiness. When we added interactions of indicators of spirituality/religiosity and classifications into the category of believer/non-believer (model with a dependent variable SHS) into regression models, another predictor was added into the resulting model – the interaction of EPD and classifications into the category of believer/non-believer (R^2 change = 0.017). High EPD values are more frequently associated with high levels of happiness in believers than in non-believers.

Discussion

Research findings repeatedly confirm a connection between religiosity, spirituality and various aspects of quality of life (as an umbrella construct for several psychological variables). Usually these are positive relationships, while registered correlation coefficients are most frequently low or moderate (Kelley, & Miller, 2007). Despite that, registered relationships are relatively stable. The idea of a connection between spirituality and quality of life is demonstrated also in the effort of authors of different conceptions of quality of life to include the spiritual dimension among the areas of multidimensional construct of quality of life (see e.g. the concept of quality of life by World Health Organization, WHOQOL Group, 1998). In our research we focused on happiness as a variable of global subjective assessment of quality of life and we analyzed its relationship towards indicators of religiosity and spirituality. We used two different operational definitions of happiness. The first one treats happiness as overall subjective assessment, to what extent a person considers themselves happy, and it may be asked about by one or a small number of similar questions. The second operational definition is broader; it does not consider happiness unidimensionally but the overall assessment of a person's happiness consists of

several aspects, such as frequent experiencing of positive affects or joy, high average level of satisfaction, absence of negative feelings, such as depression and anxiety etc. Besides main objectives we were also interested in finding whether with different conceptualizations of the same construct we register comparable results.

On the level of correlations we have not registered tight relations between religiosity/spirituality and happiness (except EWB). In regression models, Existential Well-Being and Experiential /Phenomenological Dimension of Spirituality were demonstrated as significant predictors of happiness values among demographic variables and subscales of ESI and SLC methodologies. Detailed description of said aspects of religiosity and spirituality is given in the appendix. For both tools for measuring happiness we registered the effect of experiential and existential dimension of spirituality while the cognitive, behavioral and paranormal elements of religiosity, or the aspect of internalised religiosity, were not confirmed. We did not register any major differences in the results based on different conceptualizations of subjective happiness. Simultaneously, a different impact of the existential dimension of spirituality on the values of happiness in believers and non-believers was indicated. This result, however, requires more detailed examination.

On the basis of registered results we can agree with the assertions of those authors who registered only a weak relation between the indicators of religiosity/spirituality with regard to happiness. A possible explanation may be sought in the mediator effect of other variables, based on which religiosity and spirituality do not affect happiness directly. For example according to Zullig, Ward and Horn (2006), perceived spirituality and life satisfaction was fully mediated by self-perceived health, and the perceived religiosity and life satisfaction was partially mediated by self-perceived health. „Students who describe themselves as spiritual or religious are likely to report greater self-perceived health and that greater self-perceived health likely influences life satisfaction“ (p.267). Another mediator effect is presented by Cowlshaw, et al. (2013); their results showed that the meaningfulness dimension of SOC (Sense of Coherence) mediated the influence of spirituality on life satisfaction over time, suggesting that spirituality may influence older adults' experience and perception of life events, leading to a more positive appraisal of these events as meaningful. Sawatzky, Ratner, & Chiu (2005) give the type of religiosity/spirituality, or quality of life, definition as a moderator of the relationship of the variables that we monitored. That means the way how the variables are defined and operationalised influences the relation between the variables more than age, gender, or other similar indicators. This moderator is important especially due to the absence of generally accepted definition of spirituality, religiosity and happiness.

Conclusion

In our research those dimensions of spirituality and religiosity which inform about positive functioning and deep spiritual experiences or spiritual existence were demonstrated as predictors of subjective happiness.

For better understanding of connections between religiosity/spirituality and happiness it is necessary to focus on the mediators mediating this relationship.

References

Babinčák, P. (2013). Meranie kvality života: analýza prehľadových štúdií vo vybraných databázach [Measurement of quality of life: overview studies analysis in

- selected data-bases]. *Československá psychologie*, 57 (4), 358-371.
- Cowlishaw, S., Niele, S., Teshuva, K., Browning, C., & Kending, H. (2013). 'Older adults spirituality and life satisfaction: a longitudinal test of social support and sense of coherence as mediating mechanisms. *Ageing and Society*, 33, 1243-1262.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542-575.
- Diener, E., & Clifton, D. (2002). Life satisfaction and religiosity in broad probability samples. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13, 206-209.
- Halama, P., & Adamovová, L., & Hatoková, M., & Stříženeč, M. (2006). Religiosity, Spirituality and Personality [*Religiozita, spiritualita a osobnosť. Vybrané kapitoly z psychológie náboženstva*]. Bratislava: Úep SAV.
- Hills, P., & Argyle, M. (2001). Emotional stability as a major dimension of happiness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 1357–1364.
- Kačmárová, M. (2012). The concept of God and selected personality characteristics as a predictors of quality of life of seniors [Koncept Boha a vybrané osobnostné charakteristiky ako prediktory kvality života seniorov]. *Sociálne procesy a osobnosť* [Social Processes and Personality Conference text-book] (pp.326-330), Bratislava: ÚEP.
- Kelley, B. S., & Miller, L. (2007). Life satisfaction and spirituality in adolescents. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 18, 233–262.
- Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H.S. (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research*, 46, 2, 137.
- MacDonald, D.A. (2000). Spirituality: Description, Measurement, and Relation to the Five Factor Model of Personality. *Journal of Personality*, 68, 1, 153-197.
- Mcintosh, D.N., Poulin, M.J., Silver, R.C., & Holman, E.A. (2011). The distinct roles of spirituality and religiosity in physical and mental health after collective trauma: a national longitudinal study of responses to the 9/11 attacks. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 34(6), 497-507.
- Roof, W.C. & Perkins, R.P. (1975). On conceptualizing salience in religious commitment. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 14, 111-128.
- Sawatzky, R., Ratner, P.A., & Chiu, L. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between spirituality and quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 72, 153-188.
- Thomas, C.J., & Washington, T.A. (2012). Religiosity and Social Support: Implications for the Health-Related Quality of Life of African American Hemodialysis Patients. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 51, 1375–1385.
- WHOQOL Group (1998). The World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment

(WHOQOL): development and general psychometric properties. *Social Science & Medicine*, 46(12), 1569-1585.

Zullig, K.J., Ward, R.M., Horn, T. (2006). The Association Between Perceived Spirituality, Religiosity, and Life Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Self-Rated Health. *Social Indicators Research*, 79 (2), 255-274.

Appendix

Description of scales used to measure spirituality (The Expressions of Spirituality Inventory-Revised; McDonald, 2000, p.187)

Cognitive Orientation Towards Spirituality. This dimension appears to pertain to the expressions of spirituality that are cognitive-perceptual in nature. By cognitive-perceptual is meant beliefs, attitudes and perceptions regarding the nature and significance of spirituality, as well as the perception of spirituality as having relevance and import for personal functioning. This dimension does not overtly involve religiousness or the expression of beliefs through religious means, though it does appear to be highly related to them.

Experiential/Phenomenological Dimension of Spirituality. This dimension concerns the experiential expressions of spirituality. Included within the rubric of “experiential” are experiences that are described as spiritual, religious, mystical, peak, transcendental, and transpersonal. Though this dimension appears to have some relation to broader altered states of consciousness and nonordinary experiences, empirical evidence suggests that it is a unique and identifiable construct.

Existential Well-Being. This dimension involves the expressions of spirituality that may be seen to be associated with a sense of positive existentiality. That is, it pertains to spirituality as expressed through a sense of meaning and purpose for existence, and a perception of self as being competent and able to cope with the difficulties of life and limitations of human existence.

Paranormal Beliefs. This dimension of the expressions of spirituality concerns belief in the paranormal. Based upon the analyses completed, it appears to be mostly related to beliefs of paranormal phenomena of a psychological nature (e.g., ESP, precognition, psychokinesis), though it is also composed of beliefs in witchcraft and spiritualism (e.g., ghosts or apparitions).

Religiousness. This dimension relates to the expression of spirituality through religious means. Based upon the empirical findings, it appears to better reflect religiousness that is Western oriented (i.e., it is related to Judeo-Christian forms of religious belief and practice). Moreover, it seems to focus on intrinsic as opposed to extrinsic religiousness. This dimension includes not only beliefs and attitudes of a religious nature, but also behavior and religious practice. Factor analytic work suggests that this dimension is highly related to the Cognitive Orientation Towards Spirituality dimension but is nonetheless conceptually unique.
