

**Young Adult Religiosity: Evaluating the Influence of
Individual Differences upon Religious Expression and
Religious Maturity**

Adam Jon Kranz

**Thesis Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the
degree of Bachelor of Education (Honours)**

**Faculty of Education
Avondale College**

November 2007

Statement of Original Authorship

The work contained in this thesis has not been submitted previously for a degree or diploma at any other higher education institution. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made.

Signed Akmy Date 21/11/07

Statement of Copyright

I grant to Avondale College the rights to archive and to make available my thesis in whole or in part for study purposes in the College Library, now and in the future. I retain all property rights. I also retain the right to use in future works all or part of this thesis.

Signed Akmy Date 21/11/07

Acknowledgements

I would not have been able to complete this thesis without the support of a number of valuable individuals who deserve special mention.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my academic supervisor Dr. Graham Stacey for his valuable assistance throughout the entirety of this research project. In particular I would like to thank Dr. Stacey for his scholarship, thoroughness and professional wisdom. The consistent care, patience and approachableness of Dr. Stacey have also been an added blessing throughout the research process. There have been many times when these personal characteristics have helped to alleviate the overwhelming stresses associated with research. Thank you Graham.

I would also like to thank Dr Watts who has overseen the honours program and provided his personal assistance on many occasions. Your support and encouragement have been invaluable.

Thanks also to all the Avondale College undergraduate students who took the time to complete the questionnaire. It would not have been possible to conduct the research without you.

Finally I wish to thank my parents, Peter and Carolyn Kranz, who have provided me with much needed emotional and financial support throughout the entirety of my tertiary studies. Thanks and love to you both.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page i
Declaration ii
Acknowledgements iii

ABSTRACT 3
INTRODUCTION 4
LITERATURE REVIEW 6
 WILLIAM JAMES 6
 PERSONALITY AS AN INDICATOR OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES 8
 PERSONALITY AND RELIGION 10
 CRITIQUE OF EYSENKS MODEL OF PERSONALITY 15
 THE FIVE-FACTOR MODEL OF PERSONALITY 16
 RESEARCH USING THE FIVE-FACTOR MODEL 18
 THE FIVE-FACTOR MODEL AND RELIGIOUS WELL-BEING AND MATURITY 20
 EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE 26
 MEASURES OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE 27
 RESEARCH USING EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE 28
 PROBLEM STATEMENT 31
 RESEARCH QUESTION 31
 HYPOTHESES 32
METHODOLOGY 33
 SUBJECTS 33
 INSTRUMENTS 33
 NEO-FFI 34
 Emotional Intelligence Scale 34
 Religious Expression Scale 35
 Quest Scale 36
 PROCEDURES 36
 ANALYSIS OF DATA 37
RESULTS 38
 PRELIMINARY FACTOR ANALYSES 38
 CORRELATIONS 40
 MULTIPLE REGRESSION 43
DISCUSSION 44
CONCLUSION 50
REFERENCES 53

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A: FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR EI..... 58

APPENDIX B: FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION
SCALE..... 59

APPENDIX C: PERSONALITY DIMENSIONS AND MODES OF
RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION..... 61

APPENDIX D: EI DIMENSIONS AND MODES OF RELIGIOUS
EXPRESSION..... 61

APPENDIX E: EI DIMENSIONS AND QUEST 62

APPENDIX F: PERSONALITY DIMENSIONS AND QUEST..... 62

APPENDIX G: MODES OF RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION REGRESSED ON
QUEST..... 63

APPENDIX H: PERSONALITY, RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION AND EI
REGRESSED ON QUEST 64

APPENDIX I: PERSONALITY AND EI REGRESSED ON QUEST 65

APPENDIX J: EXPLANATORY STATEMENT PROVIDED FOR
PARTICIPANTS 66

APPENDIX K: QUESTIONNAIRE 67

GLOSSARY 77

Abstract

Research has suggested that individual differences may influence one's preference for a specific mode of religious expression. A large proportion of research conducted within this domain has focused on personality as a significant indicator of individual differences. The majority of researchers have incorporated the Eysenck or Myers-Briggs models of personality. The present study evaluated the influence of the 'five-factor' model of personality and emotional intelligence upon religious expression and religious maturity. A sample of 171 undergraduate students completed a questionnaire comprised of the following four instruments; the NEO-FFI personality test (Costa & McCrae, 1992), the 33-item self report Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) (Schutte et al., 1998), the Religious Expression Scale (Boan, 1978) and the Quest Scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991). A significant association was found between both personality and religious expression and emotional intelligence and religious expression. A significant relationship was also found between the personality dimension of openness and religious maturity as measured by Quest. Furthermore, a multiple regression analysis indicated that out of personality, emotional intelligence and religious expression, the social/emotional component of religious expression predicted high scores on religious maturity. Generally, the results are consistent with previous research suggesting that individual differences influence the experience and self report of religious expression and religious maturity. Based on these findings, implications and suggestions for educational practice are provided.

Introduction

Addressing the individual differences of students has become synonymous with quality education. Understanding this phenomenon has captivated the interest of educational researchers. For example, understanding the relationship between personality type and a myriad of educational variables has received significant attention. Research has demonstrated that personality type influences the selection of a tertiary course of study (Boreham & Watts, 1998, p. 30) and preference for a particular leaning style (Shuck & Philips, 1999, p.31). Emotional intelligence (EI), as an indicator of individual differences, has also generated significant empirical inquiry within the educational domain. Research indicates EI predicts individual cognitive based performance over and above general intelligence (Lam & Kirby, 2002, p.138-139).

Considerably less attention has been given to personality and EI, as indicators of individual differences, and how they may influence religious expression and religious maturity. This is paradoxical considering the research indicates 5-40% of the general population and 50% of psychologists surveyed stated they have had at least one spiritual experience (Allman, de la Roche, Elkins & Weathers, 1992 as cited in MacDonald, 2000, p.154).

Furthermore, there is a growing body of literature suggesting there are a number of psychological and physical benefits associated with spirituality. For example, a large scale study of almost 1,000 people in Australia found prayer, church attendance and

belief in God correlated positively with wellbeing and self esteem (Francis & Kaldor, 2002, p. 183).

Despite contemporary societies growing interest and awareness of the impact of spirituality, it has become apparent that personal spirituality and organised religion need separate considerations. Personal spirituality being identifiable by the importance it places on individual experience and organised religion characterised by its emphasis on tradition, community worship and doctrine (Tacey, 2006, p.7). Other research indicates the predominant religious experiences espoused by some conservatively minded Christian denominations may be more attractive to specific personality types (Francis & Robbins, 2002, p. 219).

Religious educators and pastors are often responsible for constructing experiences where individuals have an opportunity to interact with the divine. Therefore, it is imperative they have an understanding of the complexity of individual differences and how this may impact religious expression and religious maturity. It is not uncommon for teachers and students to be egocentric concerning ones mode of religious expression, expecting others to respond to identical religious stimuli in a similar fashion. When this does not occur, teachers and students are often frustrated, surprised or annoyed. A greater understanding of this relationship may prompt teachers to develop and offer a plethora of religious experiences providing students with equal opportunity to experience the divine.

Nevertheless, significant questions remain regarding the nature of the relationship between individual differences and religious expression and religious maturity. After conducting an exhaustive review of the literature the authors of "The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Approach" state "Too much attention has been devoted to the social correlates of religious socialization and religious change, and not enough attention has focused on the factors within individuals" (Spilka, Hood, Hunsberger & Gorsuch, 2003, p.147). Accordingly, this study will examine the relation of personality and emotional intelligence to religious expression and religious maturity

Literature Review

William James

One of the first serious scientific considerations given to the nature of the relationship between religious experience and individual differences was presented by William James in his work, "The Varieties of Religious Experience", initially published in 1902 (Cook, 2003, p. 140). At the conclusion of "The Varieties of Religious Experience", William James asks the following question:

Ought it be assumed that in all men the mixture of religion with other elements should be identical? Ought it, indeed, to be assumed that the lives of all men should show identical religious elements? (James, 1985, p. 486-487)

James answers his own rhetorical question with a poignant 'No!' In justification of his emphatic answer James argues that the varieties of religious experience and belief are influenced by the varieties of human circumstance and human nature (James, 1985, p. 487-488). According to James, religious experience encompasses "the

feelings acts, and experiences of individual [men] in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to the divine” (James, 1985, p.31). Consequently, James provides numerous illustrations of the diversity of religious experience and belief, and the very title of the book with its implementation of the word ‘varieties’, further reiterates this point (Cook, 2003, p.144).

Whilst James provides a definition of religious experience, according to Cook (2003, p.144), he never offers a clear definition of human nature within his work “The Varieties of Religious Expression.” Cook (2003, p. 144) asserts that James “seems to have understood the term as referring to psychological characteristics of human beings, some of which were more or less ubiquitous human characteristics, but many of which were variable between individuals”. For instance, human characteristics such as, devotion, trust, bravery, asceticism, patience, and charity were viewed as universal aspects of human nature which were exhibited in individuals in varying degrees (James, 1985, p. 259, 298).

Despite, these examples of diversity, James only introduces two major types of human nature and their respective religious experiences: the ‘sick soul’ and the ‘healthy minded’ (Cook, 2003, p.144). According to James, individuals exhibiting healthy-mindedness have an innate sense of the goodness of life in spite of life’s hardships and or their own condition and subjection to pessimistic theologies. James describes the religion of a healthy minded individual characterized by a deep sense of communion with the divine which is not impeded by an overwhelming sense of guilt (James, 1985, p. 79-80). Conversely, James describes sick souls as individuals

burdened down by the awareness of evil. Sick souls are subject to melancholy, pessimism and a heightened sense of their own sin and guilt. To provide examples of this temperament, James quoted individuals such as John Bunyan, Leo Tolstoy and Henry Alline (Cook, 2003, p. 145). Since the publication of the “Varieties of Religious Experience” in 1902 a significant body of literature has developed in regards to the psychology of religious experience.

The relationship between individual differences and religious experience has continued to generate considerable theoretical definition in the psychology of religion field, resulting in numerous empirical studies (Jones & Francis, 1999, p.105). Concepts such as healthy-mindedness and the sick soul have not been retained within the psychological literature, since James (Cook, 2003, p. 147). Research conducted within this field has primarily been concerned with ascertaining whether religion is associated with high or low levels of psychological health (Lewis, Francis & Enger, 2004, p. 269). A large proportion of research conducted within this domain has focused on personality as a significant indicator of individual differences. The majority of researchers have incorporated the Eysenck or Myers-Briggs models of personality (Musson, 2002, p. 195).

Personality as an Indicator of Individual Differences

According to Eysenck’s model of personality there are three dichotomous or uncorrelated personality dimensions, identified as ‘extraversion’, ‘neuroticism’ and ‘psychoticism’. An individual scoring high on extraversion is described as being

sociable, carefree, optimistic and likable. An individual exhibiting high levels of neuroticism would be emotionally unstable, experiencing high levels of anxiety and depression. Individuals exhibiting high levels of psychoticism, lack impulse control resulting in abnormal levels of aggression, coldness and egocentricity (Eysenck, 1998, pp. 11).

The Myers-Brigg type indicator (MBTI) offers 16 distinct personality types, based upon four foundational binary constructs. According to the MBTI the first personality construct consists of 'introversion' or 'extroversion' which refers to ones preference for the inner or outer world. An individual scoring highly on introversion is concerned with internal ideas and experiences, whereas an individual with a high score on extroversion is concerned with people and events. The second construct, 'sensing or intuition', describes the two opposite ways in which individuals perceive the world. Sensing types tend to be particularly observant and practical absorbing information through the major senses. Intuitive types prefer abstract and theoretical information and tend to focus upon the bigger picture. The third component divides the way in which individuals make judgments, labeling them as either 'thinkers' or 'feelers'. For example, thinking types are objective thinkers. They likely address the logical consequences of a decision before passing judgment. Feeling types however, tend to consider what is important to themselves and other people before they make a decision. The final personality construct consists of 'judging' or 'perceiving'. Judging types attempt to live in an organized and planned manner, whereas perceiving types live life spontaneously and flexibly (Cook 2003, p. 149).

Personality and Religion

After a review of empirical studies utilizing Eysenck's personality measure, Eysenck (1998, p. 13) concludes that "there is practically no convincing evidence that either extraversion or neuroticism is related to religiosity." Although there have been no significant correlations between these two components of Eysenck's model of personality and religiousness, the psychoticism dimension has continued to generate interest (Eysenck, 1998, p. 13).

Recent studies conducted in the psychology of religion field have measured the correlation between Eysenck's psychoticism measure and the frequency of Christian religious practice. After reviewing eleven studies by Francis and Wilcox (1994); Maltby (1995); Francis and Wilcox (1996); Smith (1996); Francis and Bolger (1997); Francis (1997); Francis and Johnson (1999); Francis, Jones and Kelly (1999); Lewis (2000); Fearn, Booker and Francis (2001); and Kaldor, Francis and Hughes (2002), Lewis, Francis and Enger (2004, p. 270) conclude that "both frequency of personal prayer and church attendance are independent of extraversion or neuroticism, and negatively associated with psychoticism."

While, studies implementing the aforementioned personality theories have produced substantial results in regards to the relationship between religion and personality, it is in the area of personal spirituality and religious expression that the implementation of personality models has produced the most interesting results (Cook, 2003, p.151).

Subsequent work done within this area of inquiry has been theoretical, building upon the Jungian type theory of the Myers-Briggs type Indicator (MBTI).

Exploring Personality and Religious Expression: Theoretical Developments

Identifying the different modes of religious experience has recently been popularised in Christian circles with the publication of Gary Thomas' book, "Sacred Pathways". As instructive as this work is, it is primarily theoretical in nature, lacking empirical justification for its conclusions. However, it is a helpful conceptualisation, helping to explain the interface between personality and religious experience. Within this work Thomas hypothesizes several 'spiritual temperaments' to explain the diverse ways in which people attempt to draw near to God (Thomas, 2000, p.17).

Thomas asserts that these temperaments have been identified and developed by analysing scriptural examples, Church history and interviews with Christian adherents (Thomas, 2000, p.17-19). Thomas acknowledges the nine spiritual temperaments are based upon the Jungian personality theory measured by the Myers Briggs test (Thomas, 2000, p.21). Having said this, however, Thomas (2000, p.17) asserts that "Our spiritual temperament should be distinguished from our personality temperament... Knowing our personal temperaments, whether we are sanguine or melancholy, for instance, will tell us how we relate to others... But it does not necessarily tell us how we relate to God."

According to Thomas there are nine 'spiritual temperaments': 'Naturalists' are most inspired and likely to experience God when they are in a natural setting. For instance,

Thomas (2000, p.22) states that a naturalist “may learn more from watching an ant colony... than from reading a book or listening to a sermon, though they may find fulfilling thoughts from the parables of Christ which are based on nature.” ‘Sensates’ experience God most readily with their senses, and they appreciate worship services that involve, sight, sound, smell, and touch. According to Thomas Traditionalists are those who experience God most powerfully through conceptual symbols contained within rituals, liturgies and sacraments. ‘Ascetics’, experience God in solitude, austerity and strictness (Thomas, 2000, p. 24-25). ‘Activists’ experience God most powerfully when they confront injustice and work to make the world a better place through positive action. ‘Caregivers’, draw near to God when they are actively serving others and meeting their needs. ‘Enthusiasts’ are drawn towards religious experiences that are exuberant and joyful, inspiring a heartfelt response. ‘Contemplatives’, “refer to God as their lover, and images of a loving Father and Bridegroom predominate their view of God.” Consequently, contemplatives strive to experience God with their deepest, purest and brightest emotions (Thomas, 2000, p. 28). ‘Intellectuals’, relate to God by studying and discussing theological concepts. For example, ‘salvation’ is something to be understood rather than experienced, and an intellectual may feel the closest to God when they first understand something about him (Thomas, 2000, p.29). In conjunction with describing the attributes of each temperament in detail, Thomas also provides a questionnaire in order to help individuals identify their preferred spiritual temperament.

Whereas Thomas used the MBTI as a basis for the development of nine spiritual temperaments. Malcolm Goldsmith (1997) discussed the relationship between

personality and religious expression within his book "Knowing me Knowing God". The aim of the work was to help individuals understand how their innate personality type may impact upon the way in which they relate to God. Even though Goldsmith does not rely heavily upon empirical research to support the concepts within the book, its approach is based upon the Jungian type theory underlying the MBTI (Goldsmith, 1997, p. 21). Goldsmith also provides a spirituality questionnaire in an attempt to provide readers with an understanding of their spirituality preference (Goldsmith, 1997, p.41).

Goldsmith also hypothesizes about the way in which different personality types may relate to God. For instance, when he describes the spiritual walk of persons whose preference is for intuition, he states "Intuitives are likely to pray in generalizations rather than specifics" (Goldsmith, 1997, p.65). Conversely, he states that the prayer of a person who has a predominance of the Thinking personality type "is often full of doubts and points of view. It is also... well thought through, consistent, and to the point" (Goldsmith, 1997, p.79).

Another theoretical work providing hypotheses about the interface between the MBTI and religious expression is that of Bruce Duncan (2000). Within his book "Pray your Way", Duncan attempts to alert ordinary Christians to the way in which personality impacts prayer. Duncan outlines the possible associations between each of the four binary personality constructs of the MBTI and the various possible modes of Christian prayer. For example, Duncan describes the prayer of a feeling type as primarily emanating from the heart, whereas a thinking type is more inclined to offer

a prayer of the mind, characterized by theological expressions (Duncan, 2000, p. 92-93). Furthermore, extraverts are described as preferring active prayer in the company of others, whilst introverts are inclined to prefer solitude, silence and introspection (Duncan, 2000, p. 94-97). Even though Duncan identifies the importance of understanding personality type, the theoretical framework is quite fluid, and in accordance with the Jungian type theory underlying the MBTI, which does not treat personality as a static entity. Thus Duncan encourages individuals to reflect on their approaches to prayer and experiment with new methods (Cook, 2003, p. 150).

Empirical Applications

The hypotheses generated by Thomas, Goldsmith and Duncan have been subjected to empirical review, in an attempt to understand the associations between personality type and individual religious experience (Emmons & Paloutzin, 2003, p. 390). Researchers attempting to explore the aforementioned associations have focused on the Eysenck personality questionnaire. Significant associations between personality and religious expression have emerged.

In a study by Robins, Hair and Francis (1999), 172 male clergy completed the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire in conjunction with an index of Charismatic Experience, in an attempt to measure the relationship between personality type and charismatic experience. According to the findings, there was no significant relationship between charismatic experience and the personality components of psychoticism and neuroticism, leading the authors to assert that there is no significant relationship between the charismatic movement and psychopathology. However, the

authors found that the personality dimension of extraversion was consistently associated with charismatic experience (Robbins, et al., 1999, p. 239).

Maltby and Day (2001, p. 119) examined the relationship between personality, as measured by the Eysenck instrument, and scores upon the Spiritual Involvement and Belief Scale. The study surveyed 179 respondents representing a variety of workplaces, church groups and youth groups in the South Yorkshire region of England. In a similar fashion to the findings of the aforementioned studies, a significant relationship was demonstrated between the extraversion component and the subscale spirituality concepts that encouraged a reflective, open minded and sensation seeking spirituality (Maltby & Day, 2001, p. 120). These findings confirm the previous study by Maltby and Day, which also demonstrated that out of Eysencks three personality dimensions, extraversion was the only dimension that is positively related to certain spirituality components (Maltby & Day, 2001 p. 187).

Critique of Eysenks Model of Personality

Whilst Eysenks approach to personality has been influential in understanding the relationship between religion and psychopathology, a growing number of theorists have questioned its adequacy as a comprehensive measure of personality. Personality theorists have focused on five major personality factors: 'extraversion', 'neuroticism', 'agreeableness', 'conscientiousness' and 'openness'.

The Eysenk contribution of extraversion and neuroticism continue to be included within the big five personality measures, however psychoticism is not. The reason for the exclusion of psychoticism is that it has not consistently emerged as a personality dimension within subsequent personality research (Eysneck, 1998, p. 12). Furthermore, there is growing speculation as to whether psychoticism has been appropriately labeled. Personality theorists such as Zuckerman assert that the psychoticism dimension of Eysencks personality scale may measure psychopathy rather than a specific component of personality (Eysneck, 1998, p. 12). In light of these concerns, Emmons and Paloutzin (2003) encourage future researchers to implement instruments based upon the 'five-factor model of personality' (FFM), when attempting to measure the relationship between personality and religiosity. Since the FFM of personality is an empirically validated measure providing a comprehensive taxonomy of personality (Emmons & Paloutzin, 2003, p. 391).

The Five-Factor Model of Personality

The (FFM) measures personality across five dimensions: neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. In the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI), developed by Costa and McCrae (1992), these five domains are further divided into six intercorrelated facets. The descriptive facets of neuroticism include: 'anxiety', 'angry hostility', 'depression', 'self-consciousness', 'vulnerability' and 'impulsiveness'. Individuals high in neuroticism usually possess a lot of nervous energy and they often cope poorly with stress, and have trouble controlling their impulses. Facets of extraversion include: 'warmth', 'assertiveness', 'activity',

'excitement-seeking', 'gregariousness' and 'positive emotions'. Individuals scoring high on extraversion enjoy large groups and gatherings and are described as being sociable, carefree, and talkative. Openness is much less well known than neuroticism and extraversion. The facets of this domain include, 'fantasy', 'feelings', 'aesthetics', 'actions', 'ideas' and 'values'. Individuals scoring high on openness are willing to entertain novel ideas and engage in divergent thinking as they explore both inner and outer worlds. They also possess a significant amount of intellectual curiosity and the ability to evaluate and implement unconditional values. Descriptive facets of agreeableness include; 'trust', 'straightforwardness', 'altruism', 'compliance', 'modesty' and 'tender-mindedness'. Agreeableness is primarily a dimension of interpersonal characteristics. Individuals scoring high on agreeableness are sympathetic to the needs of others, often eager to help, believing others will undoubtedly be helpful in return. Conversely, individuals scoring low on agreeableness are skeptical of others' intentions competitive and egocentric. The descriptive facets of conscientiousness include; 'competence', 'order', 'dutifulness', 'achievement striving', 'self discipline' and 'deliberation'. Individuals scoring high on conscientiousness are usually meticulous planners, organised, punctual and confident in their abilities. Furthermore, high scorers on this facet have high aspirations and work diligently to achieve goals (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 14-18).

The FFM of personality has been successfully incorporated in a number of studies looking at the associations between personality and factors such as intelligence, health and psychopathology. However, its implementation in studies examining the association of religious expression to personality is uncommon. The majority of

studies examining this relationship have tended to measure personality using the MBTI or the Eysenk personality scale (MacDonald, 2001, p.156). In light of this phenomenon MacDonald (2001, p. 166) set out “to examine the relation of spirituality to the five-factor model of personality.”

Research using the Five-Factor Model

In order to measure spirituality, MacDonald (2001, p.159) administered 11 different measures of spirituality to a predominately female undergraduate sample. A series of principal-axis factor analyses substantiated the convergence of spirituality measures, and identified the coherent latent factors underpinning the plethora of existing spirituality measures (Macdonald, 2001, p. 157).

Consequently, MacDonald combined items from each dimension in order to develop the ‘Expressions of Spirituality Inventory’ (ESI), which measures spirituality according to the following five factors. Factor 1, ‘cognitive orientation towards spirituality’. MacDonald describes this dimension as cognitive-perceptual. The emergent items of this factor tap an individuals attitudes, perceptions and beliefs regarding the significance, nature and relevance of spirituality in one’s life. Factor 2, ‘experiential/phenomenological dimension of spirituality’. This dimension is concerned with one’s mode of spiritual expression, encompassing experiences that can be described as mystical, spiritual, religious, peak, transcendental, and transpersonal. Factor 3, ‘existential well being’. Items within this dimension pertain to the way in which individuals incorporate spirituality within their lives to create

meaning and purpose for existence. Factor 4, 'paranormal beliefs'. This dimension contains items tapping concern and belief in the paranormal, for example, belief in precognition, ghosts or apparitions. Factor 5, 'religiousness'. This dimension is related to forms of religious practices and beliefs indicative of Judeo-Christian conceptualisations. Furthermore, this dimension appears to focus on intrinsic rather than extrinsic religiousness (MacDonald, 2001, p. 187).

Following the development of the five dimensional ESI MacDonald (2001, p.169) explored the relationship of each dimension with the FFM of personality using the 'Revised NEO Personality Inventory' (NEO-PI-R). The study demonstrated significant correlations between certain components of the FFM of personality and certain spirituality components. The cognitive orientation towards spirituality correlated with agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion and openness. The experiential/phenomenological dimension was related to openness and then extraversion. Existential well being was negatively related to neuroticism and positively related to extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness. Interestingly, paranormal beliefs were found to be significantly related to openness, and Religiousness was related to agreeableness, conscientiousness and extraversion (MacDonald, 2001, p. 191).

To ascertain whether the ESI was conceptually unique compared to the five factors of the NEO-PI-R, MacDonald conducted two principal-axis factor analyses. The first analysis incorporated the ESI items and the NEO-PI-R facets and the second employed the ESI dimension scores along with the Supplementary Spirituality Scale

(SSS) dimension scores and the NEO-PI-R facets. Within both analyses, there appeared to be a substantial overlap between existential well-being and neuroticism. Apart from this overlap however MacDonald reported no other points of structural relatedness between the ESI and the NEO-PI-R factors (MacDonald, 2001, p. 185). Consequently, MacDonald has argued that the ESI is “conceptually unique relative to the five-factor model of personality.”

MacDonald has also asserted “that the five-factor model of personality is incomplete, lacking a domain that addresses spirituality” (MacDonald, 2001, p.192). Despite the assertions of MacDonald, Simpson, Newman and Fuqua (2007, p.37) have stated that “it might be erroneous logically to study only measures of spirituality residualized on personality”. Furthermore Simpson et al. (2007, p.37) encourages future researchers to continue a broad-ranging study of constructs and construct systems. Simpson et. al (2007, p.42) also question whether personality factors may influence ones preference for a particular mode of religious expression. Authors such as Vergote (1985, p. 56), have also asserted that the relationship between religion and psychological factors may be complex and multidirectional. That is, the nature and content of religious experiences may also influence personality.

The Five-Factor Model and Religious Well-being and Maturity

Aside from the study by MacDonald a significant number of researchers have explored the relationship between the FFM of personality and spiritual/religious well-being and maturity. Ramhanaiah, Rielage and Sharpe (2001, p.659) examined the

relationship between spirituality and personality. The study used the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWB) and the NEO PI-R. Ramhanaiah et al. (2001, p. 661) found that undergraduate students, with higher scores on the NEO PI-R scales of extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness, scored significantly higher on the SWB scale. Furthermore, multivariate analysis highlighted that student's who scored highly upon the SWB scale exhibited substantially different NEO PI-R profiles compared to those exhibiting low SWB scores. Consequently, Ramhanaiah et al. (2001, p. 661) asserted that there appears to be a relationship between a positive (extraverted, agreeable, conscientious) personality and higher scores on a measure of spiritual well-being.

Saroglou (2002, p.16) performed a meta-analysis of studies exploring the relationship between religiosity and the FFM of personality. Of the thirteen studies subjected to the meta-analysis, Saroglou classified the religious measures into the following four categories: "(1) religiosity (intrinsic and general); (2) open and mature religiosity and spirituality; (3) religious fundamentalism; and (4) extrinsic religiosity" (Saroglou, 2002, p.17). In light of the findings, Saroglou asserts that individuals scoring highly on extraversion exhibit an open-mature religiosity/spirituality which tends to be intrinsic. Furthermore, Saroglou noted those scoring high on the openness to experience component of the FFM also exhibited an open-mature religiosity/spirituality. Interestingly, Saroglou also asserted that those with an open-mature religiosity and spirituality seemed to be more emotionally stable. Conversely, low openness was associated with religious fundamentalism and neuroticism was associated with extrinsic religiosity (Saroglou, 2002, p. 22). To further understand these complex relationships. Simpson et al. (2007 p. 37) recently set out "to continue

examining linear combinations of important measures of spirituality in relationship to personality to explicate the potential complexity of these relations”.

Within the aforementioned study Simpson et al. used several scales to measure spirituality. Firstly, they used the SWB which measures an individual's 'religious well-being' (RWB) and 'existential well-being' (EWB). The RWB measures an individual's perception of their religious and spiritual life, and the EWB measures an individual's sense of purpose and satisfaction in life along with their ability to adjust to their surroundings. Secondly, the study implemented the Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale. Thirdly, the study used the Quest scale. According to the proponents of Quest religiously mature people are intrinsically committed to their faith and are likely to see their religious journey as an ongoing quest (Spilka et al., 2003, p.30). Consequently, Quest measures religious maturity according to three distinct but interrelated components including; "readiness to face existential questions without reducing their complexity", 'self-criticism and perceptions of religious doubts as positive', and 'openness to change" (Batson & Schoenrade, cited in, Burris, 1999, p. 138). Finally the study employed the Spiritual Assessment Inventory which measures a person's awareness of God and the quality of that relationship with God according to four dimensions which include; 'instability', 'disappointment', 'grandiosity' and 'realistic acceptance'. The NEO-FFI, a shortened version of the NEO personality inventory (NEO PI-R) was used to measure personality.

In order to examine the convergence of the spirituality measures, Simpson et al. conducted a factor analysis on the four measures of spiritual well being and maturity.

Simpson et. al reported the emergence of 3 factors. Based upon the content of the instruments comprising each dimension, Simpson et al. (2007, p. 39) labeled the three components; 'Positive relationship with God', 'negative relationship experiences with God', and 'utilitarianism'. Interestingly, Simpson et al. reported that the Quest Scale had a low communality with the other three measures of spirituality when the initial factor analysis was conducted. Subsequently, they assert that "whether or not the Quest ought to relate substantially to other measures of spirituality is probably debatable" (Simpson et. al. 2007, p. 42).

The results of the study were consistent with previous findings. For instance, the extraversion dimension of the NEO-FFI demonstrated a significant positive correlation with the first component, positive relationship with God ($p < .000$). Conversely, neuroticism was negatively correlated with the first component ($r = -.25$, $p < .000$), however it was positively related to component two, negative relationship experiences with God, ($r = .44$, $p < .000$). The other three positive dimensions of the NEO-FFI, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness exhibited positive but small correlations with the first component. Simpson et al. (2007, p. 41-42), also reported that the openness dimension of the NEO-FFI was positively related to the second component ($r = .26$, $p < .000$). In light of these findings the authors assert that the relationship "makes some sense given that individuals with higher scores on openness are known to be more open to exploring negative external experiences." Furthermore, openness was also found to be significantly correlated to the Quest scale, ($r = .43$, $p < .001$) (Simpson et. al. 2007, p. 41). This correlation makes some sense given that the Quest scale is designed to measure a religious journey that is

characterised by ones willingness to wrestle with religious doubts and existential questions without reducing their complexity.

There has also been empirical research that appears to justify the construct validity of the Quest scale. For instance, McFarland and Warren (1992, p. 163) set out to ascertain whether Quest predicted openness to read-belief supporting and belief-opposing religious articles. Within this study 231 respondents completed the McFarland Six-Item Fundamentalism Scale (1989), the Allport and Ross Intrinsic, Extrinsic Scale (1967) and 4 Quest scales which included the Batson & Schoenrade (1991a, b) Quest scale. Following the religious scales respondents were required to read a section containing the titles, authors and brief abstracts of 24 articles, and score their willingness to read the articles on a seven-point scale, ranging from -3 ("definitely do not want to read") to +3 ("definitely want to read"). Out of the 24 articles six articles supported specific Christian fundamentalist beliefs and six articles opposed these same beliefs. The remaining 12 articles were non-religious in nature covering such diverse topics as, the war on drugs and ecology (McFarland & Warren, 1992, p. 167). In order to adequately measure the construct validity of the Quest scale MacFarland and Warren reported that they eliminated one half of the original sample since they did not have a clear Christian self-identity and they were not Fundamentalists. The reasons given for this was that "with a sample comprised entirely of fundamentalists, fundamentalism could not confound the effects of religious orientations" (McFarland & Warren, 1992, p. 167). MacFarland and Warren reported that there was a significant relationship between high Quest scores and a willingness to read anti-fundamentalist articles and secular articles ($r = .22$, $p <$

.05) (McFarland & Warren, 1992, p. 171). Consequently, the authors assert that “the Quest scales do not merely reflect religious quest; rather, this religious quest also involves a broad desire to explore important issues” (McFarland & Warren, 1992, p. 172).

In summary, the aforementioned studies appear to outline the nature of the relationship between spiritual/religious well-being and maturity, which can be described as follows: (1) Neuroticism appears to be negatively related to higher levels of SWB and positively related to lower levels of SWB. (2) A positive relationship between extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and SWB. (3) The openness to experience dimension of the NEO-FFI is positively related to an open-mature religious journey that is characterized by a questioning approach. Overall, these findings suggest that there is a positive relationship between spiritual and psychological health (Simpson et al. 2007, p. 35)

The finding most pertinent to the present study is the positive relationship between the openness dimension of the FFM and Quest. Aside from the study by Simpson et. al., (2007) very few studies have looked at factors within individuals which may influence religious maturity (Spilka et al., 2003, p. 147). Generally, research within this field has used the conceptualisations of Quest and ‘religious fundamentalism’ to measure religious orientation/maturity and how it may influence prejudiced behavior. Both of these approaches measure religious orientation/maturity according to the way in which beliefs are held, as well as the openness of people to reconsider their religious beliefs. Over the years, a number of researchers have used religious

fundamentalism (RF) to describe a religious orientation that is dogmatic and rigid. Consequently, Altemeyer and Hunsberger (1992) developed a 20-item RF scale to measure this conceptualisation. Both the Quest and RF scales correlated significantly with prejudice. Altemeyer and Hunsberger reported that Quest scores were negatively correlated with prejudiced and that RF scores were significantly and positively associated with prejudiced scales (Spilka et al., 2003, p. 465-467).

In light of these findings the study by Simpson et al. (2007) provides insight into the factors within individuals which may influence a particular religious orientation. In speculating it appears “that the artificial distinction of spiritual and psychological life may not be a rational one” (Simpson et al., 2007, p. 42). However, due to the relatively new nature of this research replication studies are needed to explore the relationship between the FFM and Quest.

Emotional Intelligence

Relatively few studies have attempted to explore the relationship between personality, using the FFM, and the different components of religious expression and maturity. Research specifically investigating the relation of emotional intelligence (EI) to religious variables is virtually non-existent in the literature. The conceptualisation of EI by Salvoey and Mayer (1990), builds on Thorndike’s theory of social intelligence (Tapia, 1998, p. 21). According to contemporary proponents of emotional intelligence, it is a form of intelligence that includes “the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use

this information to guide one's thinking and actions" (Salvoey & Mayer, 1990, p. 189). According to Goleman (1995, p. 36) "people who cannot marshal some control over their emotional life fight inner battles that sabotage their ability for focused work and clear thought."

Consequently, EI theorists have identified three distinct facets of EI which include: 'appraisal and expression of emotion', 'regulation of emotion', and 'utilization of emotion as intelligence'. The expression of emotion measures one's ability to successfully convey personal emotions both verbally and nonverbally, as well as their ability to identify the explicit and implicit emotional signals of others. Regulation of emotion identifies the success with which an individual employs emotions to influence the moods of one's self and others. The third facet, utilizing emotion, describes the success with which an individual can harness emotions in order to think creatively, redirect attention, or motivate one-self (Rozell, Pettijohn & Parker, 2006, p. 115).

Measures of Emotional Intelligence

The identification of these three distinct facets of EI has led to the development of several different EI self report measurements, including the EQ Test (Goleman 1995), the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (Bar-On 1996a; 1996b), the Style in the Perception of Affect Scale (Bernett 1996), the EQ Map (Cooper and Sawaf, 1997) and the EI Scale designed by Schutte et al. (1998). Accordingly significant research

has explored the relationship between EI and personal and professional success (Lam Kirby, 2002, p. 133).

Research Using Emotional Intelligence

In a recent study, Rozell, et al. (2006, p. 116), examined the relationship between high levels of emotional intelligence and sales performance. The emotional intelligence self-report scale developed by Schutte et al. (1998) measured EI. Salesperson performance was measured with a self report measure of performance developed by Behrman and Perreault (1982). Rozell et al. (2006, p. 119) reported that after conducting analyses of variance (ANOVA) it was found that salespeople who had higher EI scores performed significantly better on the performance category compared to those who had low EI scores ($F = 3.62, p < 0.05$). In light of these findings, the authors have asserted that EI is associated with salesperson performance because it encompasses several important skills required for successful interpersonal and intrapersonal communication. For example, sub scale facet two (regulation of emotions) is composed of items which assess how well an individual is able to interpret the emotional communications of others as well as control his or her communications with others (Rozell et al. 2006, p. 121).

Similarly, Chan (2003, p. 415) found that there were significant correlations between EI and success on tasks requiring a high level of interpersonal and intrapersonal communication. In a sample of Hong Kong Chinese gifted students, Chan (2003, p. 410) examined the association between emotional intelligence and social coping

strategies. Chan used the emotional intelligence scale, developed by Schutte et al. (1998) which measures EI according to three discriminate dimensions. However, after conducting a factor analysis of the 33-item questionnaire, Chan concluded that four factors of EI aptly represented the data provided by the sample of Chinese students. Factor 1 encompasses a number of items describing an individual's ability to understand and regulate one's own emotions. Factor 2 includes items which reflect an individual's ability to influence and manage others' emotions. Factor 3 was characterized by items which reflected an individual's sensitivity to the emotional expressions of others. Factor 4 included items which assessed an individual's positive utilization of emotions in order to generate new ideas (Chan, 2003, p. 412). A shortened Chinese version of the SCQ-17, originally developed by Swiatek (1995), was used to measure social coping strategies. The SCQ-17 measures social coping strategies according to six dimensions, including: 'valuing peer acceptance', 'prizing conformity', 'involvement in activities', 'discounting popularity', 'denying giftedness', and 'attempting avoidance' (Chan, 2003, p. 411).

Chan reported a number of significant differential associations between each of the dimensions of EI and specific social coping strategies. For instance, there was a significant positive association between valuing peer acceptance and factors one, two, and three of the EI instrument. The Social coping facet of involvement in activities was also positively correlated with all four factors of the EI instrument. Conversely, the social coping strategy attempting avoidance was negatively associated with factors two and four of the EIS. Consequently, Chan asserts that the existence of both positive and negative associations indicates "that the higher the level of emotional

intelligence, the more the use of coping by valuing peer acceptance and involvement in activities, and the less the use of coping by attempting avoidance” (Chan, 2003, p. 415).

While there have been a number of studies indicating the positive association between facets of EI and increased levels of interpersonal and intrapersonal communication, research also suggests that certain components of EI may enhance cognitive performance. For instance, Lam and Kirby (2002, p. 135) explored “whether overall emotional intelligence and its distinct emotional reasoning abilities would positively contribute to individual cognitive-based performance over and above the level explained by general intelligence.”

Lam and Kirby used the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) to measure EI, the Shipley Institute of Living IQ Scale to assess general intelligence and eight cognitive based problems selected from the Burney (1974) logical reasoning test to measure cognitive-based performance (Lam & Kirby, 2002, p. 136). Four separate multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to substantiate whether EI predicted a higher level of cognitive based performance compared to general intelligence (Lam & Kirby, 2002, p. 137).

The Lam and Kirby (2002) study indicated that overall EI predicted individual cognitive based performance over and above that of general intelligence. The EI components of ‘perceiving’ and ‘regulating’ also contributed to cognitive based performance over and above that of general intelligence (Lam. & Kirby, 2002, p.

138-139). The authors theorized that individuals with high levels of emotional intelligence scored better on cognitive tasks because of their heightened ability to identify and control negative emotions within themselves and others, thus reducing the debilitating affects of fear and anxiety (Lam, & Kirby, 2002, p. 139). In speculating, the ability to use buffering techniques to internally segregate and encapsulate negative emotions would impact upon an individual's ability and willingness to wrestle with existential questions and religious doubts.

Problem Statement

Considering the relatively small number of studies that have explored the relationship between the (FFM) of personality and religious expression and religious maturity, and the non existence of studies exploring the correlation of (EI) and religious expression and religious maturity, the current study aims to; evaluate the influence of personality and emotional intelligence (EI) upon religious expression and maturity.

Research Question

What is the relation of personality and emotional intelligence to religious expression and religious maturity for undergraduate students enrolled at Avondale College?

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

Openness and extraversion are associated with an affective expression of religious faith.

Hypothesis 2

Agreeableness and conscientiousness are associated with an intellectual/philosophical expression of religious faith.

Hypothesis 3

Emotional Intelligence is associated with an affective expression of religious faith.

Hypothesis 4

The EI subscale component, 'the ability to utilize emotions to solve problems' is associated with an intellectual/philosophical expression of religious faith.

Hypothesis 5

The EI subscale component, 'the regulation of emotions' is associated with an intellectual/philosophical expression of religious faith.

Hypothesis 6

The EI subscale component, 'appraisal of emotions in the self and others' is associated with a subjective/affective expression of religious faith.

Hypothesis 7a

Emotional intelligence is associated with religious maturity as measured by Quest scores.

Hypothesis 7b

Openness is associated with religious maturity

Hypothesis 7c

There will be a difference between high and low scores on EI and religious maturity

Hypothesis 8a

An intellectual/philosophical mode of religious expression is the strongest predictor of religious maturity

Hypothesis 8b

When considering personality, religious expression and EI, the personality component of openness is the strongest predictor of religious maturity

Hypothesis 8c

When considering personality and EI, the personality component of openness is the strongest predictor of religious maturity

Methodology

Subjects

The questionnaire was completed by 171 first and second-year undergraduate students. The sample was comprised of pre-service education students (74.3%, N=127), undergraduate theology students (14%, N=14), bachelor of business students (2.3%, N=4) and bachelor of communications students (2.9% N=5), and other (5.8% N=10). The mean age for students was 19. Of the participants, 108 were female and 61 were male and two did not specify. 90% of the participants identified themselves as being Christian and out of the respondents 107 described themselves as being affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventist Church, 10 with the Church of England, 10 as Roman Catholic, six as Baptist, six as Uniting, 10 as Pentecostal, 10 as other, and a further 10 students did not specify.

Instruments

The questionnaire incorporated four separate instruments in order to assess personality type, emotional intelligence, preferred religious expression and religious maturity. The instrument included: the NEO-FFI personality test (Costa & McCrae, 1992), the 33-item self report Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) (Schutte et al., 1998), the Religious Expression Scale (Boan, 1978) and the Quest Scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991). The accumulated questionnaire incorporated in this study had a total of 164 questions, and required 50 minutes to complete.

NEO-FFI

The NEO-FFI personality test, developed by Costa and McCrae, assesses personality according to individual responses to 60 statements. Participants respond by indicating their level of agreement to the 60 statements on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). There was no time limit for completing the NEO-FFI; however the authors stated that most respondents required 10-15 minutes (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 11). The NEO-FFI assesses personality according to five factors, which are composed of inter-correlated traits. The five factors include: neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 14-15). The NEO-FFI instrument was developed as a short form of the 240 response NEO-PIR, thus it exhibits a proportion of the validity that the full scale possesses. The convergent correlations of the NEO-FFI with validity criteria range from “.56 to .62; none of the divergent correlations exceeds .20” (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 53). Internal consistency coefficients for the NEO-FFI were .86, .77, .73, .68, and .81 for N, E, O, A and C. Reliabilities for domain scores ranged from .75 to .83 (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p.53).

Emotional Intelligence Scale

The Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) (Schutte, et al. 1998), measures respondents emotional intelligence according to their responses on a 33-item questionnaire which measures emotional intelligence according to several subordinate factors which include, ‘awareness’ of emotions in self and others, ‘regulation’ of emotions in self and others and the ability to ‘utilise’ emotions to solve problems (Schutte, et al..

1998, p. 175). According to Schutte et al (1998, p. 173) the 33-item EIS scale exhibits an internal consistency of .87 and a two-week test-retest reliability of .78. Concerning the discriminant conceptual validity of the emotional intelligence scale this study acknowledged the concerns of Conte (2005, p. 437), who asserts that the EIS scale may be measuring similar constructs already measured by the big five personality dimensions. In order to ascertain the construct validity of the EIS scale Schutte et al., administered the revised NEO-FFI instrument and the EIS scale. Whilst high scores on the emotional intelligence scale shared a significant correlation with openness to experience, ($r(22) = 0.54, p < 0.009$), there were no other significant correlations between any of the remaining EIS factors and any of the big five dimensions (Schutte, et al., 1998, p. 175)

Religious Expression Scale

“The Religious Expression Scale is a multidimensional assessment of religious expression within the context of evangelical Christian faith,” (Boivin, 1999, p. 320). Consequently, the scale is designed to distinguish between a “predominantly ‘intellectual’ versus predominantly ‘affective’ expression of religious faith” (Boivin, 1999, p. 320). The two major components, intellectual and affective, are further divided into nine factors of religious expression which include; “general religiosity”, ‘intellectuality of religious expression’, ‘emotionality of religious expression’, ‘religious philosophical and existential concerns’, ‘concern with intense emotional experiences’, ‘emphasis on an emotional faith that relies on the support of others’, ‘emphasis on the teaching and study of the scriptures’, ‘emphasis on witnessing,

outreach', 'sharing one's emotional experience with others' and statements that did not load significantly with any of the previous eight factors" (Boivin, 1999, p. 321). The scale consists of 59 statements that participants respond to on a six-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), and 24 demographic short response questions. The Religious Expression Scale demonstrated Spearman-Brown correlation coefficients of .80 for all the factors. Test-retest reliability coefficients are not available (Boivin, 1999, p. 321).

Quest Scale

The 12-item Quest Scale measures religious maturity according to three distinct but interrelated components including; "readiness to face existential questions without reducing their complexity", 'self-criticism and perceptions of religious doubts as positive', 'and openness to change" (Batson & Schoenrade, cited in, Burris, 1999, p. 138). The Quest scale employs a nine-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree). The Quest scale demonstrated a two-week test-retest reliability of .79. Batson and Schoenrade have reported Cronbach's alphas of .75 and .81 (Burris, 1999, p. 139).

Procedures

The study was approved by the Avondale College Human Research Ethics Committee. The class teachers collected the data in the classroom. Students who were present at their respective classes during a particular week of semester one, 2007

were asked to fill in the questionnaire on a voluntary basis. The students were informed of the purpose of the study, both orally (teacher) and written (informative paragraph on questionnaire) and that the study was part of the faculty of education honors program. They were also specifically asked *not* to write their names upon the questionnaire booklet and told that the researchers guaranteed anonymity.

Analysis of Data

Due to the quantitative nature of the research design this study employed the SPSS statistical analysis program, making special use of the correlation and multiple regression components of this program. The correlation component of the SPSS program was used to ascertain the strength of relationship between personality and religious expression and religious maturity, and also the strength of relationship between emotional intelligence and religious expression and religious maturity. The multiple regression component was employed to measure the impact of the combined independent variables (EI and personality) upon both of the dependant variables (religious expression and maturity). Multiple regression analysis was also used to substantiate which independent variable (EI, personality and religious expression) was the strongest predictor of religious maturity.

Results

Preliminary Factor Analyses

In order to adequately score student responses upon the NEO-FFI, the questions were grouped into their recommended subscales, and scored as per the scoring procedures specified by the test developers (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 11). According to the results of David W. Chan's study (2003), which implemented the 33-item self-report Emotional Intelligence Scale, factor analysis defined four dimensions of emotional intelligence (Chan, 2003, p.411). Therefore, in order to explore whether the 33 items of the EIS adequately measured specific components of emotional intelligence, the item responses of the 171 undergraduate students were initially subjected to a four-factor varimax rotation analysis. However, when the item responses of the 171 students were examined for factor structure and interpretability, three distinct dimensions emerged. Each of these three factors contained seven significant loadings. The three dimensions clearly paralleled the subscale classifications developed by Schutte, et al., which included 'awareness of emotions in self and others', 'regulation of emotions in self and others' and 'the ability to utilise emotions to solve problems' (Schutte, et al., 1998, p. 175). (See appendix A for the factor analysis).

To explore whether the 59 items of the religious expression scale would adequately reflect nine specific aspects of religious expression as reported by Boan (1978), the item responses of the 171 students were subjected to a nine-factor varimax rotation analysis. The results of this did not allow for a meaningful interpretation since there was a significant number of cross loadings across the nine discriminate subscales. a

factor which may be attributable to the small number of participants. Consequently the item responses were subjected to a 2 - through 10- factor rotation analysis and examined for simple structure and interpretability. It was found that a five-factor solution was the most interpretable and consistent with the original nine factors of religious expression (See appendix B for the factor analysis). Since the present study was not concerned with reworking any of the instruments none of the questions were removed from the scales distributed to participants. The aforementioned factor analyses were conducted in order to see how the items loaded within the sample population and to aid the scoring of student responses.

Factor 1 was a factor defined by an array of items reflecting an individual's views concerning the Bible, Holy Spirit and evangelism. This dimension describes general religiosity. *Factor 2* was characterized by items that described the extent to which someone had an emotional faith that relies upon the social support of others. This dimension is interpreted as one describing a socially/emotionally dependant mode of religious expression. *Factor 3* was defined by items reflecting an individual's capacity and willingness to apply theological concepts to intellectual, political and social situations. This dimension describes a philosophical/intellectual mode of religious expression. *Factor 4* consisted of items which focused upon intellectual and doctrinal aspects of religious expression. This cluster of items describes a cognitive/intellectual mode of religious expression. *Factor 5* was characterized by items that were anti intellectual and emphasised the emotional aspects of religious worship. This dimension is interpreted as describing a subjective/affective mode of religious expression.

In summary, although the original nine-factor varimax rotation analysis did not produce results consistent with those specified by Boan (1978) the five distinct dimensions arising from the five-factor varimax rotation were consistent with the theoretical underpinnings of the original instrument, in that they produced religious expression dimensions that could be identified as either intellectual or affective (Boivin, 1999, p. 320).

Correlations

A series of Pearson product correlations were undertaken to examine the associations between: (H1) Extraversion and an affective expression of religious faith, openness and an affective expression of religious faith, (H2) agreeableness and an intellectual/philosophical expression of religious faith, and conscientiousness and an intellectual/philosophical expression of religious faith. (See appendix C for the correlation matrix between the five personality dimensions and the different modes of religious expression).

All five of the personality dimensions demonstrated significant relationships with the various modes of religious expression. Extraversion was significantly related to a social/emotional mode of religious expression ($r = .346, p < .000$) and moderately related to a subjective/affective mode of religious expression ($r = .145, p = .059$). Conversely, openness was not related to an affective mode of religious expression ($r = .071, p = .363$). However, it was significantly related to a philosophical/intellectual

mode of religious expression ($r = .385, p < .000$). Agreeableness was found to be significantly related to a philosophical/intellectual mode of religious expression ($r = .322, p < .000$) as was conscientiousness ($r = .251, p < .001$).

Another series of correlations were also undertaken to examine the associations between: (H3) Emotional intelligence and an affective expression of religious faith; (H4) the utilization of emotions to solve problems and an intellectual philosophical expression of religious faith; (H5) the regulation of emotions and an intellectual/philosophical expression of religious faith; (H6) the appraisal of emotions in the self and others and an affective mode of religious expression, and (H7) overall emotional intelligence and religious maturity. (See Appendix D for a summary of the correlation matrix).

Overall, EI was significantly related to a social/emotional mode of religious expression ($r = .165, p < .05$) however it was not related to a subjective/affective mode of religious expression ($r = .089, p = .247$). Furthermore, EI was also significantly associated with a philosophical/intellectual mode of religious expression ($r = .207, p < .01$). The EI subscale component, 'the ability to utilize emotions to solve problems' was not related to a philosophical/intellectual mode of religious expression, however it was significantly related to a 'social/emotional' mode of religious expression ($r = .299, p < .000$). The EI subscale component, 'the regulation of emotions' was significantly related to a 'philosophical/intellectual' mode of religious expression ($r = .299, p < .01$). The EI subscale component, 'appraisal of emotions in the self and others' was significantly associated with a

subjective/affective mode of religious expression ($r = .245, p < .01$). It was also significantly associated with a cognitive intellectual mode of religious expression ($r = .196, p < .01$).

H7a was developed in order to determine whether overall EI was associated with religious maturity as measured by Quest. A Pearson product correlation indicated that overall EI was not associated with religious maturity as measured by Quest (See Appendix E for a summary of correlations). H7b was developed in order to further explore the relationships between individual differences and religious maturity. A series of correlations were undertaken to assess the relationship between personality and religious maturity. The personality dimension of openness was found to be significantly associated with religious maturity ($r = .209, p < .01$). Furthermore, Neuroticism was correlated with religious maturity ($r = .159, p < .05$). (See appendix F for a summary of correlations).

In order to examine H7c an independent samples t-test was undertaken to explore the relationship between high and low scores on emotional intelligence and religious maturity. Mean and standard deviation of the EI scores for the high group were 38.05 and 6.69, respectively, and 37.0 and 5.67 for the low group. The significance level ($p = .301$) indicates that there is no significant difference between high and low scores on emotional intelligence and religious maturity.

Multiple Regression

Three multiple regression analyses were performed in order to examine the relationships between, religious expression, personality, EI and religious maturity. Within the first regression analysis the four principal modes of religious expression were used as predictors of religious maturity as measured by Quest (H8a). The 'enter' method of multiple regression was used to assess which of the religious expression variables were significant indicators of religious maturity. Out of the three modes of religious expression the social emotional and the philosophical/intellectual components were significant predictors (See appendix G for the multiple regression summary). The social/emotional component accounted for 8% of the variance ($\beta = .292$) and philosophical/intellectual accounted for another 3.4% of the variance ($\beta = .199$).

Within a second regression analysis, personality, religious expression and EI were used as predictors of scores on Quest in order to assess the combined predictive contribution (H8b). Once again the enter method was utilized. Out of the independent variables scrutinized the social/emotional and philosophical/intellectual modes of religious expression continued to be the most significant predictors of scores on Quest. The social/emotional component accounted for 8% of the variance ($\beta = .292$) and philosophical/intellectual accounted for another 3.4% of the variance ($\beta = .199$). Interestingly, neither of the personality variables nor the EI variables contributed any predictive power (See appendix H for the multiple regression summary).

A third regression analysis was performed to assess if the personality or EI variables were predictive of religious maturity, in the absence of the religious expression variables (H8c). Only the personality variable, openness was a significant predictor, accounting for 4.4% of the variance ($\beta = .209$). No other personality or EI variables were significant predictors (See appendix, I for the summary).

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to evaluate the associations between individual differences, as measured by personality and EI, and religious expression and religious maturity among a sample of undergraduate students. From the present sample, it was found that there were a number of meaningful associations between individual differences, and certain modes of religious expression and religious maturity. For example, extraversion was found to be associated with a social/emotional mode of religious expression. Additional insight from this research is provided by an evaluation of the religious expression sub scales. Factor two (social/emotional) is comprised of items indicating a preference for a religious experience characterized by social interaction. An individual scoring highly on extraversion would most likely be attracted to religious experiences that focus on the sharing of personal testimonies. Consequently, individuals scoring high on extraversion may be drawn to community worship where importance is placed upon an emotional response to stimuli. Furthermore, individuals scoring high on extraversion may become confused or disillusioned when others do not respond enthusiastically to the same religious stimuli. High scorers on extraversion may also seek God through activity, striving to

alleviate the social injustices of the world and searching out the ways in which God is at work in the world. Group discussion may also have a significant role in the religious experiences of individuals high in extraversion, since they actively seek interaction with the divine through interpersonal sharing. Goldsmith (1997, p. 82) has also asserted that individuals high in extraversion may have difficulty praying in solitude, since the silence of God may become uncomfortably apparent.

Interestingly, openness was not related to an affective mode of religious expression rather, it was related to a philosophical/intellectual mode of religious expression. Upon a closer reading of the openness personality dimension this association makes sense. According to the proponents of the FFM of personality, those scoring high upon the openness personality component exhibit a high level of intellectual curiosity and a willingness to entertain new social, political and ethical ideas (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 15). Similarly, the philosophical/intellectual mode of religious expression is a component characterized by items that stress the importance of discussing the philosophical, intellectual and political implications of Christianity. Agreeableness and conscientiousness were also found to be related to a philosophical/intellectual mode of religious expression. Consequently, individuals scoring highly on either, openness, agreeableness or conscientiousness would have a tendency to gravitate toward religious experiences encouraging intellectual inquiry. For instance, an individual exhibiting high scores in, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness may prefer to discuss the theological implications of Jesus' life death and resurrection rather than how this phenomenon makes them feel. Individuals whose preference is for an intellectual/philosophical mode of religious experience

may also have a strong urge to be continually learning new things about the divine. Their belief system must also be intellectually coherent and well thought out. Therefore, studying systematic theology, apologetics, doctrinal creeds and Christian ethics are much more appealing for individuals of this preference than listening to personal testimonies which stress the relational aspects of spirituality. Individuals whose preference is for an intellectual/philosophical mode of religious expression may also place significant emphasis upon upholding truth. Consequently, in discussions about theology and other faith traditions intellectual integrity is of the highest order and there will, inevitably, be disagreements over doctrine which will be pointed out rather than overlooked for the sake of unity. At this point it must be acknowledged that individuals are not restricted to one mode of religious expression. They may clearly appreciate various religious experiences. However, the present study suggests that individuals indicate a preference for a particular mode of religious expression.

These results appear to be generally consistent with available research. For example, Maltby & Day, (2001, p. 120), Robbins, Hair, & Francis, (1999, p. 239) and Macdonald (2001, p.191) found extraversion is associated with a reflective, emotional, open-minded and sensation-seeking mode of religious expression. Furthermore, constructs conceptually similar to that of the philosophical/intellectual mode of religious expression, have been shown to relate to openness (MacDonald 2000, p. 191). MacDonald (2000, p.191) has also reported that a predominately cognitive orientation towards religious expression is significantly associated with Agreeableness and Conscientiousness.

The EI also exhibited meaningful correlations with the different modes of religious expression. These associations however, were not restricted to a purely cognitive or affective mode of religious expression. For instance, high scores on the EIS significantly correlated with a philosophical/intellectual and social/emotional mode of religious expression. The EI sub scale component, 'the ability to utilize emotions to solve problems' was significantly related to a social emotional mode of religious expression. 'The regulation of emotions' was significantly related to an intellectual mode of religious expression and 'the appraisal of emotions in the self and others' was significantly related to a subjective affective and cognitive intellectual mode of religious expression.

Although, there have been no studies that have looked at the relationship between EI and modes of religious expression, the generalizability of these findings concur with the available research. For instance, Lam & Kirby (2002, p. 138-139) have found that the EI components of 'appraisal' and 'regulation' were significantly related to cognitive-based performance over and beyond the level attributable to general intelligence. Conversely, Chan (2003, p.415) reported that the EI components of 'appraisal' and 'regulation' were associated with an individual's ability to identify and manage the emotions of others. Although EI appears to predict success on cognitive tasks, it also seems to predict success on emotional tasks. Accordingly, the results of the present study suggest that EI is not restricted to purely cognitive or affective modes of religious expression. Rather it appears to influence the success with which one engages with the world through either cognitive or affective means, hence the duality of correlations between EI components and modes of religious

expression. Consequently, the present study theorized that overall EI would be associated with religious maturity as measured by Quest. Interestingly, overall EI was not related to religious maturity. Furthermore, when high and low EI scores were compared there appeared to be no difference in regards to scores on Quest. The findings of the present study suggest that emotional intelligence does not influence religious maturity.

The personality component of openness was indicative of religious maturity, a finding that is consistent with the results of Simpson et al. (2007, p.41). This finding is consistent given that individuals with higher scores on openness are known to be more inclined to explore opposing points of view and entertain unconventional values and novel ideas.

The present findings however, extended past other studies that have explored the associations between individual differences and religious maturity. Whilst the personality dimension of openness was found to be associated with religious maturity, a multiple regression analyses including personality dimensions and EI indicated openness was a relatively small predictor of religious maturity, accounting for only 4.4% of the variance. Furthermore, when personality, religious expression and EI were subjected to a regression analyses it was found that a 'social/emotional' mode of religious expression was the strongest predictor of religious maturity followed by intellectual/philosophical. According to these results it appears that personality and EI are not the main contributors to religious maturity. However, personality and EI contribute to religious maturity, since both of the aforementioned

modes of religious expression are influenced by a number of individual differences. For instance, a social/emotional mode of religious expression was associated with the personality dimensions of extraversion and neuroticism and the EI component of the utilization of emotions in the self and others. A philosophical/Intellectual mode of religious expression was significantly associated with the personality dimensions of openness, conscientiousness and neuroticism and the EI component of the regulation of emotions in the self and others. According to these findings, one might speculate that persons with a preference for a social/emotional mode of religious expression may be more inclined to wrestle with religious doubts and conflicting perspectives because of the importance they place upon social interaction and community worship. Furthermore, a person whose preference is for an intellectual/philosophical mode of religious expression may be motivated to question aspects of religiosity because of their willingness to explore conflicting perspectives and their desire for intellectual coherence.

As identified within the literature review, it appears that some conservatively minded denominations may be geared towards providing a particular religious experience that is in accordance with their faith tradition. This phenomenon ultimately impacts all aspects of education implemented by a particular faith tradition. The growing body of evidence suggests that there are several different modes of religious expression which are influenced by a myriad of individual differences. Accordingly, educational systems that specifically offer religious education need to contextualize course content and delivery so that all students have an equal opportunity to experience the sacred.

Aside from the homogenous nature of denominationally endorsed religious experiences within education, it is not uncommon for teachers and students to be egocentric concerning ones mode of religious expression and religious maturity. Individuals often expect others to operate in a similar fashion. When this is not the case teachers and students are often surprised, frustrated or annoyed when others do not respond to or appreciate identical stimuli. Consequently, it is of the utmost importance that teachers are made aware of the diversity of individual religious experience. If a religious educator is aware of the similarities and differences that exist amongst personality dimensions and how this may influence religious experience and maturity, a plethora of religious experiences may be offered in order to facilitate learning and enjoyment across the range of personality dimensions (Boreham & Watts, 1998, p. 26).

Conclusion

The present study adds further weight to the view that there is a substantial relationship between individual differences, as measured by personality and EI, and modes of religious expression and religious maturity. In particular, the findings of the present study indicate that there is a significant association between the personality dimensions of (a) extraversion and a social/emotional mode of religious expression and (b) openness, conscientiousness, and agreeableness and an intellectual/philosophical mode of religious expression. Furthermore, there were a number of meaningful associations between overall EI and each of the EI sub scales. However, the duality of associations between EI and the modes of religious

expression suggest that EI does not necessarily influence a preference for one specific mode of religious expression. The generalizability of these findings appear to concur with the conceptualisation of EI, since it is described as influencing the success with which one engages with the world through either cognitive or affective domains. Consequently the current study theorized EI would influence religious maturity. Interestingly, EI did not directly influence religious maturity.

As indicated in the literature review, there have been tentative results suggesting a relationship between the personality dimension of openness and religious maturity. Findings from the present study appear to confirm this phenomenon however they extended beyond current understandings suggesting a complex relationship between individual differences, religious expression and religious maturity. Out of personality, EI and modes of religious expression, a social/emotional mode of religious expression was the strongest predictor of religious maturity. Whilst the individual differences of personality and EI did not contribute to religious maturity, one could speculate they influence religious maturity, since a social/emotional mode of religious expression was associated with extraversion, neuroticism and the EI subscale component of the utilization of emotions in the self and others.

The present study has some limitations. It was designed and presented as an exploratory study, it is correlational in nature. The sample employed was voluntary and the cohort was smaller than desired. The homogenous nature of the sample also restricts the generalizability of these findings. Another limitation of the present study

is its reliance on self report data in the assessment of individual differences, religious expression and religious maturity.

While the findings of the present study suggest certain links between specific components of individual differences and religious expression and religious maturity, the exact mechanisms of possible bidirectional influence remain a crucial topic for further investigation. The finding of a social/emotional mode of religious expression being a stronger predictor of religious maturity than the personality dimension of openness is, a relatively new finding, and therefore clearly warrants further investigation as to whether this result is related to sample characteristics. There may also be value in comparing the structural nature of religious expression instruments and personality instruments in order to substantiate whether similar elements exist in regards to item content.

The most important finding represented here is a substantial relationship between the five dimensions of personality and several modes of religious expression. This adds further empirical support to the notion that factors within individuals influence their preference for a particular religious experience. Consequently, religious educators need to cater to the individual differences of students so all students have an equal opportunity to experience the sacred.

References

- Allport, G. W., & Ross, M. J. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5(4) 432-443.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, Quest and prejudiced. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 2, 113-133.
- Bar-On, R. (1996). *The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): A test of emotional intelligence*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bernet, M. (1996). "Emotional intelligence: components and correlates," paper presented at the 1996 annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, August.
- Batson, D. C., & Schoenrade, P. A. (1991a). Measuring religion as Quest: 1) Validity concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30(4) 416-429.
- Batson, D. C., & Schoenrade, P. A. (1991b). Measuring religion as Quest: 2) Reliability concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30(4) 430-447.
- Behrman, D. N., & Perreault, W. J. (1982). Measuring the performance of industrial salespersons. *Journal of Business Research*, 10(3) 355-370.
- Boreham, B. W., & Watts, J. D. (1998). Personality Type in Undergraduate Education and Physics Students. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 44 27-31.
- Boivin, M. J. (1999). 'Religious Expression Scale' in Hill, P. C., & Hood, R. W. (Eds) *Measures of religiosity*. Alabama: Religious Education Press.
- Burris, C. T. (1999). 'Quest Scale' in Hill, P. C., & Hood, R. W. (Eds) *Measures of religiosity*. Alabama: Religious Education Press.
- Chan, D. W. (2003). Dimensions of emotional intelligence and their relationships with social coping among gifted adolescents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 32(6), 409-418.
- Cook, C. C. H. (2003). William James' varieties of religious experience and Jungian varieties of human nature: the nature of the relationship between religious experience, belief and psychological type. *Journal of Beliefs & Values: Studies in Religion & Education*, 24(2), 139.
- Cooper, R., & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: Emotional intelligence in leadership and organizations*. New York: Grosset/Putnam.

- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO-PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Duncan, B. (2000). *Pray your way*. London: Longman & Todd.
- Emmons, R. A., & Paloutzian, R. F. (2003). The psychology of religion. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 373-402.
- Eysenck, M. W. (1998). Personality and the psychology of religion. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 1(1), 11.
- Fearn, M., Booker, B. B., & Francis, L. J. (2001). Personality and church attendance among artists. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 22, 225-228.
- Francis, L. J. (1997). Personality, prayer, and church attendance among undergraduate students. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 7(2), 127.
- Francis, L. J. & Bolger, J. (1997). Personality, prayer and church attendance in later life. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 25, 335-338.
- Francis, L. J., Brown, L.B., & Philipchalk, R. (1992). The development of an abbreviated form of the revised Eysenck personality questionnaire (EPQR-A): Its use among students in England Canada and Australia. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 443-449.
- Francis, L. J. & Johnson, P. (1999). Mental health, prayer and church attendance among primary teachers. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 2, 153-158.
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S.H., & Kelly, P. (1999). Personality and church attendance among female hockey players. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 27, 519-522
- Francis, L. J., & Kaldor, P. (2002). The relationship between psychological well-being and Christian faith and practice in an Australian population sample. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41(1), 179-184.
- Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2002). Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders. *Journal of Beliefs & Values: Studies in Religion & Education*, 23(2), 217-220.
- Francis, L. J., & Wilcox, C. (1994). Personality, prayer and church attendance among 16- to 18-year old girls in England. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 134, 243-246.
- Goldsmith, M. (1997). *Knowing me knowing God: Exploring your spirituality with Myers-Briggs*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Hill, P. C., & Hood, R. W. (eds) (1999). *Measures of religiosity*. Alabama: Religious Education Press.
- James, W. (1985). *The varieties of religious experience*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Jones, S. H., & Francis, L. J. (1999). Personality type and attitude toward Christianity among student churchgoers. *Journal of Beliefs & Values: Studies in Religion & Education*, 20(1), 105.
- Kaldor, P., Francis, L. J. & Hughes, P. J. (2002). Personality and community involvement: Is church going different. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 23, 101-105.
- Lam, L. T., & Kirby S. L. (2002). Is emotional intelligence an advantage? An exploration of the impact of emotional and general intelligence on individual performance. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142 (1) 133-144.
- Lewis, C. A. (2000). The personality profile of the churchgoer: A study among female French undergraduates. In L.J Francis & Y.C. Katz (Eds) *Joining and leaving religion: Jewish and Christian perspectives*. pp. 309- 331, Herefordshire: Gracewing.
- Lewis, C. A., Francis, L. J., & Enger, T. (2004). Personality, prayer and church attendance among a sample of 11 to 18 year olds in Norway. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 7(3), 269-274.
- MacDonald, D. A. (2001). Spirituality: description, measurement, and relation to the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Personality* 68 (1) 154-197
- Maltby, J., & Day, L. (2001). The relationship between spirituality and Eysenck's personality dimensions: A replication among English adults. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology* 162 (1) 119-122.
- Maltby, J., & Day, L. (2001). The relationship between spirituality and Eysenck's personality dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19, 157-163.
- McFarland, G. S. (1989). Religious orientations and the targets of discrimination. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 26(11) 111-115.
- McFarland, G. S., & Warren, C. J. (1992). Religious orientations and selective exposure among fundamentalist christians. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 31 (2) 163-174.

- Musson, D. J. (2002). Personality of male Anglican clergy in England: Revisited using the 16PF. *Mental Health and Religion*, 5 (2) 195-206
- Ramanaiah, N. V., Rielage, J. K., & Sharpe, P. J. (2001). Spiritual well-being and personality. *Psychological Reports*, 89, 659-662.
- Robbins, M., Hair, J., & Francis, L. J. (1999). Personality and attraction to the charismatic movement: a study among Anglican clergy. *Journal of Beliefs & Values: Studies in Religion & Education*, 20(2), 239.
- Rozell, E. J., Pettijohn, C. E., & Parker, S. R. (2006). Emotional intelligence and dispositional affectivity as predictors of performance in salespeople. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 14(2) 113-124.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9 (3) 185-211
- Saroglou, V. (2002). Religion and the five-factors of personality: a Meta-analytic review. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 15-25
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., and Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences* 25: 167-177
- Shuck, A. A., & Phillips, C. R. (1999). Assessing pharmacy students' learning styles and personality types: A ten-year analysis. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 63 (1) 27-33
- Smith, D. L. (1996). Private prayer, public worship and personality among 11-15 year old adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 21, 1063-1065
- Simpson, B. D., Newman, L. J., & Fuqua, R. D. (2007). Spirituality and personality: accumulating evidence. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 26 (1) 33-44.
- Spilka, B., Hood, R. W., Hunsberger, B., & Gorsuch, R. (2003). *The psychology of religion: An empirical approach*. New York: Guilford Press
- Swiatek, M. A. (1995). An empirical investigation of the social coping strategies used by gifted adolescents. *Gifted Child*, 39, 154-161.
- Tapia, M. (1998). *A study of the relationships of the emotional intelligence inventory*. Alabama: UMI.
- Thomas, G. (2000). *Sacred pathways*. Michigan: Zondervan

- Tacey, D. (2006). 'Religion versus spirituality' as a spiritual problem: Reconstructing experience with tradition. *Religious Education Journal of Australia* 22 (1) 3-9.
- Vergote, A. (1985). Psychology of religion as the study of the conflict between belief and unbelief, in: L.B. Brown (Ed.) *Advances in the psychology of religion*, p. 52-61. International series in experimental social psychology, No. 11, Ed. M. Argyle. Oxford:Pergamon.
- Wong, C. S., Law, K. S., & Wong, P. M. (2004). Development and validation of a forced choice emotional intelligence measure for Chinese respondents in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21 535-559.

Appendix A: Factor Analysis for EI

	Component		
	1	2	3
b1	.177	.407	.203
b2	.462	.169	.095
b3	.370	.407	-.112
b4	-.156	.452	.330
b5	-.051	-.075	-.624
b6	-.090	.359	.130
b7	.322	.462	.036
b8	.220	.494	-.006
b9	.278	.332	.158
b10	.366	.542	-.092
b11	.050	.591	-.058
b12	.502	.371	.054
b13	.296	.186	.224
b14	.488	.400	-.062
b15	.267	.210	.520
b16	.250	.475	.353
b17	.538	.191	.098
b18	.355	.092	.560
b19	.364	.049	.453
b20	.572	.116	.149
b21	.415	-.307	.287
b22	.480	-.064	.314
b23	.663	.031	-.125
b24	.125	.529	.295
b25	.096	.038	.738
b26	.020	.302	.333
b27	.396	.113	.273
b28	-.537	-.001	-.197
b29	-.041	.216	.635
b30	.153	.616	.224
b31	.557	.321	.100
b32	.174	.044	.508
b33	.001	-.006	-.392

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

A rotation converged in 12 iterations.

Appendix B: Factor Analysis for Religious Expression Scale

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
C1	.774	.104	-.050	.133	-.095
C2	.376	-.075	.357	.043	.161
C3	.264	.271	.365	.296	.093
C4	.776	.153	.061	.025	-.020
C5	.683	.182	-.036	-.188	-.080
C6	.279	.094	.306	.173	-.217
C7	.150	.603	-.099	.010	-.149
C8	.499	.435	.069	-.238	-.122
C9	.583	.357	-.065	-.149	-.015
C10	-.162	.034	-.211	.117	.441
C11	-.107	.097	.419	.191	.017
C12	.301	.334	-.115	.141	-.244
C13	.820	-.044	.018	.064	.065
C14	.738	.085	-.085	-.018	.041
C15	.714	.222	.039	-.092	.131
C16	.165	.419	.366	.010	-.011
C17	.628	.156	.082	.197	.001
C18	.513	.244	.035	.121	-.124
C19	.764	.143	.126	.158	-.056
C20	.787	.063	.017	.139	-.105
C21	.633	.081	-.007	.137	-.122
C22	-.118	-.001	.404	-.118	-.033
C23	.636	.280	.194	-.294	.021
C24	.181	.115	.419	.016	.091
C25	.509	.171	.223	.102	-.251
C26	.801	.120	.047	.138	-.062
C27	.053	.385	-.184	.043	-.337
C28	.493	.316	.060	.142	.022
C29	.774	.063	.013	.287	-.058
C30	.673	.135	.061	.321	.092
C31	.182	.230	.119	-.057	-.329
C32	.018	-.130	.241	.516	.044
C33	.321	.213	.198	.482	.006
C34	.375	.148	.232	.265	-.187
C35	.091	.186	.013	.563	.151
C36	-.786	.018	.033	.149	.011
C37	-.389	.337	.159	.116	.322
C38	.128	.406	.141	-.099	.148
C39	-.293	-.062	-.036	.518	.078
C40	.193	.335	.131	.094	-.011
C41	.244	-.159	.025	.473	.166
C42	.612	.044	.041	.115	-.278

Appendix B: Continued

C43	.217	.248	.069	.449	-.053
C44	.293	.265	.008	.006	.608
C45	.408	-.010	-.035	.169	.470
C46	.631	.198	.169	.011	.311
C47	-.269	-.117	.275	.040	.510
C48	.461	.203	.031	.036	.189
C49	.028	.605	-.161	.099	.003
C50	-.188	-.175	.425	.001	-.170
C51	.021	-.083	.516	.197	-.224
C52	-.328	.128	-.049	-.274	.239
C53	.785	-.009	.085	-.027	.084
C54	.304	-.038	.531	.144	.126
C55	.107	.089	.598	.344	.031
C56	.007	-.148	.546	-.071	.017
C57	.041	.287	-.041	-.131	.103
C58	.863	-.025	.094	-.030	-.132
C59	.042	.298	-.066	-.516	.198

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

A rotation converged in 8 iterations.

Appendix C: Personality Dimensions and Modes of Religious Expression

	General Religion	Social/ Emotional	Philosophical Intellectual	Cognitive/ Intellectual	Subjective/ Affective
Neuroticism	.166(*) .030	.193(*) .012	.018 .812	-.004 .960	-.045 .557
Extraversion	.019 .809	.346(**) .000	.016 .840	-.014 .856	.145 .059
Openness	.217(**) .004	.129 .094	.385(**) .000	.142 .064	.071 .353
Agreeableness	-.046 .554	.067 .383	.322(**) .000	.133 .082	.132 .086
Conscientious- ness	.074 .334	.021 .787	.251(**) .001	-.011 .892	.061 .429

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

N = 171

Appendix D: EI Dimensions and Modes of Religious Expression

	General Religion	Social/ Emotional	Philosophical Intellectual	Cognitive/ Intellectual	Subjective/ Affective
EIS total	.109 .156	.165(*) .031	.207(**) .007	-.036 .641	.089 .247
EIS utilization	.125 .103	.299(**) .000	.063 .412	-.014 .853	.098 .201
EIS appraisal	.059 .446	.037 .627	.229(**) .003	-.020 .799	-.002 .977
EIS regulation	-.001 .990	.018 .819	.063 .411	.196(*) .010	.245(**) .001

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

N = 171

Appendix E: EI Dimensions and Quest

	EIS total	EIS utilization	EIS regulation	EIS appraisal	Quest Score (total)
EIS total	1	.312(**)	-.025	.182(*)	.136
EIS utilization	.312(**)	1	-.113	.095	.071
EIS regulation	-.025	-.113	1	.007	.136
EIS appraisal	.182(*)	.095	.007	1	-.031
Quest Score (total)	.136	.071	.136	-.031	1
	.076	.356	.076	.689	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

N = 171

Appendix F: Personality Dimensions and Quest

	NEO neuroticism	NEO extraversion	NEO openness	NEO agreeableness	NEO conscientiousness	Quest Score (total)
NEO neuroticism	1	-.047	.063	.232**	-.180(*)	.159(*)
NEO extraversion	-.047	1	.160(*)	.090	.182(*)	.073
NEO openness	.063	.160(*)	1	.149	.216(**)	.209(**)
NEO agreeableness	.232(**)	.090	.149	1	.064	.136
NEO conscientiousness	-.180(*)	.182(*)	.216(**)	.064	1	.018
Quest Score (total)	.159(*)	.073	.209(**)	.136	.018	1
	.038	.344	.006	.077	.811	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

N = 171

Appendix G: Modes of Religious Expression Regressed on Quest

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.292(a)	.085	.080	5.97921
2	.353(b)	.125	.114	5.86527

a Predictors: (Constant), Social emotional

b Predictors: (Constant), Social emotional , Philo intellect

ANOVA(c)

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	561.238	1	561.238	15.699	.000(a)
	Residual	6041.920	169	35.751		
	Total	6603.158	170			
2	Regression	823.731	2	411.865	11.972	.000(b)
	Residual	5779.427	168	34.401		
	Total	6603.158	170			

a Predictors: (Constant), Social emotional

b Predictors: (Constant), Social emotional , Philo intellect

c Dependent Variable: Quest Score (total)

Coefficients(a)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	26.673	2.795		9.545	.000
	Social emotional	.668	.169	.292	3.962	.000
2	(Constant)	18.589	4.010		4.636	.000
	Social emotional	.673	.165	.294	4.068	.000
	Philo intellect	.316	.114	.199	2.762	.006

a Dependent Variable: Quest Score (total)

Appendix H: Personality, Religious Expression and EI Regressed on Quest

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.292(a)	.085	.080	5.97921
2	.353(b)	.125	.114	5.86527

a Predictors: (Constant), Social emotional

b Predictors: (Constant), Social emotional , Philo intellect

ANOVA(c)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	561.238	1	561.238	15.699	.000(a)
	Residual	6041.920	169	35.751		
	Total	6603.158	170			
2	Regression	823.731	2	411.865	11.972	.000(b)
	Residual	5779.427	168	34.401		
	Total	6603.158	170			

a Predictors: (Constant), Social emotional

b Predictors: (Constant), Social emotional , Philo intellect

c Dependent Variable: Quest Score (total)

Coefficients(a)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	26.673	2.795		9.545	.000
	Social emotional	.668	.169	.292	3.962	.000
2	(Constant)	18.589	4.010		4.636	.000
	Social emotional	.673	.165	.294	4.068	.000
	Philo intellect	.316	.114	.199	2.762	.006

a Dependent Variable: Quest Score (total)

Appendix I: Personality and EI regressed on Quest

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2
1	.209(a)	.044	.038	6.11232

a Predictors: (Constant), NEO openness

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	289.231	1	289.231	7.742	.006(a)
	Residual	6313.927	169	37.361		
	Total	6603.158	170			

a Predictors: (Constant), NEO openness

b Dependent Variable: Quest Score (total)

Coefficients(a)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	24.043	4.893		4.913	.000
	NEO openness	.368	.132	.209	2.782	.006

a Dependent Variable: Quest Score (total)

Excluded Variables(b)

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics
						Tolerance
1	EIS utilization	.017(a)	.221	.825	.017	.931
	EIS regulation	.106(a)	1.396	.165	.107	.976
	EIS appraisal	-.116(a)	-1.449	.149	-.111	.884
	NEO neuroticism	.146(a)	1.958	.052	.149	.996
	NEO extraversion	.040(a)	.528	.598	.041	.974
	NEO agreeableness	.107(a)	1.407	.161	.108	.978
	NEO conscientiousness	-.028(a)	-.365	.716	-.028	.953

a Predictors in the Model: (Constant), NEO openness

b Dependent Variable: Quest Score (total)

Appendix J: Explanatory Statement Provided for Participants

“Young Adult Religiosity: Evaluating the Influence of Individual Differences upon Religious Expression and Maturity”

The following information is provided to help you decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that you are free to decide not to participate or to withdraw at any time.

The purpose of this study is to understand the relationship between individual differences and young adult religiosity. This study is being undertaken as part of the faculty of education honors program.

Data will be collected using a self report questionnaire. The questionnaire is divided into five sections. The first four sections include items to which you can respond to in terms of the degree to which you agree or disagree with specific statements. The final section includes very brief demographic questions about you.

There are no anticipated risks and a minimal amount of time is expected to complete the survey. The benefits associated with your participation include the information gained about the relationship between individual differences and young adult religious expression and maturity. An understanding of this relationship may enhance a religious educator's awareness of the kinds of religious experiences that may appeal to different people, thus enhancing teacher student communication.

Anonymity

We guarantee complete anonymity because:

- We ask that you do not put your name anywhere on the questionnaire
- Your survey will be one of nearly two hundred and we will only look at the overall pattern of results, not at any one person.
- The principal investigator will not be present during the completion of the survey.

Returning the completed questionnaire indicates your willingness to participate in this study with full knowledge of the nature and purpose of the study. If you do not wish to participate you are free to leave at any time. Collection boxes for completed surveys are situated in the classroom and the education faculty office.

Do not hesitate to ask questions about the study before participating or during the study.

Your responses are anonymous. **DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME** on the questionnaire.

Avondale College requires that all participants are informed that if they have any complaint concerning the matter in which a research project is conducted it may be

given to the supervisor (in this case Graham Stacey 02 4980 2231), or if an independent person is preferred to the Colleges Human Research Ethics Committee Secretary, Avondale College, PO BOX 19, Cooranbong, NSW 2265, or phone (02) 4980 2221 or fax (02) 4980 2118

We thank you for your help

Sincerely

Adam Kranz

Appendix K: Questionnaire

Section A

Please rate each of the following statements according to how strongly you agree or disagree with it as an *adequate description of yourself*. Please respond to the statements according to the following scale

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

When making your answer please circle the appropriate number after each statement. Please **do not** put your name anywhere on this questionnaire

Please help us by answering every question.
Thank you for your help with this study.

- 1. I am not a worrier..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 2. I like to have a lot of people around me..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 3. I don't like to waste my time daydreaming..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 4. I try to be courteous to everyone I meet..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 5. I keep my belongings neat and clean..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 6. I often feel inferior to others..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 7. I laugh easily..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 8. Once I find the right way to do something,
I stick to it..... 1 2 3 4 5

9. I often get into arguments with my
family and co-workers..... 1 2 3 4 5
10. I'm pretty good about pacing myself so as to get
things done on time..... 1 2 3 4 5
11. When I'm under a great deal of stress,
sometimes I feel like I'm going to pieces..... 1 2 3 4 5
12. I don't consider myself especially "light hearted."..... 1 2 3 4 5
13. I am intrigued by the patterns I find
in art and nature..... 1 2 3 4 5
14. Some people think I'm selfish and egotistical..... 1 2 3 4 5
15. I am not a very methodical person..... 1 2 3 4 5
16. I rarely feel lonely or blue..... 1 2 3 4 5
17. I really enjoy talking to people..... 1 2 3 4 5
18. I believe letting students hear controversial
speakers can only confuse and mislead them..... 1 2 3 4 5
19. I would rather cooperate with others than
compete with them..... 1 2 3 4 5
20. I try to perform all the tasks assigned to
me conscientiously..... 1 2 3 4 5
21. I often feel tense and jittery..... 1 2 3 4 5
22. I like to be where the action is..... 1 2 3 4 5
23. Poetry has little or no effect on me..... 1 2 3 4 5
24. I tend to be cynical and skeptical
of others' intentions..... 1 2 3 4 5
25. I have a clear set of goals and work toward
them in an orderly fashion..... 1 2 3 4 5
26. Sometimes I feel completely worthless..... 1 2 3 4 5
27. I usually prefer to do things alone..... 1 2 3 4 5
28. I often try new and foreign foods..... 1 2 3 4 5
29. I believe that most people will take advantage
of you if you let them..... 1 2 3 4 5

30. I waste a lot of time before setting down to work..... 1 2 3 4 5
31. I rarely feel fearful or anxious..... 1 2 3 4 5
32. I often feel as if I'm bursting with energy..... 1 2 3 4 5
33. I seldom notice the moods or feelings that
different environments produce..... 1 2 3 4 5
34. Most people I know like me..... 1 2 3 4 5
35. I work hard to accomplish my goals..... 1 2 3 4 5
36. I often get angry at the way people treat
me..... 1 2 3 4 5
37. I am a cheerful, high spirited person..... 1 2 3 4 5
38. I believe we should look to our religious
authorities for decisions on moral issues..... 1 2 3 4 5
39. Some people think of me as cold and
calculating..... 1 2 3 4 5
40. When I make a commitment, I can always be
counted on to follow through..... 1 2 3 4 5
41. Too often, when things go wrong, I get
discouraged and feel like giving up..... 1 2 3 4 5
42. I am not a cheerful optimist..... 1 2 3 4 5
43. Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking
at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement..... 1 2 3 4 5
44. I'm hard-headed and tough minded in my
attitudes..... 1 2 3 4 5
45. Sometimes I'm not as dependable or reliable
as I should be..... 1 2 3 4 5
46. I am seldom sad or depressed 1 2 3 4 5
47. My life is fast paced..... 1 2 3 4 5
48. I have little interest in speculating on the nature
of the universe or the human condition..... 1 2 3 4 5
49. I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate..... 1 2 3 4 5

50. I am a productive person who always
gets the job done..... 1 2 3 4 5
51. I often feel helpless and want someone
else to solve my problems..... 1 2 3 4 5
52. I am a very active person..... 1 2 3 4 5
53. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity..... 1 2 3 4 5
54. If I don't like people I let them know..... 1 2 3 4 5
55. I never seem to be able to get organized..... 1 2 3 4 5
56. At times I have been so ashamed I just
wanted to hide..... 1 2 3 4 5
57. I would rather go on my own way than be
a leader of others..... 1 2 3 4 5
58. I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract
ideas..... 1 2 3 4 5
59. If necessary, I am willing to manipulate
people to get what I want..... 1 2 3 4 5
60. I strive for excellence in everything I do..... 1 2 3 4 5

Section B

Please rate each of the following statements according to how strongly you agree or disagree with it as an *adequate description of how you interact with others and the processes you go through when making decisions*. Please respond to the statements in this section according to the same scale we have used.

1. I know when to speak about my personal problems
to others..... 1 2 3 4 5
2. When I am faced with obstacles, I remember
times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them..... 1 2 3 4 5
3. I expect that I will do well on most things I try..... 1 2 3 4 5
4. Other people find it easy to confide in me..... 1 2 3 4 5
5. I find it hard to understand the
non-verbal messages of other people..... 1 2 3 4 5
6. Some of the major events of my life have led me
to re-evaluate what is important and not important..... 1 2 3 4 5

7. When my mood changes, I see new possibilities..... 1 2 3 4 5
8. Emotions are one of the things that make my life worth living..... 1 2 3 4 5
9. I am aware of my emotions as I experience them..... 1 2 3 4 5
10. I expect good things to happen..... 1 2 3 4 5
11. I like to share my emotions with others..... 1 2 3 4 5
12. When I experience a positive emotion, I know how to make it last..... 1 2 3 4 5
13. I arrange events others enjoy..... 1 2 3 4 5
14. I seek out activities that make me happy..... 1 2 3 4 5
15. I am aware of the non verbal messages I send to others..... 1 2 3 4 5
16. I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others..... 1 2 3 4 5
17. When I am in a positive mood solving problems is easy for me..... 1 2 3 4 5
18. By looking at their facial expressions, I recognize the emotions people are experiencing.....1 2 3 4 5
19. I know why my emotions change.....1 2 3 4 5
20. When I am in a positive mood, I am able to come up with new ideas.....1 2 3 4 5
21. I have control over my emotions..... 1 2 3 4 5
22. I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them.....1 2 3 4 5
23. I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on..... 1 2 3 4 5
24. I compliment others when they have done something well..... 1 2 3 4 5
25. I am aware of the non-verbal messages other people send..... 1 2 3 4 5

26. When another person tells me about an important event in his or her life, I almost feel as though I have experienced this event myself.....1 2 3 4 5
27. When I feel a change in emotions, I tend to come up with new ideas.....1 2 3 4 5
28. When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail.....1 2 3 4 5
29. I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them.....1 2 3 4 5
30. I help other people feel better when they are down.....1 2 3 4 5
31. I use good moods to help myself keep trying in the face of obstacles.....1 2 3 4 5
32. I can tell how people are feeling by listening to their tone of voice.....1 2 3 4 5
33. It is difficult for me to understand why people feel the way they do 1 2 3 4 5

Section C

Please rate each of the following statements according to how strongly you agree or disagree with it as an *adequate description of your own religious faith or behavior*. Please respond to the statements in this section according to the same scale we have used.

1. For myself, reading the Bible is the most important for understanding the truths of God's revelations:.....1 2 3 4 5
2. In relating to non-Christians I would feel most comfortable speaking about the philosophical soundness of my experience.....1 2 3 4 5
3. I would say that I express my faith primarily through the intellectual areas of my life.....1 2 3 4 5
4. For myself, the Bible is interpreted through the direct and immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit.....1 2 3 4 5
5. To me, the beauty of Christianity lies in the way it helps me through the joys and trials of each day.....1 2 3 4 5
6. I would say that I "think" my religion.....1 2 3 4 5

7. I need other people to help me through the
emotional aspects of my life.....1 2 3 4 5
8. I tend to express my faith through the
emotional aspects of my life.....1 2 3 4 5
9. In speaking to non-Christians I would probably
emphasize the emotional security
I experience with my faith.....1 2 3 4 5
10. Religion should not be intellectual.....1 2 3 4 5
11. For myself, the Bible is best interpreted so that
it will be consistent with history and science.....1 2 3 4 5
12. In emphasizing the rational aspects
of faith there is a danger in losing the
applicability of that faith.....1 2 3 4 5
13. I experience the Holy Spirit working
actively in my life.....1 2 3 4 5
14. I prefer to witness about the love I experience
in Christ.....1 2 3 4 5
15. During a Church service I may become
emotionally overwhelmed by the spirit of God.....1 2 3 4 5
16. The Holy Spirit works primarily through
such means as culture and history.....1 2 3 4 5
17. I find the body of Christ to be a place where His
Word is emphasized.....1 2 3 4 5
18. To evangelize means to work within groups,
developing relationships.....1 2 3 4 5
19. I prefer to witness to the truth found in Christ.....1 2 3 4 5
20. I spend time reflecting on the wonder of God.....1 2 3 4 5
21. To evangelize means to witness to individuals.....1 2 3 4 5
22. Society will change when institutions are changed.....1 2 3 4 5
23. I would say that I "feel" my religion.....1 2 3 4 5
24. I tend to be concerned about the political
and social implications of the gospel.....1 2 3 4 5

25. I prefer to listen to a minister who is a
good Biblical scholar.....1 2 3 4 5
26. I seek God's guidance through prayer and
meditation.....1 2 3 4 5
27. When troubled I prefer to talk to a person who
will show me compassion.....1 2 3 4 5
28. I prefer a church group which emphasizes
personal sharing.....1 2 3 4 5
29. I seek God's guidance through the study of scripture.....1 2 3 4 5
30. I rely on the Bible to help me understand what a
conversion experience is.....1 2 3 4 5
31. I am willing to accept another's conversion
experience as real even if it is quite different from
my own.....1 2 3 4 5
32. I am an unemotional person.....1 2 3 4 5
33. For myself, becoming a believer was the result of
much study of scripture.....1 2 3 4 5
34. Christianity may be seen as a logical system
of beliefs.....1 2 3 4 5
35. The content of a persons testimony is more
important than the feelings surrounding it.....1 2 3 4 5
36. I have never actually felt God's presence.....1 2 3 4 5
37. As Christians, we are living in the Church Age;
therefore, we should not expect God to intervene
by supernatural means.....1 2 3 4 5
38. For me, worship services are most meaningful where
we do not have to follow a set program.....1 2 3 4 5
39. I dislike it when a minister speaks with a lot of
emotions and tries to create certain feelings.....1 2 3 4 5
40. Midweek services at my church emphasize
sharing needs rather than studying scripture.....1 2 3 4 5
41. What a person thinks is more important
than how he or she feels.....1 2 3 4 5
42. In church I expect to be taught the word of God.....1 2 3 4 5

43. Worship is when you reflect on God rather than his filling you.....1 2 3 4 5
44. I may loose control of myself during prayer or worship.....1 2 3 4 5
45. Miracles and supernatural events are a regular part of a "spirit-filled" Christian's life.....1 2 3 4 5
46. I am more emotional about my faith than other people.....1 2 3 4 5
47. I don't need other people to help me grow in my faith.....1 2 3 4 5
48. I have had an emotional conversion experience.....1 2 3 4 5
49. I feel more comfortable doing things in groups than alone.....1 2 3 4 5
50. I tend to be more individualistic than other people.....1 2 3 4 5
51. I would say that I have an analytic mind.....1 2 3 4 5
52. I am not as concerned about the details of the Bible as other people are.....1 2 3 4 5
53. I can say for certain that I have felt God's presence.....1 2 3 4 5
54. My beliefs are well organized and thought out.....1 2 3 4 5
55. I am more intellectual about my beliefs than other people.....1 2 3 4 5
56. I would describe myself as a very rational person.....1 2 3 4 5
57. I am a very sociable person.....1 2 3 4 5
58. My religion is very important to me and touches all of my life.....1 2 3 4 5
59. I would describe myself as a very emotional person.....1 2 3 4 5

Section D

The following questions are about *growth and change in your religious journey*. Please respond to the statements in this section according to the same scale we have used.

1. As I grow and change, I expect my religion also to grow and change.....1 2 3 4 5

2. I am constantly questioning my religious beliefs.....1 2 3 4 5
3. It might be said that I value my religious doubts
and uncertainties 1 2 3 4 5
4. I was not very interested in religion until I
began to ask questions about the meaning and
purpose of my life.....1 2 3 4 5
5. For me, doubting is an important part of what
it means to be religious.....1 2 3 4 5
6. I do not expect my religious convictions to
change in the next few years.....1 2 3 4 5
7. I find religious doubts upsetting.....1 2 3 4 5
8. I have been driven to ask religious questions out of a
growing awareness of the tensions in my world and
in my relation to my world.....1 2 3 4 5
9. My life experiences have led me to rethink
my religious convictions.....1 2 3 4 5
10. There are many religious issues on which my
views are still changing.....1 2 3 4 5
11. God wasn't very important to me until I began to
ask questions about the meaning of my own life.....1 2 3 4 5
12. Questions are far more central to my religious
experience than are answers.....1 2 3 4 5

Section E Demographics

Please answer all of the following questions briefly. Remember that all information is strictly confidential.

Age (years) _____

Gender (please circle) Male/Female

What is your course of study at Avondale College (please put course code)

Would you consider yourself a Christian (please circle) YES/NO

Which denomination would you most likely identify with?

Glossary of Abbreviated Terms

EI	Emotional intelligence
EIS	Emotional intelligence scale
ESI	Expressions of spirituality inventory
EWB	Existential well-being
FFM	Five factor model of personality
MBTI	Myers-Brigg type indicator
MEIS	Multifactor emotional intelligence scale
NEO FFI	NEO five factor inventory
NEO PI-R	The revised NEO personality inventory
RF	Religious fundamentalism
RWB	Religious well-being
SSS	Supplementary spirituality scale
SWB	Spiritual well-being scale

AVONDALE COLLEGE LIBRARY