and Spirituality: Problems and Prospects

Brian J. Zinnbauer
Kenneth I. Pargament
Allie B. Scott
Bowling Green State University

ABSTRACT   This article examines traditional and modern psychological characterizations of religiousness and spirituality. Three ways in which religiousness and spirituality are polarized by contemporary theorists are examined: organized religion versus personal spirituality; substantive religion versus functional spirituality; and negative religiousness versus positive spirituality. An alternative approach to understanding religiousness and spirituality is presented that integrates rather than polarizes these constructs, and sets boundaries to the discipline while acknowledging the diversity of religious and spiritual expressions. Directions for future investigations of these two constructs are presented.

Psychological investigations of religiousness and spirituality date back to the turn of the century (Coe, 1900; James, 1902/1961; Starbuck, 1899). From these pioneering efforts to the present, a number of theories have been developed, many empirical studies have been conducted, and considerable knowledge about religious and spiritual belief, experience, and behavior has been accumulated. With the approach of the new millennium, popular and scientific interest in religion and spirituality continues

Correspondence concerning this article should be directed to Brian Zinnbauer at the email address bzinnba@choice.net or c/o the Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403.

to expand. Spirituality, in particular, has been the focus of a number of recent books, journal articles, and conferences.

The past 30 years have seen a number of changes in religious and spiritual expression in the United States. Accordingly, approaches to religiousness and spirituality by psychologists have shifted. These shifts, however, have not been entirely benign for the psychology of religion. Increased religious individuality in the United States has manifested itself in terms of greater disagreement among social scientists and among respondents about the meaning of religiousness and spirituality. Further, current characterizations of these two critical constructs have lost important aspects of traditional ones. Relatively broad and balanced conceptualizations of religiousness and spirituality have given way to narrower and more biased perspectives. As a result, the psychology of religion as a field is in danger of losing its focus.

The purpose of this article is to describe the increasingly biased and polarized ways in which religiousness and spirituality are currently understood by psychologists, to explore the implications of this trend, and to propose an alternate way to approach religiousness and spirituality that brings these terms into greater focus. To begin, it is necessary to describe the cultural context in which this trend has developed.

A Changing Landscape

In the years since World War II, the nature of religious membership, belief, and behavior in the United States has undergone numerous changes. According to several sources (e.g., Bruce, 1996; Mead, 1994; Princeton Religious Research Center, 1993; Roof & McKinney, 1987; Turner, Lukoff, Barnhouse, & Lu, 1995), mainline religious institutions have declined in strength in the past 25 years, and confidence in religious leadership has similarly eroded. With the notable exceptions of conservative religious denominations (Kelly, 1978) church membership has dropped since the late 1940s, and religious denominations such as the Episcopal and Methodist churches have lost at least 38% of their memberships in the past 30 years (see Shorto, 1997). The 1960s and 1970s in particular witnessed a large-scale decline in organized religious involvement, particularly among "baby boomers." Roof (1993) found that 60% of the baby boomers he surveyed dropped out of active religious involvement for 2 years or more during this period. In the last three decades, organized religion has been labeled as "irrelevant," "an obstacle to

change" (Ahlstrom, 1970, p. 12), and "preventing rather than facilitating a personal experience of the transcendent" (Turner et al., 1995, p. 437).

However, if their participation in many traditional religious organizations has dropped, Americans have not become less religious or spiritual (see Shorto, 1997, for a compilation of recent surveys). Ninety-six percent of Americans report that they believe in God, 90% pray, 90% believe in heaven, 75% believe in the existence of angels, 93% of homes in the United States contain a Bible, and 33% of American adults say they read the Bible at least once a week. In fact, whereas religious television programming accounted for 1% of all television programming in 1977, it comprised 16% in 1996 (Shorto, 1997).

During the same time period that mainline religious institutions declined, alternatives to traditional religious institutions as well as new forms of faith under the label "spirituality" have risen in popularity. The 1980s and 1990s have seen the term spirituality attached to numerous religious, social, and political movements. As noted by Roof (1993), references to Eastern spiritualities, Native American spiritualities, twelve-step spiritualities, feminist spiritualities, Goddess spiritualities, men's spiritualities, earth-based or ecological spiritualities, and Judeo-Christian spiritualities are now common in popular culture. Also, the number of American Hindus, Buddhists, and Muslims has dramatically increased in the past three decades (Bedell, 1997). According to Shorto (1997), there are presently as many Muslims in the United States as Presbyterians (3.5 million).

In the context of a tradition of individualism in American religious culture (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swindler, & Tipton, 1985; Miles, 1997), new spiritual practices also have developed as privatized and personalized religious expressions that fall outside of the purview of traditional religious institutions (Roof, 1993). Interest in Eastern religious practices such as transcendental meditation (TM) and yoga has flourished. Meditation centers have been established around the country, and interest has grown in occult subjects such as astrology, theosophy, and Rosacrucianism (Ahlstrom, 1970; King, 1970; Roof, 1993). By the 1980s, 400 new spiritual associations had developed (Hood, Spilka, Hunsberger, & Gorsuch, 1996) and spirituality was identified as a "megatrend" in modern American society (Naisbett, 1982). New psychotherapies that bordered on the religious, such as est, Scientology, and Bioenergetics, also developed and attracted followers (Bruce, 1996). Ahlstrom (1970) described this movement as a countercultural one that

emphasized "spontaneity and freedom from dogma—whether theological or social" (p. 13). Instead of traveling the well-worn paths of traditional faiths, many people have embarked on searches for their own subjective meanings by picking and choosing from various religious and spiritual offerings (Bibby, 1987; Bruce, 1996; Marty, 1998; Roof, 1993; Roof & McKinney, 1987).

Thus, the present-day American religious and spiritual landscape reflects a decline in many traditional religious institutions, an increase in personalized and individualized forms of expression, and a culture of religious pluralism. In this context, even the meanings of the central constructs themselves, religiousness and spirituality, are subject to diverse interpretations.

The Many Meanings of Religiousness and Spirituality

Various definitions of religiousness and spirituality are held by scholars and those in the general community. Examples of these divergent definitions drawn from various scholarly disciplines include: the concrete, "practices carried out by those who profess a faith" (Doyle, 1992, p. 303); the abstract, "the attitude peculiar to a consciousness which has been altered by the experience of the numinosum" (Jung, 1938, p. 6); and the metaphysical, "concern with the ground and purpose of the world we call God" (Rahner & Vorgrimler, 1981, p. 437). Likewise, spirituality has been variously defined by social scientists in terms of relationships, "the presence of a relationship with a Higher Power that affects the way in which one operates in the world" (Armstrong, 1995, p. 3); inner motivations, "our response to a deep and mysterious human yearning for self-transcendence and surrender, a yearning to find our place" (Benner, 1989, p. 20); existential quests, "the search for existential meaning" (Doyle, 1992, p. 302); and prescriptions, "the systematic practice of and reflection on a prayerful, devout, and disciplined Christian life" (O'Collins & Farrugia, 1991, p. 228). The history of the psychology of religion is likewise replete with various and sundry definitions of religiousness and spirituality. Examples of such definitions can be seen in Table 1.

A few empirical investigations support the claim that different social scientists have different definitions of religiousness and spirituality. In one early study, Clark (1958) asked 68 psychologists, psychiatrists, ministers, religious scholars, sociologists, anthropologists, and philosophers to

Table 1
A Sample of Definitions of Religion and Spirituality in the Psychology of Religion

---

Religion

Argyle and Beit-Hallahmi (1975, p. 1): a system of beliefs in a divine or superhuman power, and practices of worship or other rituals directed towards such a power.

Batson, Schoenrade, and Ventis (1993, p. 8): whatever we as individuals do to come to grips personally with the questions that confront us because we are aware that we and others like us are alive and that we will die.

Clark (1958, p. 22): the inner experience of the individual when he senses a Beyond, especially as evidenced by the effect of this experience on his behavior when he actively attempts to harmonize his life with the Beyond.

William James (1902/1961, p. 42): the feelings, acts, and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine.

Spirituality

Benner (1989, p. 20): the human response to God's gracious call to a relationship with himself.

Elkins, Hedstrom, Hughes, Leaf, and Saunders (1988, p. 10): a way of being and experiencing that comes about through awareness of a transcendent dimension and that is characterized by certain identifiable values in regard to self, life, and whatever one considers to be the Ultimate.

Shafranske and Gorsuch (1984, p. 231): a transcendent dimension within human experience . . . discovered in moments in which the individual questions the meaning of personal existence and attempts to place the self within a broader ontological context.

Vaughan (1991, p. 105): a subjective experience of the sacred.

---

define religion. The concepts emphasized in the definitions ranged from references to the supernatural and mystical experiences, to ultimate concerns, social values or group concerns, and church membership. Clark concluded that religion has many facets and that social scientists "mean very different things by the term 'religious.' " (p. 146)

Scott (1997) recently performed a content analysis of a sample of 31 definitions of religiousness and 40 definitions of spirituality that have appeared in social scientific writings over the past century. She found that definitions of religiousness and spirituality were generally evenly

distributed over nine content categories, and that no single category accounted for a majority of definitions. The nine content categories developed by Scott were: experiences of connectedness or relationship; processes leading to increased connectedness; behavioral responses to something sacred or secular; systems of thought or sets of beliefs; traditional institutional or organizational structures; pleasurable states of being; beliefs in the sacred, the transcendent, and so forth; attempts at or capacities for transcendence; and concern with existential questions or issues. Her analysis points to diversity in content of religiousness definitions and similar diversity in the definitions of spirituality, and further suggests the lack of a comprehensive and accepted theory or theories that account for the multifaceted nature of the constructs.

The diversity found in researchers' views about religiousness and spirituality is similar to the diversity found among research participants. In their study of religiousness and spirituality, Zinnbauer et al. (1997) asked 305 individuals from a variety of professional and religious backgrounds to write their own definitions of religiousness and spirituality. Three judges then content analyzed the definitions and placed them into thirteen categories. Consistent with Scott's (1997) findings, no single category accounted for a majority of the definitions of either construct. Once again, the results of this content analysis indicated a sizable amount of variability in personal definitions of religiousness and spirituality.

The policy capturing studies of Pargament et al. (1995) and Zinnbauer (1997) are also relevant here. Policy capturing uses statistical analyses to characterize human decision making and judgment. In their study of religiousness, Pargament et al. (1995) asked 27 undergraduate college students and 25 clergy to rate 100 profiles of hypothetical people in terms of their degree of religiousness. These profiles differed in terms of 10 separate cues relevant to perceptions of religiousness. These cues were: religious experiences (feeling the presence of God in one's life), personal benefits (deriving support, comfort, or meaning from formal religious beliefs), doctrinal orthodoxy (holding traditional Christian beliefs), church attendance (attendance at religious services), personal religious practices (prayer, meditation, or Bible reading outside of religious services), evangelism (active attempts to convert others to his/her beliefs), financial donations to church (proportion of income donated to the church), religious knowledge (knowledge about central doctrines and teachings of one's religious denomination), altruism (acts of giving without gaining something in return), and religious development

(whether an individual came to his/her current religious beliefs through a process of questioning and searching or through a simple acceptance of what was taught). Regression analyses were then conducted to generate a judgment "policy" for each judge that indicated which cues were used by each judge to rate the profiles.

The results of this study indicated that religiousness was an organized and identifiable construct that meant different things to different participants. Coherent and consistent policies were identified for the majority of the students and clergy, but only one cue was used by a majority of students (personal benefits, 55%) to rate religiousness, and only one cue was used by a majority of clergy (church attendance, 86%) in their ratings of religiousness. Additionally, low intraclass correlations were found for all raters' mean levels of judgments and their use of the cues. This points to substantial divergence among raters in their ratings of the profiles and the meanings they attributed to religiousness. For example, to some students and clergy religiousness meant church attendance, to others it meant acts of altruism, to others it meant performing religious rituals, and to others it meant a combination of different beliefs and practices.

Zinnbauer (1997) extended the study by Pargament et al. (1995) to include judgements of both religiousness and spirituality. This study used eight different cues to create 60 profiles of hypothetical people. Judgments of both religiousness and spirituality were collected from 21 Christian clergy and 20 registered nurses. From these judgments, separate policies of religiousness and spirituality were derived for each participant. Four religiousness cues were used in the profiles: formal/organizational religion (attendance at formal religious services and adherence to the church's prescribed tenets, doctrines, and practices); altruism (acts of giving without gaining something in return); personal religious practice (frequency of prayer or Bible study not linked to involvement in a church or organized religion); and personal benefits (the degree to which an individual derives support or comfort from formal religious beliefs). Four spirituality cues also were used: personal/existential meaning (the degree to which one seeks meaning in one's life, insight into oneself, or understanding about the world); spiritual experiences (the degree to which one feels close to God and feels God's presence in one's life); sacred connection (the frequency one feels a sense of interconnectedness with the world and all living things); and spiritual disciplines (the frequency of participation in activities intended to promote spiritual growth such as meditation or yoga).

The results of this study indicated that the participants held organized and coherent conceptions of religiousness and spirituality. In fact, coherent and consistent judgment policies were identified for nearly all of the clergy and nurses. These policies, however, differed from participant to participant. For the clergy, only one cue, formal/organizational religion, was used in a majority of religiousness (90%) and spirituality (63%) policies. From the calculation of intraclass correlation coefficients, the clergy as a group displayed a moderate divergence in the meanings they attributed to religiousness, and a substantial divergence in the meanings they attributed to spirituality. Similar to the clergy, a majority (83%) of the nurses used the cue formal/organizational religion to rate religiousness, but no single cue was used by a majority of nurses to rate spirituality. Likewise, the nurses as a group exhibited modest divergence in the meanings they attributed to religiousness, and considerable divergence in the meanings they attributed to spirituality.

Additionally, Zinnbauer (1997) found group differences between the clergy and nurses in their policies of spirituality and religiousness. For example, the constructs appeared to overlap more for the clergy than for the nurses. The consistent use of the cue formal/organizational religion by clergy suggests that attendance at formal religious services and adherence to a church's tenets and doctrines are the central features of both constructs for this group. Unlike the clergy, no single cue was found in a majority of both policies for the nurses. Instead, most cues were associated with either religiousness or spirituality. Similar to several current conceptions of the constructs (e.g., Emblen, 1992; Peteet, 1994; Shafranske & Gorsuch, 1984) religiousness was predominantly associated with formal/organizational religion, and spirituality was more often associated with closeness with God and feelings of interconnectedness with the world and living things. The reasons for these group differences were not determined in this study, but variables such as differences in religious training, age, and occupational background were proposed as potential contributors (Zinnbauer, 1997).

These studies underscore the diversity in definitions of religiousness and spirituality among researchers and respondents. In addition to these interindividual differences, the evidence points to intergroup differences in the meanings of these two constructs. Amidst this proliferation of religiousness and spirituality definitions, however, the beginnings of a collective opinion are emerging. The nature of this emerging perspective,

though, raises several important questions and concerns for psychological theory and research.

An Emerging Perspective

Modern psychological ways of understanding religiousness and spirituality have emerged against the backdrop of changes in American religious and spiritual life, and the recent increased interest in spirituality as a topic of study. Despite their novelty, these developments may have a downside. Traditionally broad and balanced characterizations of religiousness and spirituality are giving way to narrower and more polarized depictions, and in the process, this area of inquiry is losing its focus.

The Traditional Approach

Three aspects of traditional psychological writings on religion are particularly salient. The first aspect is that religion has been regarded by many scholars and researchers as a "broad-band" construct and not explicitly differentiated from spirituality (Pargament, in press; Zinnbauer et al., 1997). Descriptions of religion by psychologists have included a wide array of beliefs, behaviors, feelings, and experiences. More specifically, religion has been investigated from both substantive and functional perspectives. The substantive approach to religion focuses on the beliefs, emotions, practices, and relationships of individuals that are explicitly related to a higher power or divine being (Bruce, 1996). Religion is defined by its substance, the sacred. An example of this approach is the definition of religion provided by Spiro (1966): "an institution consisting of culturally patterned interaction with culturally postulated superhuman beings" (p. 96). Another example is the definition of religion provided by Argyle and Beit-Hallahmi (1975): "a system of beliefs in a divine or superhuman power, and practices of worship or other rituals directed towards such a power" (p. 1).

The functional approach, in contrast, emphasizes the purpose that religiousness serves in the life of the individual. Beliefs, emotions, practices, and experiences are examined, but the focus is on how they are used to deal with the fundamental problems of existence such as meaning, death, isolation, suffering, and injustice (Bruce, 1996; Pargament, 1997). As argued by Bonnell (1969, cited in Lovinger, 1984), "the way we choose to handle existential anxiety is our religion, because this is our

'ultimate concern' " (p. 84). In the words of Batson, Schoenrade, and Ventis (1993), religiousness is "whatever we as individuals do to come to grips personally with the questions that confront us because we are aware that we and others like us are alive and that we will die" (p. 8).

A second aspect of traditional psychological research has been its emphasis on personal aspects of religiousness. Some writers, such as Verbit (1970), have included social or communal aspects of religious life in their conceptualizations, but psychological research has traditionally focused on individuals' behavior, cognitions, affects, experiences, and motivations (Pargament, 1997). William James' definition of religion captures this traditional focus: "the feelings, acts, and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine" (1902/1961, p. 42).

A third aspect of traditional approaches is the recognition that faith can have positive and negative forms. Some writers have described religion in largely negative terms (e.g., Freud, 1927/1961; Ellis, 1980), but a number of others have provided balanced contrasts of different types of religious belief and practice (see Hood et al., 1996, for a summary). For example, Allport (1966) contrasted a superior form of faith labeled intrinsic religion with an inferior form labeled extrinsic religion. The intrinsic believer for Allport "lives" his or her religion and views faith as an ultimate value in itself. In contrast, the extrinsic believer "uses" religion in a strictly utilitarian sense to gain safety, social standing, or other nonreligious or antireligious goals. Similarly, Allen and Spilka (1967) contrasted committed religion, described as an abstract, philosophical, open, flexible perspective, with consensual religion, portrayed as a vague, nondifferentiated, personally convenient faith. Further, Fromm (1950) distinguished an impoverished authoritarian religion based on obedience, from a self-actualized humanistic religion that celebrates individuals' strength and self-realization. Finally, Hunt (1972) contrasted religious beliefs in terms of their depth: literal religion takes religious statements at face value; antiliteral religion simply rejects literal religious statements; and mythological religion reinterprets religious statements in terms of their deeper symbolic meanings.

Thus, psychologists of religion have traditionally avoided simple labels of religion as wholly bad or wholly good. Most psychologists in this field of study would agree that the relationship of religion to variables such as well-being depends on the type of religion (Pargament, 1997)

and other variables, such as the salience of the religion to a given person or group (Hood et al., 1996).

Modern Developments

Although psychologists have traditionally painted religion with relatively broad and balanced strokes, the picture appears to be changing (see Table 2 for a summary). Spirituality and religiousness are emerging as "narrow-band" constructs that are polarized from each other. The progression of these changes has included the separation of religious experiences and sentiments from their association with organized religion, the rise in popularity of the construct spirituality, and the increasing polarization of spirituality and religiousness.

The first of these three changes is evident in the writings of Abraham Maslow. As early as 1964, Maslow suggested that traditional religious organizations were no longer the sole proprietors of religious beliefs and experiences. Concepts such as values, ethics, spirituality, and morals should be "taken away from the exclusive jurisdiction of the institutionalized churches" (Maslow, 1964, p. 12). Maslow further argued that practically everything that might be defined as characteristic of the

Table 2
Contrasts Between Traditional and Modern Psychological
Approaches to Religiousness and Spirituality

Traditional	*Modern*
1 Religion as a broad-band construct	Religion as a narrowly defined construct
2 Spirituality not widely differentiated from religion; religion and spirituality not polarized	Spirituality explicitly differentiated from religion; religion and spirituality polarized
3 Emphasis on personal religiousness	External, institutional religion contrasted with personal, relational spirituality
4 Religion includes substantive and functional elements	Substantive religion contrasted with functional spirituality
5 Religion regarded as positive and negative	Religion viewed as negative, spirituality viewed as positive

religious experience could be accepted by the traditionally religious and the nonreligious alike. This includes experiences of:

> the holy; . . . humility; gratitude and oblation; thanksgiving; awe before the mysterium tremendum; the sense of the divine, the ineffable; the sense of littleness before mystery; the quality of exaltedness and sublimity; the awareness of limits and even of powerlessness; the impulse to surrender and to kneel; a sense of the external and of fusion with the whole of the universe; even the experience of heaven and hell. . . . (Maslow, 1964, p. 54)

Maslow also asserted that experiences formerly labeled "religious" need not be connected to the divine. Instead, experiences of holiness, reverence, illumination, and piety also could be used to describe secular "peak experiences." According to Wulff (1996), it was Maslow's hope that separating personal "peak" or "mystical" experiences from the exclusive purview of the religious traditions would foster such experiences by freeing them from the suppressive and restrictive "paraphernalia of organized religion."

During this same period, popular interest and psychological research into spirituality as a distinctive construct rose. References to spirituality in the Religion Index increased substantially from the 1940s and 1950s to the present (Scott, 1997), and spirituality has received increasing attention within psychology in terms of measurement and scale development. Scales measuring aspects such as core spiritual experiences (Kass, Friedman, Leserman, Zuttermeister, & Benson, 1991), spiritual well-being (Moberg, 1979; Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982), spiritual gifts (Hocking, 1975), and spiritual orientation (Elkins, Hedstrom, Hughes, Leaf, & Saunders, 1988) have been created and are currently in various stages of scale validation. Conceptual models of spirituality that lend themselves to scientific investigation have been generated (e.g. Helminiak, 1987, 1996a, 1996b; LaPierre, 1994). And recently, measures involving spirituality have been used in studies of phenomena such as anxiety (Kaczorowski, 1989) and psychosocial interventions with the seriously mentally ill (Lindgren & Coursey, 1995).

Traditionally, psychologists of religion have not distinguished spirituality from religiousness (Turner et al., 1995). Either they included all of the phenomena associated with both constructs under the term religion, or used the terms interchangeably (Spilka & McIntosh, 1996). Currently, however, the wide range of phenomena formerly associated with the

construct religion is being subdivided into religiousness and spirituality. In the process, these two constructs are becoming polarized in many psychological writings and studies (Pargament, in press). Three of these polarizations are particularly salient: organized religion versus personal spirituality; substantive religion versus functional spirituality; and mundane harmful religion versus lofty helpful spirituality.

Organized religion versus personal spirituality.   Scholars are distinguishing the "organized," "social," and "traditional" beliefs and practices of religion from the "personal," "transcendent," and "relatedness" qualities of spirituality. One example from the research literature is Emblen's (1992) content analysis of references and common uses of the two terms in the last 30 years of the nursing literature. From these references Emblen compiled lists of the key words identified with the two constructs. Forty-eight key words were associated with religiousness, and 68 key words were associated with spirituality. Emblen then created separate definitions of religiousness and spirituality by grouping together the most frequently used key words associated with each term. Religiousness was thus defined as "a system of organized beliefs and worship which a person practices," and spirituality was defined as "a personal life principle which animates a transcendent quality of relationship with God" (p. 45).

Peteet (1994) offers similar definitions in his writings on religious and spiritual problems in psychotherapy. He defined religiousness as "[reflecting] commitments to beliefs and practices characteristic of particular traditions" and spirituality as "[viewing] the human condition in a larger and or transcendent context and [being] therefore concerned with the meaning and purpose of life and with unseen realities, such as one's relationship to a supreme being" (p. 237).

This polarization also is becoming evident in the general culture. For example, Walker and Pitts (1998) recently completed a three-part study of moral maturity that involved participants drawn from three age groups. In one part of the study, 120 participants were each asked to rate a number of descriptors in terms of the degree to which they characterized a prototypically moral, religious, or spiritual person. The results of the study indicated that manifesting moral character and believing in a higher power were central descriptors of both religious and spiritual people. However, spirituality was seen as a "personal affirmation of the transcendent" in contrast to religion, which was seen as "the creedal and ritual

expression of spirituality that is associated with institutional church organizations" (p. 409).

Substantive religion versus functional spirituality.   Many functional descriptions formerly attributed to religion are now invoked to characterize spirituality. Spirituality has come to represent whatever people do to attain a variety of goals, such as meaning in life, wholeness, interconnections with others, truth, and one's own inner potential. Examples from recent writings include Goldberg's description of spirituality as a search for universal truth (1990), Mauritzen's depiction of spirituality as "the human dimension that transcends the biological, psychological, and social aspects of living" (1988, p. 118), and Soeken and Carson's (1987) understanding of spirituality as a type of belief that relates the individual to the world and gives meaning and definition to existence. Religiousness, increasingly linked to institutions, formalized belief, and group practices, may be peripheral to these functional tasks (Pargament, in press). Wulff (1996) notes that, whereas spirituality is now commonly described as a dynamic functional process, religion is increasingly depicted as a static substantive entity.

Negative religiousness versus positive spirituality.   Religiousness and spirituality have acquired specific valences in popular and scientific writings. In effect, spirituality is credited with embodying the loftier side of life and the highest in human potential, whereas religiousness is denigrated as mundane faith or as institutional hindrances to these potentials. Tart (1975) illustrates this polarization. The term *religious*, he says, "implies too strongly the enormous social structures that embrace so many more things than direct spiritual experience." Religion is associated with "priests, dogmas, doctrines, churches, institutions, political meddling, and social organizations" (p. 4). In contrast, the term *spiritual* "implies more directly the experience that people have about the meaning of life, God, ways to live, etc." Spirituality for Tart is "that vast realm of human potential dealing with ultimate purposes, with higher entities, with God, with life, with compassion, with purpose" (p. 4).

A similar contrast is provided by Elkins (1995), who views religion as institutional and dogmatic, and connoting cathedrals, stained glass windows, and organ music. In contrast, spirituality "is a way of being that comes about through awareness of a transcendent dimension and that is characterized by certain identifiable values in regard to self, others,

nature, life, and whatever one considers to be the Ultimate" (p. 10). Fahlberg and Fahlberg (1991) also contrast religion as "that which is concerned with the social activities of a church group, cult, or occult" with spirituality as "that which is involved in contacting the divine within the Self or self—Self referring to realms of consciousness well beyond the ego" (p. 274). Martin Marty (1996) captures this polarization very nicely: spirituality is now cool; religion is uncool.

Criticisms

The polarization of religiousness and spirituality can yield only a limited understanding of the two constructs. For example, opposing "institutional" religion to "personal" spirituality ignores the fact that virtually every major religious institution is ardently concerned with spiritual matters (Pargament, in press). In fact, the primary objective of religious organizations is to bring individuals closer to God (Carroll, Dudley, & McKinney, 1986) or to whatever is defined as the transcendent. Certainly some groups may be more effective at this task than others, and some groups may have lost sight of this goal, but the search for the sacred remains the most fundamental of religious missions.

   Conversely, to see spirituality as a solely personal phenomenon is to overlook the cultural context in which this construct has emerged, and the fact that spirituality is not experienced or expressed in a social vacuum. It is no coincidence that the popularity of spirituality has grown in a culture that values individualism and rejects conventional authority (Berger, 1967). Furthermore, in spite of the anti-institutional rhetoric that surrounds this construct, the rise of spirituality has been accompanied by the establishment of numerous spiritual organizations and groups (Hood et al., 1996) such as New Age groups, twelve-step groups, yoga groups, meditation groups, and others. Technology also has spawned new forms of spiritual association, as illustrated by the growing popularity of Internet Web sites devoted to spirituality. Individuals dissatisfied with their churches, temples, and synagogues do not simply leave; they seek out new religious homes. These new homes may be smaller and "off the beaten path," but they still represent places where like-minded people can gather and share their views. And eventually, these homes may grow. According to the church-sect theory of Reinhold Niebuhr (1929), sectarian movements that break from established churches eventually tend to become church-like themselves over time as they grow, become more

successful, and become more accepting of new membership. If this process is applicable to the spirituality movement, eventually we should see many people moving from smaller to larger spiritual homes. For now, in any case, if religion and spirituality continue to be polarized as the institutional and the personal, we run the risk of losing sight of the individual mission of the religious institution, and the social context of spirituality.

The polarization of substantive religion and functional spirituality also constricts the two constructs unnecessarily. Substantive definitions of religiousness tend to reduce it to a static entity. They describe what religion is, not what it does or how it works. What is lost in substantive definitions is the dynamic operation of religion in the life of the individual. The result is a religion frozen in time (Pargament, 1997).

Likewise, restricting spirituality to functional definitions is problematic. A purely functional spirituality leads to problems of boundaries (Bruce, 1996). How does spirituality differ from other responses to existential issues? More generally, what is to distinguish the psychology of religion from other disciplines just as concerned about questions of meaning, self, and value? If the scope of spirituality encompasses virtually all forms of philosophical musings, existential questions, peak experiences, and personal values, then to call something "spiritual" is to communicate very little about it. Without its sacred substantive core, functional spiritualities become unduly broad and bland. Like functional religion, the special transcendent nature of functional spirituality becomes "flattened out . . . absorbed into a night in which all cats are grey" (Berger, 1974, p. 129). The polarization of religion and spirituality into the substantive and functional leaves us with a static, frozen religion and a spirituality without a core.

Finally, the practice of designating spirituality as the "good guy" and religion as the "bad guy" is vulnerable to criticisms that have been leveled against the church-sect literature and the research on intrinsic-extrinsic religion; evaluation is confounded with description (Hood et al., 1996). This is not to say that religious and spiritual paths and goals should not be evaluated. However, by building these valences into the definitions of the two, important aspects of each construct are obscured.

The notion of "good" spirituality may lead scholars and those in the greater population to neglect the potentially destructive side of spiritual life. People can and have pursued the loftiest and noblest of spiritual goals through a number of different paths that include both the effective and

the ineffective, the helpful and the harmful. History reveals numerous examples of individuals who have sought closeness with God through extreme self-punishing asceticism, bloody and murderous crusades, and suicidal bombings. The untimely deaths of the Jonestown and Heaven's Gate followers are recent examples of destructive spirituality. Stripping away the dark side of spirituality may brighten its image, but it leaves a distorted picture of a rich phenomenon.[1]

Conversely, involvement in organized religious life is by no means harmful to everyone. A considerable body of research has documented the supportive effects of involvement in religious institutions, especially for the disenfranchised (see Pargament, 1997). For many people from all walks of life, religious congregations represent convoys of love and caring that accompany them over the lifespan (Maton & Pargament, 1987). Belief in the basic tenets of Christianity and Judaism, that there is a loving God who is vitally concerned about humanity, also has been associated with various measures of health and well-being (Pargament, 1997).

In sum, by defining religion and spirituality as bad and good processes, we obscure the full character of each. It is tempting to reach for such simple characterizations, or even to preserve the polarization by suggesting that it is the "religious" part of spirituality that is responsible for the destructive consequences and that only the "spiritual" part of religion has true value. The cost of this conception, however, is watered down scholarship and poor science. Furthermore, this type of polarization leads us away from more interesting research questions. For example, why do some, in the search for the highest of goals, achieve the greatest of their potentials, while others end up destroying themselves and others? In what ways do some forms of organized religious life facilitate well-being while others prevent it? Only by considering the potential of both religiousness and spirituality for both good and ill can these questions be addressed.

---

1. Alternately, it is important not to err on the other side of the continuum by pathologizing all nontraditional spiritual expressions. Some researchers and members of the media have portrayed members of novel spiritual groups and "cults" as inherently pathological. The empirical research in this area clearly contradicts this depiction. An empirical association between cults and pathology is lacking; cult members have generally not displayed significantly higher levels of maladaptive behavior than the general population. In fact, some evidence indicates that membership in "deviant" religious and spiritual groups is associated with increases in social compassion and self-actualization, and lower levels of illicit drug use, suicide, neurotic distress, and moral confusion (Richardson, 1985; Robbins & Anthony, 1982).

   Finally, it is important to note that this trend toward the polarization of religiousness and spirituality in some psychological writings does not necessarily reflect the perspectives of all scholars or respondents. In a recent empirical study, Zinnbauer et al. (1997) found that when participants were asked to choose among five different statements that describe the relationship between religiousness and spirituality, very few respondents indicated that religiousness and spirituality are the same concept (2.6%). Notably, most of the respondents in this study identified themselves as both spiritual and religious (74%); in contrast, 19% identified themselves as spiritual but not religious, and 4% labeled themselves as religious but not spiritual. Whereas certain subgroups such as mental health professionals, New Agers, and college students were more likely than others to identify themselves as spiritual but not religious, this study indicated that most people view the terms as distinct and view themselves as both religious and spiritual (see also Cook, Borman, Moore, & Kunkel, 1997).

   It is tempting in light of the difficulties in defining these critical constructs to throw up our hands and argue after Allport (1950) that religion and spirituality are subjective phenomena unique to each individual. Comprehensive definitions of these terms would thus be impossible, or perhaps only adequate to their own authors (Yinger, 1967). Idiographic views of religion and spirituality, however, cannot be wholly entertained by researchers; it is difficult to build a coherent body of knowledge in this area of inquiry without some agreement about the meaning of key constructs.

   What is needed is an integrative perspective that can account for the varieties of individuals' religious and spiritual experiences without polarizing the two. Leaders in the psychology of religion have recently written that "the cry for good theory has reached the level of cacophony" (Hood et al., 1996, p. 446). Similarly, other writers (e.g., Spilka & McIntosh, 1996) have lamented the current incoherence of the construct spirituality, and the dire need to operationalize the term and place it within a solid theoretical framework.

An Alternative Approach

The psychology of religion faces two dilemmas in defining religiousness and spirituality. First, there is a tension between remaining pluralistic enough to account for the varieties of religious and spiritual experiences,

and the genuine need for some degree of agreement and convergence among researchers to generate a coherent research program and cumulate research findings across studies. Second, there is a need to distinguish between the constructs without polarizing them. Conceptualizations such as that proposed by Pargament (1997) may offer a response to these dilemmas.

Religion

Hearkening back to traditional approaches that characterize religion as a broad-band construct, Pargament (1997) defines religion as "a search for significance in ways related to the sacred" (p. 32). This definition rests on a proactive, goal-oriented view of human nature: People actively seek what they consider to be significant and of ultimate concern to them. Two dimensions of this search are particularly salient: the pathways taken by individuals in their search for various significant goals, and the destinations or significant goals themselves. For the religious individual, a variety of pathways may be chosen to pursue a given goal. As one path proves unsuccessful, it may be modified or replaced with another. Likewise, as circumstances change and certain goals and values are challenged, individuals may choose to protect and conserve their goals, or they may elect to transform and replace them with newer and more compelling ones (Pargament, 1997).

Not all searches for significance are religious. What distinguishes religious pathways and destinations from other human experiences is their association with the sacred.[2] According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the sacred refers to the holy, those things "set apart" from the ordinary, worthy of veneration and reverence. The sacred includes concepts of God, the divine, and the transcendent. However, the sacred is not limited to higher powers. It also includes objects that become sanctified by virtue of their association with, or representation of, the holy (Pargament, Mahoney, & Swank, in press). There are several classes of sacred objects: time and space (the Sabbath, churches), events and transitions

---

2. The concept of the sacred within the study of religion is not without some controversy and debate (e.g., see Idinopulos & Yonan, 1996). However, even among critics it is recognized that the notion of the sacred is widely accepted in academia and the general culture as the dominant criterion or the defining factor for religion (Guthrie, 1996).

(birth, death), materials (crucifix, wine), cultural products (music, literature), people (saints, cult leaders), practices (prayer, tithing), psychological attributes (self, meaning), social attributes (compassion, patriotism), and roles (marriage, parenting, work). We can also speak of sacred means and sacred ends. When an individual seeks out a sacred destination in life, or takes a pathway that is somehow connected to the sacred, we describe that individual as religious.

   This approach departs from narrow and polarized views of religious experience. For example, both the substantive and the functional are included in the definition. Substantively, religion is associated with the sacred. By connecting religion with the sacred, boundaries are marked around the construct to distinguish it from other related processes (e.g., creativity, poetry, fantasy), and to distinguish the psychology of religion from other related disciplines (e.g., philosophy, social work). However, religion is not a static entity. Functionally, religion represents a search for any number of significant goals in life.

   Religious destinations and pathways associated with the sacred also may encompass both personal and social religious expressions. Religion may involve the search for personal ends, such as peace of mind, meaning in life, control and mastery, self-development, and good physical health. Religion may also involve social ends, such as the desire for closeness and intimacy with others, membership in a religious community, and the goal of peace and justice in the world. To achieve significant goals, the religious devotee may travel very personal trails of individually constructed beliefs and practices that have little to do with traditional religious institutions. Others, however, may prefer to follow more established paths and involve conventional religious institutions, rituals, and systems of belief. And, it is important to note, individuals are not the only ones who define religious pathways and destinations (Benedict, 1934). Families, organizations, communities, and cultures also prescribe the goals people should strive towards and the pathways they should take to reach these goals.

   Finally, this definition of religion is broad enough to include the good and the bad of religious life. Religious paths and goals include the noble as well as the nefarious. For example, some may use religious pathways (e.g., church involvement) to achieve nonreligious and antireligious ends, such as social climbing or self-aggrandizement at the expense of others. Moreover, people can follow constructive as well as destructive religious pathways toward their destinations of significance. The goal of religious

community, for instance, can be sought through efforts to embrace others within the larger community, or through intolerance, bigotry, and persecution of those who differ. In short, as a search for significance in ways related to the sacred, religion bridges the functional and the substantive, the individual and the institutional, the traditional and the novel, and the good and the bad.

Spirituality

Pargament (1997) defines spirituality as a search for the sacred. As such, spirituality is the heart and soul of religion, and religion's most central function. Spirituality has to do with the paths people take in their efforts to find, conserve, and transform the sacred in their lives. Whereas religion encompasses the search for many sacred or nonsacred objects of significance, spirituality focuses specifically and directly on the search for the sacred. As with religion, spirituality can take individual and institutional, traditional and nontraditional, and helpful and harmful forms.

It is worth noting that psychologists have often reduced the search for the sacred to other purportedly more basic motives and drives. Spirituality has been said to be, at its root, a form of anxiety reduction, a source of social cohesion, an evolutionary advantage, and so on. Certainly it can serve these purposes, but the search for the sacred represents a legitimate destination in its own right that cannot be reduced to other ends without losing its essence (Pargament, in press). Of course, we cannot measure whether an individual has indeed found God, but we can study the physical, psychological, and social "footprints" left by those engaged in the search. We also can compare individuals who take different pathways toward different destinations. In this vein, there is evidence to suggest that those who report themselves to be spiritually motivated do manifest different psychological, social, and religious characteristics than those who report other motivations (Emmons, in press; Pargament et al., 1990; Welch & Barrish, 1982). Emmons (in press), for example, found that people who reported more "spiritual strivings" manifested higher levels of purpose in life, marital satisfaction, and general life satisfaction. Furthermore, the correlations between spiritual strivings and well-being exceeded the correlations found in previous studies between other types of strivings and well-being. We are not suggesting that spiritual strivings are inherently "good" or "better" than other strivings, but we are proposing that individuals who take different spiritual, religious, and secular

pathways may differ from one another in a variety of ways detectable through empirical research.

It is important to stress once again that the sacred is not limited to traditional concepts of God, higher powers, or the divine. As Durkheim (1915) noted, "by sacred things one must not understand simply those personal beings which are called Gods or spirits; a rock, a tree, a spring, a pebble, a piece of wood, a house, in a word, anything can be sacred" (p. 52). In fact, much of the power and diversity found among spiritual expressions comes from the human ability to sanctify secular objects. Virtually any object or attribute can be imbued with divine qualities. Moreover, this sanctification process can have important consequences. Employees who view their work as a sacred vocation are likely to approach their role quite differently from those who see their work as a way to pay the bills. Spouses and parents who see their relationships and responsibilities as sacred are also likely to treat their relationships differently from those who see their relationships in secular terms. In a recent study by Mahoney et al. (1997), couples who characterized their marriages as sacred reported higher levels of marital satisfaction, marital dependence, and effective problem solving strategies than couples who viewed their marriages in less of a sacred light. Other objects of significance such as meaning, community, self-improvement, peace, and justice also may be transformed when invested with sacred character.

Conceptualizing spirituality in this way broadens the domain of the sacred beyond traditional concepts of God, but it also maintains some boundaries to this area of study. As much as significant objects such as intimacy with others, authenticity, meaning in life, holism, and self-improvement may be valued in our culture, they do not fall within the spiritual realm unless they are somehow connected with the sacred. Many processes and objects of significance are, in fact, often implicitly tied to the sacred, but the connection must be made explicit before they can be labeled spiritual.

What is the relationship between religion and spirituality? From Pargament's (in press) perspective, religion is a broader and more general construct than spirituality. If the sacred is involved in either a pathway or a destination then that search qualifies as religious. Thus, religion encompasses not only the search for sacred ends (spirituality), but the search for secular ends through sacred means. For example, at the institutional level, religion extends itself to include the search for many ostensibly secular goals, as illustrated by recent sermons within African American

churches to encourage organ donations, church singles groups to promote intimacy and ultimately marriage, and ecumenical efforts to advocate for low-cost housing within the community. At the individual level, religious activities also can serve ends that are not necessarily sacred in nature: prayers for the health of a loved one, reading Proverbs for help in problem solving, or attending a church funeral to comfort the bereaved. Many psychologists have sharply criticized the "use" of religion for secular ends (e.g., Allport & Ross, 1967). However, there is an important distinction to be made between *uses* of religion for legitimate secular purposes and *misuses* of religion for destructive ends such as discrimination, violence, and sexual abuse (Pargament, 1992). Furthermore, as we have stressed here, many seemingly secular ends can be invested with sacred significance through the process of sanctification. Indeed, this is one of the essential functions of organized religion—to encourage people to see the world in a sacred light. And as more and more objects of significance are made sacred, the distinction between religion and spirituality fades. For those who find the whole of life to be sacred, there is little difference between the two processes.

Implications and Conclusions

After years of relative neglect, the psychology of religion and spirituality is now experiencing a renewal of interest and attention. But the increased attention also has been accompanied by serious questions about the meanings of the two constructs most central to this area of inquiry. In this article, we have suggested an alternative to the emerging meanings of religion and spirituality: one that integrates rather than polarizes these constructs, and one that sets boundaries to the discipline, while acknowledging the diverse ways people express their religiousness and spirituality.

The alternative approach presented here has several implications for further research. The study of spirituality, we believe, can inject new energy and insight into the scientific study of religion and the study of individual differences. Perhaps most important, it reminds us that the search for the sacred lies at the heart of religion, and that this motivation deserves greater appreciation and further study in its own right. Initial investigations by Emmons (in press) are very promising in this regard. Spiritual strivings, he finds, represent a class of goals with distinctive implications for personal well-being and physical health. This is an area

ripe for additional inquiry. How, for instance, do people acquire sacred goals? What aspects of life are likely to be sanctified? To what extent and under what conditions do people sanctify potentially destructive objects of significance such as despotic leaders, violence, or "ethnic cleansing"? Furthermore, how do we account for the apparent power of spiritual motivation? Perhaps, as Emmons and Cheung (1997) suggest, spiritual goals provide an overarching framework for living, one that integrates other goals, reduces conflict, and offers the individual a sense of higher purpose and coherence in life. Perhaps spiritual strivings are more stable than other goals; people may be likely to persist in their search for the sacred in the face of external obstacles and threats if their goals are enduring and highly salient. And perhaps, people are especially likely to draw on spiritual resources and methods of coping in the pursuit of sacred ends.

The study of spirituality also offers a bridge to the examination of new pathways to the sacred. Much of the psychology of religion has focused on studies of mainline expressions, such as church attendance, prayer, Bible reading, and religious commitment. The emerging construct of spirituality alerts us to alternate, less traditional pathways to the sacred. They include: meditation, twelve-step programs, new religious movements, healing groups, dance, music, and social action. Oriented to the sacred, these nontraditional pathways may take on added power in peoples' lives.

Thus, the study of spirituality points to new and potentially fruitful directions for research. However, researchers entering this area of study should fully acquaint themselves with the long tradition of study in the psychology of religion and consider how their models and methods advance the field. It is important to determine the degree to which concepts of spirituality overlap with existing religious approaches. To avoid "reinventing the wheel" (Gorsuch, 1984), researchers constructing new measures of spirituality also should examine whether their scales add predictive power over and above established measures of religiousness (e.g., Hall & Edwards, 1996). This process may add clarity to the current empirical status of spirituality, a topic presently murky at best (Spilka & McIntosh, 1996).

Both religion and spirituality have been characterized here as dynamic processes interconnected with all types and levels of experience including the ordinary as well as the extraordinary, the social and situational as well as the personal. The challenge for researchers is to capture religion and spirituality "in motion" within the larger context of personal, social,

and situational forces. Decontextualized studies of people removed from their groups or detached from the ups and downs of their lives will not be adequate to this task. Researchers have to get closer to people, and in essence, accompany them in their search for significance amidst life's changing demands and challenges.

For example, we have worked closely with people facing a variety of life crises, from divorce, major illness, and bereavement to natural disasters such as the Midwest floods and the terrorism of the Oklahoma City bombing. In the process, we have identified a number of specific religious and spiritual methods of coping that help people conserve significance when threatened, or transform significance when necessary (Pargament, 1997; Zinnbauer & Pargament, 1998). For those seeking to conserve a sense of meaning in the face of seemingly incomprehensible events, appraisals of the situation as God's will or as an opportunity for spiritual growth appear to be especially helpful. Feelings of spiritual support and partnership with God in coping also seem to be particularly valuable to people searching for a sense of connectedness and control in life. And for those struggling to find more satisfying sources of significance, spiritual conversion offers a viable solution in the form of radical change. This sort of "functional analysis" holds promise for our understanding of the ways religion and spirituality work in concrete life situations and specific social contexts.

In the process of this research, investigators should remain open to the potential of religion and spirituality for both positive and negative outcomes. Paradoxically, it seems, the same forces that have given us exemplars of love, compassion, wisdom, and justice have been associated with intolerance, bigotry, violence, and self-destruction. How can we make sense out of this puzzle? Comparisons between those who are religious and spiritual with those who are secular will not provide the answer; after all, the vast majority of people in the United States label themselves religious and/or spiritual. More telling will be comparative studies of religious and spiritual subgroups who take diverse religious and spiritual pathways to various sacred and nonsacred destinations. In this vein, some research has begun to identify forms of religiousness and spirituality that are helpful (see above) and forms tied to personal, social, and spiritual distress (see Pargament, 1997, for a review). These latter "red flags" (Pargament et al., 1998) include: attributions of misfortune to a punishing God, conflict with clergy or congregation, spiritual discontent, immoderate religious solutions, and religious passivity in

controllable situations. Advances in this field will depend on the researcher's willingness to grapple with the dual nature of religion and spirituality; they are a source of both problems and solutions.

Finally, to appreciate topics as sensitive, complex, and elusive as religion and spirituality, a variety of concepts and tools are needed. Single-item measures of religiousness and spirituality, so common in this area of study, can provide only the barest insight into these phenomena. Given the multiplicity of religious and spiritual meanings, self-ratings of religiousness and spiritually (e.g. Likert-type ratings) are likely to yield uninformative and ambiguous data.

Similarly, something important is lost when we restrict our tools of investigation exclusively to either case studies, surveys, narrative analyses, observational studies, correlational analyses, or experimentation. Each of these methods has its own strengths and weaknesses. Together, they supplement each other and yield a more complete picture of religious and spiritual experience. Commenting on the need for multiple concepts and methods in this area of study, Bertocci (1972) wrote: "Especially in the area of the psychology of religion [and spirituality], psychologists may be likened to fisherman throwing their lines into an unexplored lake. What fish they catch depends upon the nature of the hook and of the bait used. It seems clear that a wise psychologist will bring with him a variety of hooks and bait, and try to be aware of his own limitations as a fisherman" (p. 38).

These are exciting times for the psychology of religion and spirituality. In the midst of changing religious and spiritual expressions in the United States, psychologists have an opportunity to help shape the ways in which these terms are understood in the next millennium. By avoiding polarized definitions of religiousness and spirituality and carefully attending to the meanings of these central constructs, we have the opportunity to shed some light on the most elusive and yet most human of all phenomena.

REFERENCES

Ahlstrom, S. E. (1970). The radical turn in theology and ethics: Why it occurred in the 1960's. In R. D. Lambert (Series Ed.) and J. M. Gustafson (Vol. Ed.), *The annals of the American academy of political and social science: Vol. 387. The sixties: Radical change in American religion* (pp. 1–13). Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.

Allen, R. O., & Spilka, B. (1967). Committed and consensual religion: A specification of religion-prejudice relationships. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* **6**, 191–206.

Allport, G. W. (1950). *The individual and his religion*. New York: Macmillan Company.

Allport, G. W. (1966). The religious context of prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* **5**, 447–457.

Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* **5**, 432–443.

Argyle, M., & Beit-Hallahmi, B. (1975). *The social psychology of religion*. London: Routledge.

Armstrong, T. D. (1995, August). *Exploring spirituality: The development of the Armstrong measure of spirituality.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.

Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W. L. (1993). *Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bedell, K. B. (Ed.). (1997). *Yearbook of American and Canadian churches*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swindler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Benedict, R. (1934). *Patterns of culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Benner, D. G. (1989). Toward a psychology of spirituality: Implications for personality and psychotherapy. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity,* **5**, 19–30.

Berger, P. (1967). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociological theory of religion*. New York: Doubleday.

Berger, P. (1974). Some second thoughts on substantive versus functional definitions of religion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* **13**, 125–134.

Bertocci, P. A. (1972). Psychological interpretations of religious experience. In M. Strommen (Ed.), *Research on religious development: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 3–41). New York: Hawthorn.

Bibby, R. W. (1987). *Fragmented gods: The poverty and potential of religion in Canada*. Toronto: Irwin.

Bruce, S. (1996). *Religion in the modern world: From cathedrals to cults*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carroll, J., Dudley, C., & McKinney, W. (1986). *Handbook for congregational studies*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Clark, W. H. (1958). How do social scientists define religion? *Journal of Social Psychology,* **47**, 143–147.

Coe, G. A. (1900). *The spiritual life: Studies in the science of religion*. New York: Eaton & Mains.

Cook, S. W., Borman, P. D., Moore, M. A., & Kunkel, M. A. (1997). *College students' perceptions of spiritual people and religious people*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Doyle, D. (1992). Have we looked beyond the physical and psychosocial? *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management,* **7**, 302–311.

Durkheim, E. (1915). *The elementary forms of religious life*. New York: Free Press.

Elkins, D. N. (1995). Psychotherapy and spirituality: Toward a theory of the soul. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology,* **35**, 78–98.

Elkins, D. N., Hedstrom, L. J., Hughes, L. L., Leaf, J. A., & Saunders, C. (1988). Toward a humanistic-phenomenological spirituality: Definition, description, and measurement. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology,* **28**, 5–18.

Ellis, A. (1980). Psychotherapy and atheistic values: A response to A. E. Bergin's "Psychotherapy and Religious Values." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* **48**, 635–639.

Emblen, J. D. (1992). Religion and spirituality defined according to current use in nursing literature. *Journal of Professional Nursing,* **8**, 41–47.

Emmons, R. A. (in press). Assessing spirituality through personal goals: Implications for research on religion and subjective well being. *Social Indicators Research.*

Emmons, R. A., & Cheung, C. (1997, August). *From goal to whole: Spiritual strivings and personality integration.* Paper presented the American Psychological Association annual conference, Chicago, Illinois.

Fahlberg, L. L., & Fahlberg, L. A. (1991). Exploring spirituality and consciousness with an expanded science: Beyond the ego with empiricism, phenomenology, and contemplation. *American Journal of Health Promotion,* **5**, 273–281.

Freud, S. (1961). The future of an illusion. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 11, pp. 5–56). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1927)

Fromm, E. (1950). *Psychoanalysis and religion.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Goldberg, R. S. (1990). The transpersonal element in spirituality and psychiatry. *The Psychiatric Residents Newsletter,* **10**, 9.

Gorsuch, R. (1984). Measurement: The boon and bane of investigating religion. *American Psychologist,* **39**, 228–236.

Guthrie, S. (1996). The sacred: A skeptical view. In T. A. Idinopulos & E. A. Yonan (Eds.), *The sacred and its scholars* (pp. 124–138). Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Hall, T. W., & Edwards, K. J. (1996). The initial development and factor analysis of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory. *Journal of Psychology and Theology,* **24**, 233–246.

Helminiak, D. A. (1987*). Spiritual development: An interdisciplinary study*. Chicago: Loyola University Press.

Helminiak, D. A. (1996a). *The human core of spirituality: Mind as psyche and spirit.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Helminiak, D. A. (1996b). A scientific spirituality: The interface of psychology and theology. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion,* **6**, 1–19.

Hocking, D. L. (1975). *Spiritual gifts.* Long Beach, CA: Sounds of Grace Ministries.

Hood, R. W., Spilka, B., Hunsberger, B., & Gorsuch R. L. (1996). *The psychology of religion: An empirical approach.* New York: Guilford Press.

Hunt, R. A. (1972). Mythological-symbolic religious commitment: The LAM scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* **11**, 42–52.

Idinopulos, T. A., & Yonan, E. A. (Eds.). (1996). *The sacred and its scholars.* Leiden: E.J. Brill.

James, W. (1961). *The varieties of religious experience*. New York: Collier Books. (Original work published 1902)

Jung, C. G. (1938). *Psychology and religion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kaczorowski, J. M. (1989). Spiritual well-being and anxiety in adults diagnosed with cancer. *Hospice Journal,* **5**, 105–116.

Kass, J. D., Friedman, R., Leserman, J., Zuttermeister, P. C., & Benson, H. (1991). Health outcomes and a new index of spiritual experience. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* **30**, 203–211.

Kelly, D. M. (1978). Comment: Why conservative churches are still growing. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* **17**, 165–172.

King, W. L. (1970). Eastern religions: A new interest and influence. In R. D. Lambert (Series Ed.) and J. M. Gustafson (Vol. Ed.), *The annals of the American academy of political and social science: Vol. 387. The sixties: Radical change in American religion* (pp. 66–76). Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.

LaPierre, L. L. (1994). A model for describing spirituality. *Journal of Religion and Health,* **33**, 153–161.

Lindgren, K. N., & Coursey, R. D. (1995). Spirituality and mental illness: A two-part study. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal,* **18**, 93–111.

Lovinger, R. J. (1984). *Working with religious issues in psychotherapy*. New York: Aroson.

Mahoney, A., Pargament, K. I., Jewel, T., Emery, E., Scott, E., Swank, A., Rye, M., & Butter, E. (1997, August). *Sacred vows: The sanctification of marriage and its psychosocial implications*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association annual conference, Chicago, IL.

Marty, M. E. (1996, April 17). *Getting organized. The Christian Century,* **113**, 439.

Marty, M. E. (1998). Revising the map of American religion. In W. C. Roof (Ed.), *Americans and religions in the twenty-first century* (pp. 13–27). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maslow, A. H. (1964). *Religions, values, and peak-experiences*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Maton, K. I., & Pargament, K. I. (1987). The role of religion in prevention and promotion. *Prevention in Human Services,* **5**, 161–205.

Mauritzen, J. (1988). Pastoral care for the dying and bereaved. *Death Studies,* **12**, 111–122.

Mead, L. B. (1994). *Transforming congregations for the future*. Bethesda, MD: The Alban Institute.

Miles, J. (1997, December 7). Religion makes a comeback. (Belief to follow). *The New York Times Magazine*, pp. 56–59.

Moberg, D. O. (1979). The development of social indicators for quality of life research. *Sociological Analysis, 40*, 11–26.

Naisbett, J. (1982). *Megatrends: Ten new directions transforming our lives*. New York: Warner Books.

Niebuhr, H. R. (1929). *The social sources of denominationalism*. New York: Holt, Reinhart, & Winston.

O'Collins, G., & Farrugia, E. G. (1991). *A concise dictionary of theology*. New York: Paulist Press.

Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (1982). Loneliness, spiritual well-being and quality of life. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research, and therapy* (pp. 224–237). New York: Wiley.

Pargament, K. I. (1992). Of means and ends: Religion and the search for significance. *International Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 2*, 201–229.

Pargament, K. I. (1997). *The psychology of religion and coping.* New York: Guilford Press.

Pargament, K. I. (in press). The psychology of religion and spirituality? Yes and No. *International Journal for the Psychology or Religion.*

Pargament, K. I., Ensing, D. S., Falgout, K., Olsen, H., Reilly, B., Van Haitsma, K., & Warren, R. (1990). God help me (I): Religious coping efforts as predictors of outcomes to significant negative life events. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 18*, 793–824.

Pargament, K. I., Mahoney, A., & Swank, A. (in press). Religion and the sanctification of the family. In T. Brubaker (Ed.), *Religion and the family*. Menlo Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Pargament, K. I., Sullivan, M. S., Balzer, W. K., Van Haitsma, K. S., & Raymark, P. H. (1995). The many meanings of religiousness: A policy capturing approach. *Journal of Personality, 63*, 953–983.

Pargament, K. I., Zinnbauer, B. J., Scott, A. B., Butter, E. M., Zerowin, J. L., & Stanik, P. (1998). Red flags and religious coping: Identifying some religious warning signs among people in crisis. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 54*, 77–89.

Peteet, J. R. (1994). Approaching spiritual problems in psychotherapy: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Psychotherapy Practice and Research, 3*, 237–245.

Princeton Religious Research Center. (1993). *Religion in America, 1992–1993*. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Rahner, K., & Vorgrimler, H. (1981). *Dictionary of theology*. New York: Crossroad.

Richardson, J. T. (1985). Psychological and psychiatric studies of new religions. In L. B. Brown (Ed.), *Advances in the psychology of religion: Vol. 2. International Series in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 209–223). New York: Pergamon Press.

Robbins, T., & Anthony, D. (1982). Deprogramming, brainwashing, and the medicalization of deviant religious groups. *Social Problems, 29*, 284–296.

Roof, W. C. (1993). *A generation of seekers: The spiritual journeys of the baby-boomer generation*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.

Roof, W. C., & McKinney, W. (1987). *American mainline religion: Its changing shape and future*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Scott, A. B. (1997). *Categorizing definitions of religion and spirituality in the psychological literature: A content analytic approach*. Unpublished manuscript.

Shafranske, E. P., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1984). Factors associated with the perception of spirituality in psychotherapy. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology, 16*, 231–241.

Shorto, R. (1997, December 7). Belief by the numbers. *The New York Times Magazine*, pp. 60–61.

Soeken, K. L., & Carson, V. J. (1987). Responding to the spiritual needs of the chronically ill. *Nursing Clinics of North America, 22*, 603–611.

Spilka, B., & McIntosh, D. N. (1996, August). *Religion and spirituality: The known and the unknown.* Paper presented at the American Psychological Association annual conference, Toronto, Canada.

Spiro, M. (1966). Religion: Problems of definition and explanation. In M. Banton (Ed.), *Anthropological approaches to the study of religion* (pp. 85–126). London: Tavistock.

Starbuck, E. D. (1899). *The psychology of religion*. New York: Scribner.

Tart, C. (1975). Introduction. In C. T. Tart (Ed.), *Transpersonal psychologies* (pp. 3–7). New York: Harper and Row.

Turner, R. P., Lukoff, D., Barnhouse, R. T., & Lu, F. G. (1995). Religious or spiritual problem: A culturally sensitive diagnostic category in the DSM-IV. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease,* **183**, 435–444.

Vaughan, F. (1991). Spiritual issues in psychotherapy. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology,* **23,** 105–119.

Verbit, M. F. (1970). The components and dimensions of religious behavior: Toward a reconceptualization of religiosity. In P .E. Hammond & B. Johnson (Eds.), *American mosaic* (pp. 24–39). New York: Random House.

Walker, L. J., & Pitts, R. C. (1998). Naturalistic conceptions of moral maturity. *Developmental Psychology,* **34**, 403–419.

Welch, M. R., & Barrish, J. (1982). Bringing religious motivation back in: A multivariate analysis of motivational predictors of student religiosity. *Review of Religious Research,* **23**, 357–369.

Wulff, D. M. (1996). *Psychology of religion: Classic and contemporary*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Yinger, J. M. (1967). Pluralism, religion, and secularism. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* **6**, 17–28.

Zinnbauer, B. J. (1997). *Capturing the meanings of religiousness and spirituality: One way down from a definitional Tower of Babel.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University.

Zinnbauer, B. J., & Pargament, K. I. (1998). Spiritual conversion: A study of religious change among college students. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* **37**, 161–180.

Zinnbauer, B. J., Pargament, K. I., Cole, B., Rye, M. S., Butter, E. M., Belavich, T. G., Hipp, K. M., Scott, A. B., & Kadar, J. L. (1997). Religion and spirituality: Unfuzzying the fuzzy. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* **36**, 549–564.