Amy L. Ai
Paul Wink
Raymond F. Paloutzian
Kevin A. Harris *Editors*

# Assessing Spirituality in a Diverse World

Springer

Assessing Spirituality in a Diverse World

Amy L. Ai • Paul Wink
Raymond F. Paloutzian • Kevin A. Harris
Editors

# Assessing Spirituality in a Diverse World

Springer

*Editors*
Amy L. Ai
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL, USA

Raymond F. Paloutzian
Westmont College
Santa Barbara, CA, USA

Paul Wink
Department of Psychology
Wellesley College
Wellesley, MA, USA

Kevin A. Harris
Algos Behavioral Health Services
San Antonio, TX, USA

ISBN 978-3-030-52139-4 ISBN 978-3-030-52140-0 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52140-0

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021
This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

*My parents, who exemplified spiritual models for me in face of crises.*

Amy L. Ai

*Michele Dillon, who ignited my interest in the study of religion and spirituality.*

Paul Wink

*My colleagues, who reviewed manuscripts for The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion from 1998 to 2016.*

Raymond F. Paloutzian

*My wife Nicole, my daughter Olivia, and my parents Fred and Nancy, who taught me the meaning of spirituality and love.*

Kevin A. Harris

# Foreword

One of my undergraduate professors, now a long time ago, once made the offhanded comment that has stuck with me all these years—"the more we know, the more we know that we don't know." Perhaps nowhere is this comment more true than in the scientific study of religion and spirituality.

One would be hard-pressed to get around the fact that the study of religion and spirituality is going through radical changes, largely reflecting the changing landscape of our objects of study. Religion and spirituality are cultural variables. When cultures go through changes, or when researchers apply their skills in different cultures, we can expect that culturally sensitive variables such as religion and spirituality (Belzen, 2010; Cohen, 2009) will also change. The scientific studies of religion and spirituality, once a field that focused its efforts almost exclusively on the Judeo-Christian tradition (and largely just Christian), have quickly grown into a highly diverse field that acknowledges the complexity and richness of culturally embedded religious and spiritual life. What often undergirded the research in those early years was the implicit assumption that the psychological dynamics found in the Judeo-Christian tradition is generalizable both (1) to other traditions and (2) to those with a spiritual orientation that is less defined by religious boundaries. As researchers have begun to expand their efforts beyond the Judeo-Christian context (or to further study Judaism and Christianity, but in other cultures), we are learning just how complex and varied religious life is. One size does not fit all. Furthermore, we have discovered that diversity is found even where homogeneity might be expected. For example, Dougherty et al. (2009) found a considerable theological variation on beliefs about heaven, conceptions of God, religious identity, and New Age even within a conservative Southern Baptist congregation in Central Texas. The state of the discipline is nicely summarized by Pargament, Mahoney, Exline, Jones, and Shafranske (2013).

> Multiplicity and diversity might be the terms that most accurately describe the current status of the psychology of religion and spirituality. No single paradigm dominates the field… Instead, the psychology of religion and spirituality is marked by exceptional diversity in concepts, theories, methods, and measures. This is, perhaps as it should be; the multiplicity in the field is an accurate reflection of the richness of religious and spiritual life. (pp. 4–5)

It is also the case that psychologists and other social scientists who study religious and spirituality phenomena have, so it seems, developed some critical concerns about issues of measurement—and for good reason. Measurement is foundational to scientific discovery. The obsession with measurement was, at least in part, a product of the times in which contemporary psychology of religion was maturing through its formative years. The early work of William James and the Clark School in the psychology of religion was quickly relegated to a third-class status with the rise of behaviorism and its accompanying underlying positivistic philosophy (see Vande Kemp, 1992). By the mid-twentieth century, those who were influential in the reemergence of the psychological study of religion, aided greatly by Gordon Allport's reputation and the 1950 publication of his seminal work *The Individual and His Religion*, recognized the importance of measurement not only to the progress of the field but in establishing scientific credibility within the discipline of psychology as a whole. By 1984, Gorsuch concluded that a measurement paradigm proved successful by establishing a number of valid standardized measures. This measurement "boon," however, had come at a price—the "bane" of neglected conceptual development (Gorsuch, 1984, p. 228). Fortunately, psychologists of religion have responded to Gorsuch's challenge and conceptual work has greatly progressed in the 35 years since his analysis. In fact, Evonne Edwards and I noted the not-so-surprising fact that some of the best measures in the psychology of religion are those rooted in rich conceptual soil such as attachment processes, psychological coping, mysticism, and the like. As we said, "good theory and good measurement go hand in hand" (Hill & Edwards, 2013, p. 53).

The diversity of the field requires that measurement efforts keep up. The single most common question I have received since the publication of *Measures of Religiosity* (Hill & Hood, 1999) is something along the lines of "Isn't there a measure of spirituality that is free of cultural and religious boundaries?" Such questions are a red flag for me. This is *not* to say that there are no universal characteristics of religion and spirituality. As cognitive scientists of religion are quick to remind us, there are hidden structural elements of our psychological edifice that help us interpret an experience as religious or spiritual, regardless of cultural context (Barrett, 2013). Thus, there are some aspects of religion or spirituality that involve basic underlying issues that transcend religious and cultural traditions and, if such an aspect is the construct of research interest, then utilizing a measure that has been verified across cultures is not only justified but preferred. However, we should not assume that measures, just because of their generalizability, are necessarily the gold standards that are going to best move the field forward. Our object of interest is simply too complex with too many particular constructs of interest to always assume such an approach.

Thus, it is time for a book like this. What you will find here is a spate of articles that cut across many of the issues of multiplicity and diversity facing the field. The very fact that religion and spirituality are multicultural is directly addressed on the pages herein. Sometimes, measures are best developed indigenously, resulting in culturally sensitive measures that are specific to identified religion and spiritual traditions. There is an obvious strength in taking such a cultural approach to

measurement development. Other times, it is worthwhile to take a cross-cultural approach whereby the generalizability of a measure that is specific to a particular religious tradition is tested in other cultures and religious traditions. You will find good examples of both cultural and cross-cultural approaches here and, as explicitly noted in Chap. 22, measures and supporting evidence reported throughout this volume make a strong case for *both* universal and particular characteristics of religion and spirituality.

With the exception of some work by Hood and colleagues on mysticism, nonconventional spirituality is a topic that was given little thought until recently. But, once again, the richness of our object of study requires that research moves beyond the boundaries of conventional religion. You will find such efforts described here.

No single approach to measurement will answer the many challenging questions facing researchers who study religious and spiritual life. Nor will the study of only some types of religion and spirituality allow us to fully grasp the complexity of our object of study. As we progress through the much-unchartered territory, we will discover new dimensions that will help us understand that the more we know, the more we know that we don't know. Along the way, however, we will indeed gain new insights and understanding of religion and spirituality, as we already have. This book will greatly help navigate the course.

Peter C. Hill
Biola University
La Mirada, CA, USA

## References

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

Barrett, J. L. (2013). Exploring religion's basement: The cognitive science of religion. In R. F. Paloutzian & C. L. Park (Eds.), *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* (2nd ed., pp. 234–255). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Belzen (2010). *Towards cultural psychology of religion: Principles, approaches, applications.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Cohen, A. B. (2009). Many forms of culture. *American Psychologist, 64*, 194-204.

Dougherty, K. D., Bader, C. D., Froese, P., Poison, E. C., & Smith, B. G. (2009). Religious diversity in a conservative Baptist congregation. *Review of Religious Research, 50*, 321–334.

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

Hill, P. C., & Edwards, E. (2013). Measurement in the psychology of religiousness and spirituality: Existing measures and new frontiers. In K. I. Pargament, J. J. Exline, & J. W. Jones (Eds.), *APA handbook of psychology, religion, and spirituality: Volume 1: Context, theory, and research* (pp. 51–77). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hill, P. C., & Hood, R. W., Jr. (1999). *Measures of religiosity*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

Pargament, K. I., Mahoney, A., Exline, J. J., Jones, J. W., & Shafranske, E. P. (2013). Envisioning and integrative paradigm for the psychology of religion and spirituality. In K. I. Pargament, J. J. Exline, & J. W. Jones (Eds.), *APA handbook of psychology, religion, and spirituality:*

*Volume 1: Context, theory, and research* (pp. 3–19). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
Vande Kemp, H. (1992). G. Stanley Hall and the Clark school of religious psychology. *American Psychologist, 47*, 290–298.

**Peter C. Hill**, PhD is Professor of Psychology at Rosemead School of Psychology, Biola University, in La Mirada, CA. His research interests focus on religious/spiritual measurement, positive psychological virtues such as humility and forgiveness, religious fundamentalism, and the role of affect in religious or spiritual experience. He is a past president of Division 36 (Society for the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality) of the American Psychological Association (APA) and was elected Fellow of the APA in 1998. He has co-authored or co-edited seven books including *The Psychology of Fundamentalism: An Intratextual Approach (2005), Measures of Religiosity (1999),* the *Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology* (1999), and the 5th edition of the leading psychology of religion textbook *The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Approach* (2018, Guilford Press).

# Contents

**Part III Spiritual Emotions and Personal Experiences**



**Part IV Spiritual Diversity in Under-Investigated Cultures**

**Part V Spirituality-Based Specific Concepts**



**Part VI Conclusion**

# Contributors

**Zuhâl Agilkaya-Sahin** Istanbul Medeniyet University, Istanbul, Turkey

**Amy L. Ai** Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

**Mona M. Amer** The American University in Cairo, New Cairo, Egypt

**Eric P. Boorman** Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

**Kay C. Bruce** Western Seminary, Portland, OR, USA

**Thomas J. Coleman III** Coventry University, Coventry, UK

Society and Cognition Unit, University of Bialystok, Bialystok, Poland

**Pearson Croney-Clark** Office of the Minister of Agriculture, Government of Canada, Ottawa, ON, Canada

**Elizabeth Dowling** Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA

**Julie J. Exline** Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, USA

**Harris L. Friedman** University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

California Institute of Integral Studies, San Francisco, CA, USA

**Terry Lynn Gall** Saint Paul University, Ottawa, ON, Canada

**G. John Geldhof** Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA

**Login S. George** University of Connecticut, Mansfield, CT, USA

**Joshua B. Grubbs** Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, USA

**Kevin A. Harris** Algos Behavioral Health Services, San Antonio, TX, USA

**Ralph Hood** University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Chattanooga, TN, USA

**Dick Houtman** KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

**Jonathan Jong** Coventry University, Coventry, UK

**Andreas Kastenmüller** Universität Siegen, Siegen, Germany

**Barbara Keller** Center for Biographical Studies in Contemporary Religion, Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany

**Pamela E. King** School of Psychology & Marriage and Family Therapy, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, USA

**Constantin Klein** Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich, Germany

**Harold Koenig** Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, USA

King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

**Janne Kontala** Åbo Akedemi University, Turku, Sweden

**Marianne Nilsen Kvande** Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

**Mika Lassander** Åbo Akedemi University, Turku, Finland

**Aryeh Lazar** Ariel University, Ariel, Israel

**Klara Malinakova** Palacky University Olomouc, Olomouc, Czechia

**Luciana Fernandes Marques** Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil

**Ahmad S. Musa** Al al-Bayt University, Mafraq, Jordan

**Siu-man Ng** Department of Social Work and Social Administration, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

**Marzieh Nojomi** Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

**Peter Nynäs** Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland

**Doug Oman** University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

**Eyüp Ensar Öztürk** Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey

**Raymond F. Paloutzian** Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

**Kenneth I. Pargament** Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, USA

**Crystal L. Park** University of Connecticut, Mansfield, CT, USA

**Christopher Peterson** University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

**Thomas G. Plante** Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA, USA

Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

**Indah Permata Putri** Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

**P. Scott Richards** Center for Change of Universal Health Service, Inc., Orem, Utah, USA

**Peter W. Sanders** Utah Valley University, Orem, UT, USA

**Seyma N. Saritoprak** Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, USA

**Nick Stauner** Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, USA

**Heinz Streib** Center for Biographical Studies in Contemporary Religion, Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany

**Terrence N. Tice** University of Michigan, Denver, CO, USA

**Jonathan M. Tirrell** Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA

**Paul Tromp** KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

**Jennifer Medina Vaughn** Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, USA

**Qi Wang** Department of Social Work and Social Administration, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

**Paul Wink** Department of Psychology, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA, USA

**Yeonsoo Yoo** Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, USA

**Suk-Kyung You** Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, South Korea

**Jimmy Yu** Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

# About the Editors

**Amy L. Ai, PhD, MS, MA, MSW** is an interdisciplinary researcher and professor at the Florida State University. She received her PhD and three master's degrees from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Her academic career has focused on cross-disciplinary research on human strengths, spirituality, health and mental health, existential crisis, gerontology, and well-being. Her studies have been funded by grants from federal, state, international, and private agencies. She is a Fellow of the Association of Psychological Science, American Psychological Association (Divisions 56, 38, 36, and 20), Gerontological Society of America, and, American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare, a Hartford Geriatric Faculty Scholar; and a Fulbright Senior Specialist and Distinguished Chair.

**Paul Wink, PhD, MA** is the Nellie Zuckerman Cohen and Anne Cohen Heller Professor in Health Science and a professor in the Psychology Department at Wellesley College. He holds a PhD in personality psychology from the University of California at Berkeley and was a visiting faculty at the University of Michigan. Dr. Wink's research interests are in the area of adult development and aging broadly defined to include psychosocial functioning, and the interface between personality, life course transitions, and sociohistorical context. His extensive research on narcissism focuses on the differences between healthy and pathological (overt and covert) narcissism. He has published extensively in the areas of religiousness and spirituality, adult development, generativity, and narcissism. Wink's research has been supported by grants from the Open Society Institute, the Lilly Foundation, the Fetzer Institute in collaboration with the Institute for Research on Unlimited Love, and the John Templeton Foundation.

**Raymond F. Paloutzian, PhD** Claremont Graduate School, is Professor Emeritus of experimental and social psychology at the Westmont College and consultant to the Religion, Experience, and Mind (REM) Lab Group at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He was Visiting Professor at the Stanford University and the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium. He edited *The International Journal*

*for the Psychology of Religion* (1998–2016). He wrote *Invitation to the Psychology of Religion*, 3rd ed. (Guilford, 2017) and edited *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Psychological Pathways to Conflict Transformation and Peace Building* (with A. Kalayjian; Springer, 2010), *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 2nd ed. (with C. L. Park; Guilford, 2013), and *Processes of Believing: The Acquisition, Maintenance, and Change in Creditions* (with H.-F. Angel, L. Oviedo, A. L. C. Runehov, and R. J. Seitz; Springer, 2017).

**Kevin A. Harris, PhD, LP, HSP** is a Licensed Psychologist at Algos Behavioral Health Services and a former assistant professor of psychology at Our Lady of the Lake University in San Antonio and at the University of Texas of the Permian Basin in Odessa, Texas. He earned his BA in Psychology from the Indiana University Kokomo, his MS in Counselling and Counsellor Education from the Indiana University Bloomington, and his PhD in Counselling Psychology from the Ball State University. He is a Licensed Psychologist (LP) in Texas, a Health Service Psychologist (HSP), and a National Certified Counsellor (NCC). Prior to his Texas jobs, he served as an addictions counsellor in South Florida. He specializes in the psychology of religion and spirituality, the psychology of music, assessment of faith, and campus sexual assault prevention and is a co-editor of the second edition of *Measures of Religiosity*.

# Part I
# The Past and the Trend Calling for New Dimensions

# Introduction


**Amy L. Ai and Paul Wink**

**Abstract** *Assessing Spirituality in a Diverse World* addresses an important issue in social scientific research on spirituality, be it religious or not. In collaboration with a group of international social scientists, especially those affiliated with psychology of religion and spirituality, we provide data on more than two dozen assessment measures with sound or preliminary psychometric information intended to be used by both researchers and practitioners. As social scientists begin to tackle increasingly diversified belief systems around the globe, new challenges lie in assessing religious/spiritual (R/S) concepts across different beliefs and cultures. An immediate gap for social scientists to fill is to create new or to enable existing instruments to validate and assess R/S concepts across diverse beliefs. To address this gap, this book reflects a collaborative scientific effort to advance R/S assessment with solid psychometric information on a variety of measures reflecting today's global trends. We hope that this volume will provide a critical turning point in research and practice in R/S matters toward a new future in which not only mainstream social scientists, including psychologists, but a wider gamut of behavioral and mental health professionals as well, will address spirituality in its diverse manifestations in their scientific investigation and training.

**Keywords** Diversity · Globablization · Instrument development · Religiousness Social scientific research · Spirituality · Validation

## 1 Introduction

*Assessing Spirituality in a Diverse World* addresses an important issue in social scientific research on spirituality, be it religious or not. In collaboration with a group of international social scientists, especially those affiliated with psychology of religion and spirituality, we provide data on more than two dozen assessment measures

A. L. Ai (✉)
Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

P. Wink
Department of Psychology, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA, USA

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

A. L. Ai et al. (eds.), *Assessing Spirituality in a Diverse World*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52140-0_1

with sound or preliminary psychometric information intended to be used by both researchers and practitioners. The goal of this book is to (a) better understand the role of spirituality across different faith, worldviews, and cultures, including both Western and non-Western religions and non-religious belief systems, and (b) enrich the mainstream of social science, including psychology, and health science research. The rationale for the book lies in the need to address the variety of religious experiences. As posited by William James (1901–1902/1982), the founding member of the American Psychological Association (APA), "the divine can mean no single quality but instead entails multiple qualities" (p. 330). This book extends James' dictum to include varied and nuanced conceptualizations and assessment tools of spirituality that are culturally diverse and reflect both religious and/or non-religious worldviews.

## 2 The Objectives of the Book

A decade ago, an expert panel organized by the U.S. National Institutes of Health termed the area of spirituality, health, and wellbeing as a genuine frontier of research (Miller & Thoresen, 2003) and pointed to assessment issues as its major limitation (Hill & Pargament, 2003). Recently, health scientists at Harvard posit that spiritual interconnection could inform future strategies for both public health and individualized, patient-centered care (VanderWeele, Balboni, & Koh, 2017). Yet, their claim was made based on findings from studies without validated measures for perceived spiritual support. The objective of our compendium is to meet the challenges posed to the assessment of spirituality by an increasing diverse and globalized world. These challenges to this enterprise include: (1) addressing diversity in a changing world, (2) advancing diverse conceptualization and operationalization of spirituality as a universal human psychological dimension, and (3) mobilizing the synergy in a cross-cultural endeavor to achieve this inter-disciplinarily shared scientific innovation.

Concerning objective (1), addressing diversity in a changing world, this book meets new challenges posed by the rapid growing trend of globalization and diversification of religiousness and spirituality (R/S). From a sociological view of religion, Houtman and Tromp (Chap. 3, this volume) point to an emerging and ever stronger trend of *post-Christian spirituality* or privatized religious beliefs and practices in departing from churches, as particularly evident in Western European countries. In the post-World War II era, while many Christian church pews have emptied, the majority of Europeans continue to profess a belief in some kind of a transcendent or sacred force, one that is more holistic, meaningful, and personalized. On the other hand, in Central and Eastern Europe including, for example, Poland and Russia, the state sponsors a religion or an unofficial preferred faith (e.g., Catholic or Orthodox) as a backlash against former secular regimes. Meanwhile, we have witnessed an increase in Muslim populations in the Western Europe partly attributable to regional conflicts and wars that have given rise to new migration patterns (Lipka,

2017). Conversely, of course, many non-Western parts of the world are witnessing a rapid growth of Protestant, especially Pentecostal, churches.

The U.S. has experienced a similar emergence of a culturally diversified and increasingly personally complex religious landscape although lagging behind the Western European scene (Ai et al., 2009; Ai, Wink, & Shearer, 2011; Chaps. 3, 4, 8, this volume). This trend is partly attributable to the diversified faiths among the Baby Boomer generations who were influenced by the religious freedom during the turbulent 1960–1970s (Wuthnow, 1998) and to the influx of new and ethnically diverse immigrant groups along with the aging of the traditional White Christian population (Cox & Jones, 2017). Surveys indicate that 40% of contemporary Americans have experienced a change in religious beliefs in their lives, with a growing number either self-identifying as *spiritual but not religious* or as religiously unaffiliated (Dillon & Wink, 2007; Pew Forum, 2009). For the first time in U.S. history, many Americans hold mixed religious or spiritual beliefs (Pew Forum, 2012). Moreover, many believers report beliefs that draw on multiple religious/spiritual (R/S) traditions, and over one-third embrace Eastern/Asian and so-called New Age R/S beliefs (e.g., reincarnation and spiritual energy located in natural or physical objects such as crystals, mountains, or trees).

Today, the religiously unaffiliated (e.g., atheist, agnostic, or "nothing in particular") account for nearly one-quarter (24%) of Americans, and this group has roughly tripled in size since the early 1990s (Cox & Jones, 2017). Nevertheless, the majority of the unaffiliated continue to experience spiritual fulfillment but do so outside of traditional religious settings and beliefs, and they participate in various forms of non-church spirituality (Pew Forum, 2012). As shown in the current surveys in the United Stage, 80% of Americans believe in God, but only 56% confirmed their God as the one described in the Bible (Pew Research Center, 2018a, 2018b). An additional 33%, including 9% of non-believers, hold beliefs in some other higher power or spiritual force. This evolving R/S landscape in the changing world calls for scientific assessment of concepts reflecting different spiritual worldviews in order to understand the meanings and values of diverse beliefs in the lives of today's varied populations. Whereas establishing and validating such instruments has become an urgent challenge, most currently available scales measure mainstream R/S only. This discrepancy constitutes a mismatch between the assessment tools that are needed and those that are available in contemporary R/S social and health science research, as well as psychological practices.

At present, to our knowledge there are no published books on assessment of spirituality beyond the mainstream Western religious perspective. Thus, it is imperative for social scientists, including psychologists, to redress the gap through developing objective measures assessing the ever more complex spiritual landscape, including various religious traditions and increasing secular or non-religious worldviews. *Assessing Spirituality in a Diverse World* attempts to fill this void by addressing the growing demand and need for differentiated and culturally sensitive measures and methods of assessing spirituality.

Regarding Objective (2), advancing diverse conceptualization and operationalization of spirituality as a universal human psychological dimension, the literature

has witnessed an explosion in quality empirical research examining the influences of R/S engagement on human wellbeing and a tremendous growth in the development of measures of R/S constructs, as summarized by Richards, Paloutzian, and Sanders (Chap. 2, this volume). Measures of R/S have often focused solely on mainstream religious views, however, with little attention paid to spiritual perspectives outside the Western world. Yet, as pointed out by Richards et al., R/S matters concern all humans constituting a universal condition of human existence. This poses the challenge of developing measures that are sensitive to similarities and differences in religious and spiritual practices and beliefs across the major religious traditions (e.g., Islam, Daoism, Christianity, Buddhism) along with other beliefs and worldviews (e.g., atheism, varied folk beliefs). A non-religious or non-mainstream spiritual perspective assessed in scientific studies is often relegated to the category of the "Nones"/Nonreligious, a practice that is criticized by Coleman and Jong (Chap. 5, this volume) for obscuring the complexity of these beliefs and practices.

Perhaps most importantly, the current measurement practices appear to be insensitive to capturing fundamental differences between Western and non-Western religious and spiritual beliefs and practices (Ai, Bjorck, Huang, & Appel, 2013). A key area of difference between these two traditions centers on what constitutes something that is deemed *Sacred.* Although the concept *sacred* is shared by Western and non-Western believers, these two broad R/S traditions diverge in both (a) the nature of things considered to be *Sacred* and (b) ways in which an individual connects with it. In regard to its nature, Western R/S (Christianity, Islam, Judaism) tends to define divinity in a personalized view as, for example, God or the Holy Ghost. Many local or ethnic-specific spiritualties, in contrast, practiced by indigenous populations (e.g., Native Americans, certain Central and East Asian tribes) worships animals (e.g., White buffalo, cow, eagle) or other sacred objects (e.g., spirits of holy mountains, rivers, or crystal). Moving yet further away from a personalized view of divinity, numerous Asian religious and spiritual traditions (Buddhism, Confucianism, Daoism, and Hinduism) favor multi-faceted, depersonalized, or abstract ideas of *Sacredness* (e.g., cosmos, universal spirit, energy, nature, or society). These may aim to encapsulate the ultimate meaning of life, but do not include a personalized supreme being that thinks or behaves as a god-like being. Although some Eastern notions of *Sacred* may strike as secular or even atheistic to the Western eye, they are nevertheless imbued in Eastern religious traditions with divine-like qualities and reflect a spiritual essence.

The diverse nature and meaning of spiritual belief systems may help explain cross-cultural differences in ways people connect with that which is Sacred to them. Western individuals may relate to God through an emotional tie (e.g., love or anger) and/or personalized behaviors (e.g., collaborative coping, religious struggle; see Ai, Peterson, Tice, Paloutzian, & Croney-Clark, Chap. 20, this volume; Oman, Plante, Boorman, & Harris, Chap. 21, this volume; Stauner, Exline, Grubbs, & Pargament, Chap. 7, this volume). Both approaches exemplify a personal relationship with God or other supreme force that exists apart from the individual's consciousness. Similarly, ethnic or indigenous worshipers may perceive divine messages or receive divine character strengths from sacred animals (e.g., courage from eagles).

Eastern believers, however, pursue complete *unity* with their *Sacred* entity through practices such as mindfulness aimed at enlightenment in Buddhism and Hinduism (see Ng & Wang, Chap. 15, this volume), health and longevity in Daoism, or building moral consciousness and conduct in Confucianism (see Ai, Wink, Tice, Kastenmuller, & Yu, Chap. 4, this volume). All these diverse ways of connecting with something regarded as Sacred share the same meaning in Eastern spirituality, an integration of the person with a coherent whole. Given the vast cultural differences in spiritual worldviews and practices, it makes sense that many items in traditional Euro-centric R/S measures (e.g., "How much do you love God?", "How often do you attend church?") fail to capture the core experiences of non-Western believers whose faith is not centered on a personal God.

Understanding and assessment of the diverse R/S worldviews is further complicated by internal differences embedded within a single overarching religious tradition or context. For instance, many non-Western cultural traditions share a collectivist orientation despite geographic and ethnic differences in spiritual beliefs (e.g., Hinduism, Buddhism, Daoism, various indigenous practices). More complication arises from a disjunction between religious beliefs and practices that may cut across the various traditions. Despite the fundamental differences between Buddhism and Christianity, Catholicism and Tibetan Buddhism, for example, embrace a hierarchical religious structure led by various faith leaders (Pope and Cardinals vs. Living Buddha and Lamas). In contrast, Protestantism and Zen Buddhism focus more on individualized practices and a decentralized religious organization. Despite these differences, all spiritual belief systems, nevertheless, grapple with the same existential issues such as who we are, why we are here, what our future holds, and what makes our lives and deaths meaningful. In this book, we therefore construe spirituality as broad and overarching concept, a significant human dimension that provides meaning and motivation in life (see Park, George, & Ai, Chap. 6, this volume), irrespective of underlying worldviews or cultures, whether they be religious or not.

Given our construal, we will not offer a uniform definition of spirituality, nor will we attempt to reconcile all the different perspectives regarding its meaning and underlying practices. Rather, we allowed all the chapter contributors to conceptualize and operationalize the concept in their own way. They were encouraged to adopt a problem-solving approach and to evaluate the topic of their inquiry through a theoretical and socio-cultural lens that they deemed most appropriate to the assessment tool they were describing. To this end, we strongly encouraged contributors to incorporate in their chapters cutting-edge theoretical and empirical developments in the field of psychology (e.g., positive and negative emotions, coping, terror management, human development, resilience, personality).

As for Objective (3), mobilizing the synergy in a cross-cultural endeavor to achieve an inter-disciplinarily shared scientific innovation, based on their long-standing research on diverse spiritual concepts, Amy Ai and Paul Wink felt that the time was right to pull together disparate efforts by more and less well published scholars in the field of R/S. With that aim in mind, we organized a symposium at the 2016 APA Convention in Denver, Colorado, conducted by Kevin Harris, where we

invited a group of scholars to present their research on what we deemed to be non-traditional measures of R/S. Following the symposium, we invited its participants to convert their presentations to chapters in this edited volume. We augmented the list of contributors in several ways. We contacted a number of additional contributors within and beyond the APA, whose research interests met our criterion of extending the assessment of R/S beyond the traditional Judeo-Christian perspectives. Some of these researchers were well-established scholars in the field of psychology of religion; they provided chapters discussing well-validated measures that have been translated into many languages and used extensively in cross-cultural research (e.g., Paloutzian et al., Chap. 17, this volume; Plante, Chap. 18, Streib, Klein, Keller, & Hood, Chap. 19, this volume).

Others were invited to contribute chapters describing less well-validated measures that we considered to be important to our aim of capturing the diversity of R/S experiences. These latter contributions included chapters on self-report scales used with Muslim populations and for a Buddhist concept of mindfulness, as well as measurement of spirituality among Latino adolescents (Amer, Chap. 13, Saritoprak & Exline, Chap. 14, Ng & Wang, Chap. 15, King et al., Chap. 16, this volume). We further extended invitations to participate to a group of European researchers who captured the newly evolved spiritual landscape involving a blending of different religious traditions (e.g., New Age spiritualties; see Houtman &Tromp, Chap. 3, this volume) and the proliferation of non-believers (Coleman & Jong; Chap. 5, this volume).

Contributors to each chapter were requested to specify explicitly the connections of their topic to developments in the larger field of psychology or other social sciences on R/S concepts, to provide theoretical foundations for their measures, to highlight the distinctive contributions that their survey could offer, to specify the utility and critique the scales they presented, and to suggest multicultural applications. We asked that each chapter meet three criteria. It had to provide a theory-driven assessment of particular spiritual measures, discuss their psychometric properties, and evaluate their applicability to a diverse world. The broad aim for each contribution is to provide data on assessment tools that can be used in future research. Collectively, we also aim to enhance the substantive understanding of how R/S factors influence live outcomes, including health, well-being, and personality functioning, in order to inform clinical practices and policy-making relevant to existential issues.

Holding a high standard of empirical evidence, this peer-reviewed book offers the promise of integrating the study of diverse spiritualities into the mainstream of social sciences, including psychology, but not through a "one-size-fits-all" approach. As noted by Richards, Paloutzian, & Sanders (Chap. 2, this volume), the majority of existing R/S measures are weak in empirical validation, resulting in their underutilization in mainstream of psychological research. All research reports included in this book are based on sound design, including robust data, samples, and procedures. We attempted to implement Hill and Pargament's (2003) call for innovative measures and methods in the field of R/S studies. To meet this challenge, contributors to our volume were encouraged to provide information on the structure of their scales, employ multiple studies, and include, where available, findings from ethnically and culturally diverse samples. Although all studies drew sizable samples

from students to community dwellers, some included multiple samples with significantly different demographic characteristics and from various geographic locations in the world used to validate the structure of the scale and provide substantive research findings.

## 3 The Organization of the Book

This book has six parts. Part I presents the background, rationale, trends, and emerging solutions in an over century-long endeavor to measure spirituality and religion. In Chap. 2 (this volume), Richards, Paloutzian, and Sanders provide an overall review of these key issues and highlight major assessment challenges, despite the flourishing since the 1960s in the development of measures assessing religious and spiritual beliefs and practices. Whereas social scientists, historians, philosophers, and theologians all agree that religion/spirituality are universal phenomena, the Western cultural milieu and a Christian theological framework underlying most assessment tools means that they do not meet the needs for studying R/S in a diverse world.

Part II includes chapters addressing advanced topics related to spiritual worldviews. In Chap. 3 (this volume), Houtman and Tromp explore the post-Christian spiritual landscape predominant in Western Europe. In doing so, they provide evidence for the reliability and validity of the *Post-Christian Spirituality Scale* (PCSS), assessing, among other concepts, perennialism (the notion that all religions capture the same ultimate truth), bricolage (the disposition to draw on different religious traditions to make personal sense of spirituality), and immanence (the belief that the sacred is an ever-present force throughout the cosmos). In Chap. 4 (this volume), Ai, Wink, Tice, Kastenmüller, and Yu report findings on the *Connection of Soul* (COS) self-report scale that assesses God-centered, cosmic-spiritual, and secular conceptualizations of life after death reflecting three dominant worldviews central to the monotheism predominant in the Western world, Buddhism and Hinduism prevalent in South Asia, and the East-Asian traditions steeped in Confucianism and Daoism, respectively. They provide evidence on how each of these conceptualizations of afterlife relate to personality, well-being engagement in everyday life-tasks and R/S orientations.

Coleman and Jong (Chap. 5, this volume) consider the status of the "nones" or the growing number of individuals who identify as nonreligious. Five existing measures (the *Measure of Atheist Discrimination Experiences* (MADE), the *Microaggressions Against Non-Religious Individuals Scale* (MANRIS), the *Reasons of Atheists and Agnostics for Nonbelief in God's Existence Scale* (RANGES), the *Dimensions of Secularity* (DoS) scale, and the *Humanism Scale* (H-Scale)) are reviewed to demonstrate that just like religiosity, non-religiosity is a multidimensional phenomenon with a plurality of meanings that cannot be fully captured by the categories of "none"/nonreligious that tend to predominate in most R/S questionnaires.

Park, George, and Ai (Chap. 6, this volume) argue that the quest for existential meaning is a central concern of human beings across diverse worldviews and has

constituted a central theme in both Western and Eastern religions as individuals try to make sense of adversity, suffering, and death. Findings from their *Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale* (MEMS) are used to show the advantages of conceptualizing and measuring meaning in term of its three components—comprehension, purpose, and mattering—rather than assessing meaning with an aggregated single factor instrument. Stauner, Exline, Grubbs, and Pargament (Chap. 7, this volume) claim that R/S struggles are a universal phenomenon that affects both religious individuals irrespective of their spiritual beliefs and practices but are also found among persons who identify as not religious. Their findings indicate high stability over time of the *Religious and Spiritual Struggles* (RSS) scale that consists of six sources or domains of spiritual struggles (divine, demon, interpersonal, moral, ultimate meaning, and doubt).

Part III is devoted to measures devoted to the assessment of spiritual emotions and experiences. Ai, Wink and Gall (Chap. 8, this volume) report findings on the *Reverence in Religious and Secular Contexts* (RRSC) Scale, a checklist that (a) distinguishes reverence as a positive sacred emotion from other related positive emotions (e.g., awe, elevation) and (b) assesses feelings of reverence in both religious and secular (e.g., nature, interactions with others) settings. Findings from an extensive medical follow-up study are used to show the role played by reverence in recovery from cardiac surgery. In addition, data from two college samples demonstrate the differential relationship between reverence in religious and secular settings and two basic personality types characterized by either adjustment to conventional societal norms or an emphasis on personal growth.

In Chap. 9 (this volume), Friedman describes his *Self-Expansiveness Level Form* (SELF), a self-report measure that assesses an interconnected sense of secular-naturalistic self that is similar to, yet distinct from, spirituality or mysticism. Employing a transpersonal view of spirituality and psychology, Harris construes the self as malleable, and expansive over space and time. In Chap. 10 (this volume), Ai, Peterson, Koenig, Paloutzian, and Harris argue that coping with adversities through private prayer is a cross-faith and cross-cultural experience akin to William James's (1982) conception of prayer in distress; yet frequency measures of prayer in most population studies may not capture its function in clinical and crisis-based studies. The information from three studies in samples with very different characteristics and traumatic events demonstrate the appropriate psychometric properties of their measure, *Using Private Prayer for Coping* (UPPC), elucidate the function of prayer coping, and the mechanisms associated with its efficacy.

Then, in Chaps. 11 and 12, Lazar evaluates the psychometric properties and research findings associated with two widely used measures of spirituality: the *Spiritual Orientation Inventory* (SOI) and the *Expression of Spirituality Inventory* (ESI). The SOI as a measure of humanistic spirituality is not confined to a religious context. Its subscales, focusing on cognitive, experiential, and affective aspects of functioning, measure spiritual dimensions traditionally associated with religious beliefs such as transcendence and sacredness of life but also includes subscales assessing meaning and purpose in life, altruism, idealism, and awareness of the tragic that are pertinent to the lives of religious and not conventionally religious

individuals, as well as non-believers. Lazar reviews findings from over 20-peer reviewed publications using the SOI. Unlike the SOI, the ESI was developed based on a factor analysis of numerous existing spirituality-related measures. Its five subscales assess cognitive orientation toward spirituality, an experiential/phenomenological dimension, traditional religiousness, experiencing of paranormal beliefs, and sense of well-being. Along with providing a wealth of data on the psychometric properties of the ESI, Lazar discusses issues associated with inclusion of paranormal beliefs and sense of well-being in a measure of spirituality.

Part IV turns our attention to spirituality measures intend to be used with under-investigated religious traditions and populations. In Chap. 13 (this volume), Amer critiques the focus on Christianity among mainstream field of psychology of religion and the resulting misapplications in research on Islam, one of the fastest growing religion around the globe. To address the cultural sensitivity issues and paucity of empirical research among Muslims, she reviews multiple measures designed specifically to assess religious beliefs and practices in this population. In Chap. 14 (this volume), Saritoprak and Exline investigate positive aspects of spiritual struggle—jihad—from an Islamic perspective. Using the *Spiritual Jihad Mindset Measure* (SJMM), they find an association between jihad and spiritual growth, and between jihad and growth resulting from traumatic experiences. In addition, embarking on a jihad had a positive effect among Muslim adults on wellbeing as well as being associated with virtues of patience, gratitude, and forgiveness.

Ng and Wang (Chap. 15, this volume) discuss key differences between Buddhist and Western practices of mindfulness. Whereas Western practices emphasize non-judgmental observation of experiences for cultivating calmness, Buddhist meditation tends to focus on full awareness of suffering. Based on an overview of Buddhist original concepts (e.g., the notions of impermanence and dissolution of the self common to major branches of Buddhism), Ng and Wang developed The *Body-Mind-Senses Awareness Scale* (BMSAS) and the *Greed-Distress Non-Clinging Scale* (GDNCS) measuring two key features of Buddhist mindfulness practices: awareness and non-clinging.

King, Yoo, Vaughn, Tirrell, Geldhof, and Dowling (Chap. 16, this volume) validate two of the three dimensions (sense of transcendence and fidelity but not contribution) of the *Measure of Diverse Adolescent Spirituality* (MDAS) in two Central American samples involving both Catholic and Protestant believers. The Transcendence and Fidelity subscales demonstrate statistical invariance among both Mexican and Salvadoran youths. The findings of their research indicate that the MDAS is a valid measure to be used with Latino populations.

Part V reports on measures of more specific spirituality-based concepts. This part is opened by Ray Paloutzian et al. (Chap. 17, this volume) overviewing his *Spiritual Well-Being Scale* (SWBS) that has been used in approximately 300 studies and was translated into at least 10 languages (Paloutzian, Agilkaya-Sahin, Bruce, Nilsen Kvande, Malinakova, Fernandes Marques, Musa, Nojomi, Öztürk, Putri, & You, Chap. 17, this volume). The SWBS consists of a religious well-being dimension and an existential well-being subscale that consists of items phrased in non-religious language. In their chapter, Paloutzian and his collaborators present the rich data,

accumulated since 1982, on the relationship between the SWBS and its two dimensions and, among others, a variety of mental health outcomes including anxiety, depression, stress, and PTSD. The unavoidable language-bound and culture-bound limitations of using spirituality-related measures in translation are discussed.

In Chap. 18 (this volume), Plante defines faith as engagement with spiritual and religious beliefs and institutions that can be applied to a wide range of diverse religious traditions including theistic and non-theistic worldviews. His well-established *Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire* (SCSRFQ), translated into more than a dozen languages, has proven to be useful in predicting positive outcomes in medical, psychiatric, and educational settings. In Chap. 19 (this volume), Streib, Klein, Keller, and Hood discussed the highly researched and validated *Mysticism Scale* (M-scale). The scale assesses three dimensions of mystical experiences: introversive mysticism involving the perception of timelessness and spacelessness, extroversive mysticism or the experience of inner subjectivity and unity with all things, and interpretation (the experience of positive affect, sacredness and the revelation of a new view of reality). Based on wealth of cross-cultural empirical evidence, Streib et al. argue that mysticism is at the core of spiritual experiences shared among diverse religious and non-religious believers.

Ai, Tice, Peterson, Paloutzian, and Croney-Clark (Chap. 20, this volume) suggest that drawing strengths or support from a spiritual relationship may be a universal human experience across various traditions in human history. The *Perceived Spiritual Support Scale* (PSSS) shows not only adequate psychometric properties but across a number of studies mediates the relationship between faith, prayer, and other sociodemographic characteristics and positive outcomes following adversity, including open heart surgery and such collective traumatic experience as 9/11 and Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. In Chap. 21 (this volume), Oman, Plante, Boorman, and Harris define spiritual modeling as the ability to learn from a significant member of one's immediate community or a prominent spiritual figure. Such modeling has been described in research literature as an important source of self-efficacy. Their *Spiritual Modeling Self-Efficacy—Stand-Alone* (SMSA-SA) scale has two dimensions, community-based models and prominent models, correlated but separable from each other and differentially predictive of various outcomes.

In Chap. 22 (this volume), Nynas, Kontala, and Lassander offer a novel approach to the assessment of R/S in the form of the *Faith Q-sort* (FQS), an ipsative (person centered) measure that enables the uncovering of various patterns of religious and spiritual beliefs across different countries and cultures. Unlike self-report scales with a fixed response format, the Q-set methodology provides respondents with a set of items that they can place, based on their own preferences, into a set of categories ranging from characteristic to uncharacteristic. Nynas and colleagues use this methodology to uncover similarities and differences in various types of faith orientations in 12 countries spanning Western and Eastern Europe, Asia, the Middle East, North and South America, and Africa.

At the end of this volume, in Part VI, Wink, Ai, and Paloutzian discuss the theoretical and methodological lessons learned from the chapters included in the present volume. They highlight the vibrancy of research into diverse spiritualities. As shown

by many of the book's chapters, they argue that culturally specific measures enhance our ability to explain and understand the complexities of spiritual phenomena in humanity and help us appreciate religious traditions other than our own and humanize "the other."

## 4 Final Thoughts

As social scientists begin to tackle increasingly diversified belief systems around the globe, new challenges lie in assessing R/S concepts across different beliefs and cultures. An immediate gap for social scientists to fill is to develop new and further validate existing instruments assessing R/S concepts across diverse beliefs. To address this gap, this book is organized to reflect a collaborative scientific effort to advance R/S assessment with solid psychometric information on a variety of measures reflecting today's global trends.

Understandably, not all measures in this book are in the same stage of development. Although several scales have been well-established for decades, researched in various cultures, and translated into many languages (e.g., the SWBS and the SCSRFQ; see Paloutizian et al., Chap. 17, and Plante, Chap. 18, this volume), some brand-new scales will need more validation and replication in other samples and other cultures. A few new concepts also need more theoretical enrichment and fuller research into their underlying constructs and subconstructs. Despite these imperfections, we hope that this volume will provide a critical turning point in religious and spiritual research and practice toward a new future in which not only mainstream social scientists, including psychologists, but a wider gamut of behavioral and mental health professionals as well, will address spirituality in its diverse manifestations in their scientific investigation and practices.

## References

Ai, A. L., Bjorck, J. P., Huang, B., & Appel, H. (2013). Asian American spirituality and religion: Inherent diversity, uniqueness, and long-lasting psychological influences. In K. Pargament, J. Exline, & J. Jones (Eds.), *The APA handbook of psychology, religion, and spirituality* (Vol. I, pp. 581–598). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ai, A. L., Wink, P., & Shearer, M. (2011). Secular reverence predicts shorter hospital length of stay among middle-aged and older patients following open-heart surgery. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 34*(12), 532–541.

Ai, A. L., Wink, P., Tice, T. N., Bolling, S. F., Wasin, A., & Shearer, M. (2009). Prayer and reverence in naturalistic, aesthetic, and socio-moral contexts predicted fewer complications following coronary artery bypass. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 32*, 570–581.

Cox, D., & Jones, R. P. (2017). *America's changing religious identity*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from https://www.prri.org/research/american-religious-landscape-christian-religiously-unaffiliated

Dillon, M., & Wink, P. (2007). *In the course of a lifetime: Tracing religious belief, practice, and change*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hill, P. C., & Pargament, K. I. (2003). Advances in the conceptualization and measurement of religion and spirituality. *American Psychologist, 58*, 64–74.
James, W. (1982). *The varieties of religious experience: A study in human nature*. New York, NY: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1901–1902).
Lipka, M. (2017). *Europe's Muslim population will continue to grow—But how much depends on migration*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/12/04/europes-muslim-population-will-continue-to-grow-but-how-much-depends-on-migration/
Miller, W. R., & Thoresen, C. E. (2003). Spirituality, religion, and health: An emerging research field. *American Psychologist, 58*, 24–35.
Pew Forum. (2009). *Many Americans mix multiple faiths: Eastern, new age beliefs widespread.* Retrieved from http://pewforum.org/docs/?DocID=490
Pew Forum. (2012). *"Nones" on the rise: One-in-five adults have no religious affiliation.* Retrieved from http://www.pewforum.org/Unaffiliated/nones-on-the-rise.aspx
Pew Research Center. (2018a). *Religion & public life.* Retrieved from http://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/frequency-of-praye
Pew Research Center. (2018b). *When Americans say they believe in God, what do they mean*? Retrieved from http://www.pewforum.org/2018/04/25/when-americans-say-they-believe-in-god-what-do-they-mean/
VanderWeele, T. J., Balboni, T. A., & Koh, H. K. (2017). Health and spirituality. *JAMA, 318*(6), 519–520.
Wuthnow, R. (1998). *After heaven: Spirituality in America since the 1950s*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

**Amy L. Ai,** PhD, MS, MA, MSW, is an interdisciplinary researcher and professor at Florida State University. She received her PhD and three master's degrees from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Her academic career has focused on cross-disciplinary research on human strengths, spirituality, health and mental health, existential crisis, gerontology, and well-being. Her studies have been funded by grants from federal, state, international, and private agencies. She is a Fellow of the Association of Psychological Science, American Psychological Association (Divisions 56, 38, 36, and 20), and Gerontological Society of America, a Hartford Geriatric Faculty Scholar, and a Fulbright Senior Specialist and Distinguished Chair.

**Paul Wink,** PhD, MA, is the Nellie Zuckerman Cohen & Anne Cohen Heller Professor in Health Science and a professor in the Psychology Department at Wellesley College. He holds a PhD in personality psychology from the University of California at Berkeley and was a visiting faculty at the University of Michigan. Dr. Wink's research interests are in the area of adult development and aging broadly defined to include psychosocial functioning, and the interface between personality, life course transitions, and socio-historical context. His extensive research on narcissism focuses on the differences between healthy and pathological (overt and covert) narcissism. He has published extensively in the areas of religiousness and spirituality, adult development, generativity, and narcissism. Wink's research has been supported by grants from the Open Society Institute, the Lilly Foundation, the Fetzer Institute in collaboration with the Institute for Research on Unlimited Love, and the John Templeton Foundation.