Measuring Multiple Dimensions of Religion and Spirituality for Health Research:

Conceptual Background and Findings from the 1998 General Social Survey

Ellen L. Idler, Ph.D.
Rutgers University

Marcia Ory, Ph.D.
National Institute on Aging

Marc Musick, Ph.D.
University of Michigan

Kenneth I. Pargament, Ph.D.
Bowling Green State University

Christopher G. Ellison, Ph.D.
University of Texas

Lynda H. Powell, Ph.D.
Rush Presbyterian-St. Luke's Medical Center

Linda K. George, Ph.D.
Duke University

Lynn Underwood, Ph.D.
Fetzer Institute

Neal Krause, Ph.D.
University of Michigan

David Williams, Ph.D.
University of Michigan

GSS Topical Report No 33

July, 2001

Corresponding author: Ellen L. Idler, Ph.D., Institute for Health, Health Care Policy, and Aging Research, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 30 College Avenue, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1293. email: idler@rci.rutgers.edu Voice:732-932-7516 Fax:732-932-6872

Short title: Measuring Religiousness for Health Research

Acknowledgements

Grateful acknowledgment is made to the Fetzer Institute, Kalamazoo, Michigan, for their financial, intellectual, and technical support of the Working Group, and to the Fetzer Institute and the National Institute on Aging for their support of the conference on Methodological Approaches to the Study of Religion, Aging, and Health, Washington DC, March 16-17, 1995. A version of this paper was presented at the meetings of the Gerontological Society of America, San Francisco, CA, November 1999.

Abstract

The emerging interest in the role of religion and spirituality in health and medicine has been hampered by an absence of measurement tools for assessing the complex, multidimensional nature of individual religiousness and spirituality. The authors, members of a working group on health and religion, conceptualized domains of the construct, identified the potential relevance of each domain to health, then located or developed, and pilot-tested items for the domain. Thirty-three items were fielded in the 1998 General Social Survey (GSS) (N=1445), a representative sample of the U.S. population. Factor analysis within and across domains produced 9 indices with good reliability and 3 individual items. The items and indices show low to moderate correlations with each other and with additional standard measures of religiousness in the GSS, demonstrating content, convergent, and discriminant validity. The resulting instrument is: multidimensional, brief enough to be included in clinical or epidemiological survey interviews, inclusive of both traditional religiousness and non-institutionally-based spirituality, appropriate for diverse Judeo-Christian populations, and potentially useful in many types of health research.

Keywords: religiousness, spirituality, measurement, health, medicine

Religiousness and spirituality have entered the agenda of research on psychosocial factors in health. In just the last few years, a number of major longitudinal studies have reported both long and short-term beneficial effects of individual religiousness on physical health status. For example, in an 8-year study of National Health Interview Survey data, Hummer et al. (1999) show that regular attendance at religious services is associated with an additional 8 years of life expectancy when compared with never attending, despite adjustment for initial health status and a large set of social and behavioral risk factors. These effects were consistent across all age, gender and race/ethnicity groups, and for all major causes of death. A second mortality study, in Israel, found half as many deaths from all causes among residents of religious kibbutzim, compared with secular kibbutzim, when 16-year death records from 11 matched pairs of kibbutzim were compared (Kark et al., 1996). A third study, in a clinical setting, found that older patients having elective heart surgery were three times more likely to survive if they reported they gained a sense of strength and comfort from their religious beliefs than if they did not (Oxman, Freeman, and Manheimer, 1995). In another study of elderly people, frequent attendance at religious services was a strong predictor of better physical functioning after 1 to 6 years follow-up, and even up to 12 years later for some groups (Idler and Kasl, 1997). This small sample of findings does not constitute a review of the literature, although it does represent a variety of populations, outcomes, study designs, analytic techniques, follow-up periods, and geographic regions; more extensive reviews can be found in McCullough et al. (in press, 2000) and in Koenig et al. (in press, 2000). These four studies also illustrate both the strengths and weaknesses of research in this field.

A recent critique of studies of religion, spirituality, and medicine characterizes the evidence of an association between religion and health as "weak and inconsistent" (Sloan et al., 1998). While this review of the literature raises significant issues that researchers in this area must certainly address, we as a group would dispute the claim that the existing evidence is either weak or inconsistent. The critique mischaracterizes several studies' findings as weak by misconstruing as "confounders" factors that are actually explanatory (Koenig et al., 1999), e.g. the finding that lower smoking rates among frequent attenders partially account for their lower mortality rates. Further, other findings reviewed are

inconsistent only in the narrow sense that different dimensions of religiousness show protective effects in different populations. The four studies mentioned above provide good examples of how limitations in the measurement of the independent variable lead to apparent inconsistencies in the findings. Hummer et al. (1999) had only a single indicator of attendance at religious services available for their analysis. Kark et al. (1996) did not even use individual level data, and characterized all individuals in the kibbutz by the settlement's religious or secular orientation. Oxman et al.(1995) and Idler and Kasl (1997) had relatively more elaborate measures available of both attendance and religious feelings, but even these are at best rudimentary measures of a complex construct that includes a variety of behavioral aspects, such as attendance at public worship services, solitary prayer, meditation, or reading sacred texts, as well as attitudinal aspects such as beliefs, values, and feelings.

Among the few that do include more than one domain of the construct, there are some superficially inconsistent findings; Idler and Kasl (1997), for example, found significant protective effects of attendance, but no effects of religious feelings, on later functional ability in a healthy elderly population, while Koenig et al. (1998) found significant effects of religious feelings but not attendance on remission from major depressive disorder among hospital inpatients. But different studies may highlight different dimensions of this complex construct without implying inconsistency: seriously ill patients with mobility limitations may utilize or benefit from different forms of religious involvement than healthy, community-dwelling adults, for example. It is clear that a wider set of dimensions of religiousness and spirituality must be systematically examined before much can be concluded concerning the role of religion in health in the wide range of situations in which it is relevant.

Apart from the growing evidence that religiousness and spirituality are linked to health, there is consistent evidence that, to a large proportion of Americans at least, religion is important for its own sake. Fifty-nine percent of the U.S. population consider religion to be "very important" to them (Princeton Religion Research Center, 1994); 54 percent pray once or more often every day (Woodward, 1997). Moreover, many Americans believe that there is a connection of religion to health; 79 percent

believe that God answers prayers for healing from incurable diseases (Woodward, 1997); 25 percent pray regularly for healing for their own illnesses (Eisenberg et al., 1993); and 64 percent think doctors should pray with a patient if the patient requests it (Kaplan, 1996). As the appearance of these surveys in the news media attests, there seems to be a growing interest in these topics in the popular culture in the U.S. as well as in the research literature.

Objectives of the NIA / Fetzer Working Group

In 1997 a working group was formed by the Fetzer Institute and the National Institute on Aging to develop a self-report survey instrument to measure religiousness and spirituality that would be brief, multidimensional, suitable for use in religiously heterogeneous populations among adults of all ages, inclusive of both traditional religiousness and non-institutionally-based spirituality, and likely to be linked to health outcomes. Since the instrument would be used in health research, its dimensions were limited to those thought likely to be related to health, even though some dimensions, such as support from religious congregations, or forgiveness, had rarely or never been examined. The distinction between religiousness and spirituality was important. While many respondents regard the two as indistinguishable, others may have had experiences that they would identify as spiritual or transcendental, to which they do not ascribe traditional religious meaning. Moreover, the instrument was to be as inclusive as possible in its language about religious practices to get appropriate responses from members of at least the major religious groups in American society.

The instrument was to be brief. There is always limited time available for the measurement of psychosocial factors in health surveys, and brevity is even more of a concern for clinical studies where participants are already ill. At the same time, these requirements had to be balanced against 1) the need for a psychometrically sound instrument, where multiple items for each domain were desirable to enhance reliability, 2) the need to include items with negative phrasing to tap any potentially negative aspects of religiousness, and to reduce social desirability bias, and 3) the commitment of the group to developing measures for a broad and inclusive list of domains with theoretical relevance to health.

Potential Pathways

There are many dimensions to religiousness and spirituality, and they may be connected to health outcomes in different ways. The view of the working group was that religious or spiritual variables could not be simply combined into a single scale and the effects of "religiosity" examined; rather, the various dimensions of religiousness and spirituality must be examined separately for their potential effects on health. Moreover, while many of the best-known studies have focused on all-cause mortality as an outcome, the conceivable array of mental and physical health outcomes, and the importance of different outcomes at different stages of the life course made a broad approach to domain identification the most desirable. Behavioral, social, psychological, and directly physiological causal pathways from religiousness/spirituality to health were considered, as was the potential for a negative effect of religion on health. The goal for developing the instrument was to provide researchers with the potential to link multiple dimensions of religiousness and spirituality to as many of these potential mechanisms as possible.

Reduction of behavioral risks. Religious teachings may promote a "healthier" lifestyle with respect to known risk factors, such as alcohol abuse or promiscuous sexuality. The negative association between substance use and religiousness is relatively well-established (Gorsuch, 1995; Kendler, Gardner, and Prescott, 1997); it is particularly significant among adolescents and college students, for whom it represents a lowering of lifetime risk (Wallace and Forman, 1998; Benson and Donahue, 1989). There is also evidence that smoking rates are lower among members of religious groups (Idler and Kasl, 1997; Koenig et al., 1998). Certain religious groups, such as Seventh-Day Adventists, promote healthy dietary practices as a major part of their religious doctrine (Phillips et al. 1980). While not all religions have specific teachings regarding these health risk behaviors, theologians (Vaux, 1976) have argued that "purity of life" is a "generic religious value" and that most religions have beliefs about maintaining the purity of the mind, body, and soul. In a 28-year follow-up study by Strawbridge et al. (1997), Alameda County, California, respondents who attended services more often at the start of the study had lower

mortality rates, partly because they were also less likely to be smokers; moreover, attenders who *did* smoke were more likely to *quit* smoking during the period of follow-up, and this also accounted for part of the difference in the rates.

Expansion of social support. Religious groups may also represent supportive, integrative communities for many of their members. Religious group membership is one of the major types of social ties available to people, along with family, friends, and other community groups; such ties, including religious group membership, have been shown in a number of important epidemiological studies to reduce mortality in a linear fashion as the number of such ties increases (Berkman and Syme, 1979; House, Landis and Umberson, 1988). The support offered by these social ties is conceptualized as either emotional, in the sense of sharing sympathy or encouragement, and/or instrumental, meaning tangible offers to assist with tasks, materials, or money. Religious congregations provide both strong and weak social network ties, and are potential sources of all types of support for those in stressful situations. In several regional and national studies, frequent attenders at religious services have also reported larger social networks, more contact and more social support than infrequent attenders or nonattenders (Idler and Kasl, 1997; Ellison and George, 1994; Bradley, 1995).

Enhancement of coping skills. Religious feelings and thoughts may also promote better well-being. Religious groups offer members a complex set of beliefs about God, ethics, human relationships, life and death, many of which are directly relevant to health. Religious belief systems have been called "symbolic universes" (Berger, 1967) which can give the events of life and death a spiritual significance. Individuals can draw on the stories and beliefs of their faith tradition to put their own lives into a much larger context, to learn lessons from others who have faced similar troubles, to allay fear, or to gain hope for the future. Studies have shown that religious beliefs and practices also appear to be associated with higher self-esteem and feelings of self-worth among older adults (Krause, 1995); individuals who describe themselves as having a strong religious faith report themselves to be happier and more satisfied with their lives (Ellison, 1991).

Religious involvement appears to have particular protective effects for the well-being of individuals in crisis situations. Religious coping, when compared with other ways of dealing with problems, apparently is especially helpful in situations of bereavement or serious illness, over which little direct control is possible (Mattlin, Wethington, and Kessler, 1990). Studies of heart surgery patients (Ai et al., 1998), hospitalized elderly (Koenig, George, and Peterson, 1998), older women with hip fractures (Pressman et al., 1990), men with severe disabilities (Idler and Kasl, 1992), recent widowers (Siegel and Kuykendall, 1990), kidney transplant patients (Tix and Frazier, 1998) and parents who had lost a child (McIntosh, Silver, and Wortman, 1993) have found significantly lower levels of depression among those in the sample who had religious resources to aid in their coping. Religious belief systems offer resources for understanding tragic or stressful events; religious or spiritual interpretations of difficult circumstances may have the power to bring individuals to a state of peace or acceptance of a situation which cannot be altered, and give them the ability to live with it. Religious rituals associated with healing or mourning can assist in the process of adjustment to difficult life transitions when people must give up old sources of significance and find new ones (Pargament, 1997).

Physiological mechanisms. Religiousness and spirituality may also provide a cushion against both major and minor stressors through direct physiological pathways. Through such neuroendocrine messengers as the catecholamines, serotonin, and cortisol, negative emotions arising from stressful situations have been associated with key pathogenic mechanisms including myocardial ischemia (Jiang, Babyak, and Krantz, 1996), arrhythmias (Kamarck and Jennings, 1991), increased platelet aggregation (Levine, Towell, and Suarez, 1985), suppressed immune response (Stone and Bovbjerg, 1994), and elevations in risk factors (Brindley and Rolland, 1989). Certain religious and spiritual practices may elicit the "relaxation response", an integrated physiological reaction in opposition to the "stress response" (Benson, 1975). Repeated elicitation of the relaxation response results in a reduction in muscle tension; a reduction in activity of the sympathetic branch of the autonomic nervous system; a reduction in the activity of the anterior-pituitary/adreno-cortical axis; a lowering of blood pressure, heart rate, and

oxygenation; and changes in brain wave activity and wave function (Delmonte, 1985). To elicit this response, individuals focus on a repetitive word, sound, image, or repetitive action such as breathing. When given a choice, most individuals choose a prayer or verse from the Bible (Ai et al, 1998; Benson, 1996). Religious rituals, undertaken in public or in private, may provide individuals with physical, emotional, and cognitive cues for integrating the experience of the mind, body, and spirit, and achieving transcendent states.

These potential pathways directed the attention of the working group to aspects of religion which suggested biobehavioral or psychosocial processes that were already known in health research. Some of these pathways have direct cushioning effects that prevent stress and its sequelae from occurring; in primary preventive health practices, or early resolution of conflict in important relationships, people with available religious or spiritual resources may sidestep certain health risks or minimize the effects of others. On the other hand, religion and spirituality may also operate through a powerful pathway of enhancing coping and feelings of self-worth precisely in situations where predictability and control over outcomes, concepts central to most models of stress reduction in health psychology, are limited.

PHASE I

With these potential causal pathways in mind, then, the members of the working group identified ten domains of religiousness and spirituality for inclusion in the new measure. In Phase I, literature reviews were carried out, existing multimensional instruments in the social scientific study of religion were examined for potential items, and reports were prepared delineating the relevance of the domain to health research. For some domains, extensive testing and item development had already been carried out, in some cases by research teams headed by working group members. In other cases tested measures did not exist, and original items were written by group members. A justification and long set of items for each domain was compiled and is available from the authors (Fetzer Institute, 1999). Pilot testing of

items for the domains was performed in several ongoing projects of working group members, including, among others, 65 coronary artery bypass surgery patients, 296 Oklahoma City residents, and a nationwide sample of Presbyterian Church members. From the preliminary data, a set of 33 items were chosen to represent the domains. Table 1 shows each domain, its potentially testable relevance to health, and the wording of the item as developed for Phase II.

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION The question on current religious preference or affiliation taps nominal identification with a religious community, without requiring current membership. This item can be supplemented by a probe for a specific denomination of Protestantism and/or branch of Judaism. The approach of the General Social Survey (GSS) (Davis and Smith, 1998) is to be comprehensive and detailed in its coverage of American religious groups, allowing researchers the flexibility of grouping affiliation categories for their own purposes. Classification schemes for the GSS variables can be found in Roof and McKinney (1990) and Smith (1990).

The argument for a potential association with health derives from the known doctrinal differences between groups, especially with respect to dietary practices, tobacco, and alcohol use. Epidemiologists have long studied the Amish, Mormons, religious orders, and homogeneous, endogamous religious groups, and found lower rates of cancer, hypertension, and overall mortality than in the general population (Jarvis and Northcott, 1987). Studies of cancer among Mormons have found particularly low rates of smoking- and alcohol-related cancers, which decline within the group as adherence to church doctrine increases (Gardner and Lyon, 1982). More speculatively, some have suggested that a range of denomination-specific beliefs or ritual practices such as beliefs about sin and divine grace (Watson, Morris, and Hood, 1988) or cathartic worship styles (Gritzmacher, Bolton, Dana, 1988) might influence mental or physical health. On the other hand, community studies of mainstream Protestants, Catholics, and Jews have shown no differences in the protective effects of similar levels of attendance at services (Idler and Kasl, 1992; Siegel and Kuykendall, 1990). Denominational differences in health are especially likely to be confounded with region and the effects of socioeconomic status and

should remain an important topic for study, and for the adequate description of the population being studied.

PERSONAL RELIGIOUS/SPIRITUAL HISTORY This measure distinguishes individuals who have had steady lifelong religious commitment from those whose experience may have been marked by conversion or an experience of deepening religious/spiritual commitment. It may be particularly important in regions of the U.S. where evangelical denominations predominate. The experience of salvation, or "being saved" may be a sensitive indicator of perceptions of group membership (or nonmembership) commonly held in these cultures. The item is adopted from Koenig et al. (Koenig et al., 1994).

Evidence for the relationship of this domain to health comes primarily from population-based and clinical studies conducted in North Carolina showing that respondents reporting life-changing religious or spiritual experiences have fewer depressive disorders and symptoms (Koenig et al., 1994) fewer anxiety disorders and symptoms (Koenig et al., 1993) and less alcohol abuse and dependence (Koenig et al., 1994). Life-changing experiences in the religious or spiritual arena may be accompanied by behavior changes in substance use, for example, which could have direct physical or mental health consequences.

PUBLIC RELIGIOUS PRACTICES The involvement of the respondent with a formal public religious institution: a church, synagogue, temple, mosque, ashram, etc. is a behavioral, rather than an attitudinal measure. It indicates exposure to the spiritual, emotional, and social resources of the religious group. Surveys which measure any domain of religiousness apart from affiliation most commonly measure the frequency of attendance at religious services. We include one item for attendance at services, and another to assess the frequency of participation in non-worship activities such as education programs, volunteer efforts, or musical activities. One or both of these items have been used for decades in national surveys, including the GSS (Davis and Smith, 1998).

Cross-sectional and longitudinal studies (Koenig et al., in press, 2000) consistently find

significant associations between religious attendance and physical health status indicators including specific conditions such as hypertension, general measures of functional disability, and overall mortality. Frequency of attendance at services may indicate the frequency with which heightened states of religious consciousness, or the experience of the sacred, is achieved through prayer, music, architecture, or rituals (Bygren, Konlaan, and Johansson, 1996; Williams, 1994). Regularity of attendance may indicate behavioral conformity to religious beliefs regarding alcohol use, smoking, dietary practices, or sexual intercourse (Gorsuch, 1995; Wallace and Forman, 1998). Frequent contact with the social network of the congregation may make spiritual, emotional, or instrumental social support more readily available (Ellison and George, 1994). The constant reinforcing of the belief structure may provide improved perception of control, understanding, and comfort in times of crisis (Pargament, 1997). In short, attendance may be a marker for a complex set of processes. Its predictive strength may vary directly with the frequency of attendance.

PRIVATE RELIGIOUS PRACTICES These behavioral items assess private religious practices, a conceptual domain that is alternatively referred to by the terms nonorganizational, informal, or noninstitutional religiousness. The domain of private religious practices is distinct in that the behaviors take place in the home, or generally in daily life, alone or with family. The frequency of these practices may indicate piety or devoutness, or the penetration of religious rituals or messages into everyday life. We adapted the items from Taylor and Chatters (1991), Stark and Glock (1968), and the GSS (Davis and Smith, 1998).

A review of gerontological research on religion through the late 1980s concluded that, particularly for elderly people, there was an important distinction to be made between public worship practices ("organizational" religiousness) and private activities ("nonorganizational" religiousness) (Levin, 1989); a number of studies of elderly populations have found that declining attendance at services *was* accompanied (or precipitated) by declining health, but these declines were *not* matched by declines in private religious practices. Cross-sectional studies, then, may report inverse associations

between health and private religious practice, reflecting a causal direction in which changes in health status preceded actual increases in these practices (Idler, 1995).

The study of private religious practice and its potential effect on health is thus a complex one, requiring longitudinal study designs. At the same time, there is a great deal of public and scholarly interest in the subject of prayer and meditation (Woodward, 1997; Levin, 1997), and some evidence for the efficacy of prayerlike repetition of sacred phrases in producing the "relaxation response" (Benson, 1996). Thus these items are of particular importance for health research, not only because of the apparent tendency of people in poor health to engage in them more frequently, but also because of their potential to produce psychophysical states which may have subsequent effects on health.

SOCIAL SUPPORT There is a rich literature on the relationship between social support and health, and a substantial body of work on the measurement of various aspects of social support. Even casual observation would suggest that religious congregations provide support for their members; thus this dimension appeared to be an obvious one for inclusion, although there were no existing measures of the dimension. The items are modified versions of items developed by Liang (Krause, 1995; Krause, in press; Rook, 1984) which specify that the source of the support be the religious group. The types of support offered remained the same. We focused on two of the several aspects of social support because of their demonstrated relationship to health: anticipated support (Krause, in press) and negative interaction (Rook, 1984). Anticipated support is defined as the belief that others are willing to provide help should the need arise; membership in a formal religious organization carries with it the implicit promise that members of the religious community will provide help in the future if it is needed. The items concerning negative interactions were important to include because congregational settings can be sites of conflict as well as comfort and support.

Religious support is likely to related to health and well-being in the same way that social support is, including improved compliance with medical treatments, greater use of preventive options, through encouragement, referrals, and modeling. In the absence of distinct stressors, support from a religious

group may increase self-esteem, bolster feelings of control, and provide the benefits of embeddedness in an integrated social network with strong as well as weak ties. Further, assistance from a congregation may help to offset the adverse effects of serious stressful life events such as the death of a loved one or financial loss. In a word, religious social support may act to prevent stress from occurring, and to provide resources that enhance coping when it does.

RELIGIOUS COPING Studies of religious coping focus on people in adverse situations seeking comfort and understanding in religion (Pargament, 1997; Ellison, 1994). A number have shown that religion is especially effective in coping with situations of loss or illness (e.g. Mattlin, Wethington, and Kessler, 1990), when the situation is not amenable to change. Major life events can threaten or harm many objects of significance -- the sense of meaning, intimacy with others, personal control, physical health, one's sense of security. Religion offers a variety of coping methods for conserving these objects of significance, or if that is no longer possible, transforming them. The items we propose assess: (1) positive religious coping reflective of benevolent religious methods of understanding and dealing with life stressors; and (2) negative religious coping reflective of religious struggle, and are taken from Pargament et al. (Pargament et al., 1998; Pargament, Koenig, and Perez, in press).

Measures of religious coping have been associated with indicators of physical health, mental health, and spiritual outcomes (Ellison, 1994); methods of religious coping may serve as antidotes to anxiety, as checks on human impulses, as sources of meaning in the world, as stimuli for personal growth and development, or as bases of social cohesiveness. Recent studies show that religious coping methods are distinct from global religious orientations in influencing the outcomes of stressful events (Pargament, 1997). The motivation to find and experience the sacred may also have intrinsic health benefits that cannot be "reduced" to other psychosocial mechanisms.

BELIEFS AND VALUES One of the central features of religiousness is the cognitive dimension of belief; members of religious groups are identified as "believers". The items chosen indicate the presence or absence of beliefs in 1) the existence of a protective God, 2) responsibility for others who are less

fortunate, 3) the existence of life after death, and 4) the importance of religious beliefs for other areas of life. By definition, beliefs differ from one religion to another. These items met the criteria of being commonly held by many (not all) of the major religious groups in Western society; they were adopted from multiple sources (Davis and Smith, 1998; Hoge, 1972; Benson and Elkin, 1990; King and Hunt, 1975).

Beliefs are central to health and healing as well as to religion. The power of the placebo effect, a change in a patient's illness attributable to the symbolic import of a treatment rather than a specific pharmacologic or physiological property, is a familiar feature of medical practice and research (Beecher, 1966; Turner, et al., 1994). Religious faith may mobilize placebo effects by enhancing the memory of repeated, familiar, positive therapeutic states. Belief in a benevolent God and an afterlife may be key to a generalized expectation of positive outcomes. Moreover, religious beliefs offer individuals cognitive resources beyond these relatively simple or naive beliefs in good outcomes. Beliefs about the meaning of suffering and death are in some way central to all religions (Bowker, 1970); they create webs of meaning and comprehensibility which may comfort and sustain believers even in the midst of acute tragedy or long-term suffering.

Belief in the importance of concern for others is a value promoted by all of the major world religions. Studies in twenty countries and with four different faith traditions show that more highly religious people consistently show a more collectivist orientation and place little value on self-indulgence or sensation-seeking (Schwartz and Huismans, 1995); such religiously-motivated orientations might reduce risky behaviors such as heavy drinking, fast driving, promiscuous sex. Other researchers have also identified the prosocial orientation of religious respondents; there are direct teachings in many faiths on the subject of love and concern for others, and feelings of divine protection may encourage feelings of security and friendliness to strangers (Ellison, 1992; Pollner, 1989); moreover, "downward comparisons", or the consistent tendency of people to compare themselves with others who are worse off than themselves, is commonly shown to enhance feelings of well-being and reduce depression (Affleck

and Tennen, 1991); opportunities for such comparisons may occur more frequently for individuals who regularly perform charitable acts.

COMMITMENT This domain attempts to capture a behavioral expression of commitment to one's religious faith or spiritual beliefs. Recent work in the sociology of religion argues that commitment is best conceptualized and measured in terms of the offerings, of time or money, that individuals are willing to make (Iannaccone, 1994), because these represent sacrifices of resources that could be spent otherwise. Some evidence exists to suggest that behaviorally-oriented "hard" measures of religious commitment are more strongly linked to health status than attitudinally-oriented "soft" ones (Gartner, Larson, and Allen, 1991); thus we include a measure of the contribution of household income to religious congregations (Davis and Smith, 1998). Because the amount contributed could be biased by the total household income available, we also present a variable for the ratio of dollars given to total family income.

FORGIVENESS The concept of forgiveness is a fundamentally religious concept for those in the Judeo-Christian tradition. It is the focus of a major Jewish holiday (Yom Kippur) and a theme in much of Jewish scripture. It is also the core belief of the Christian faith, celebrated in Easter, the most important Christian holiday. Jews and Christians have concepts of both divine and interpersonal forgiveness, the latter being modeled on the former. The concept is also found in Zen Buddhism, Confucianism, and Islam (Kaplan, Munroe-Blum, and Blazer, 1993). A psychological model of forgiveness shows the parallel development of cognitive and moral reasoning: as individuals develop cognitively, they become able to take the perspective of others, to empathize with others' weaknesses, and to value them despite their faults (Enright, Gassin, and Wu, 1992; McCullough and Worthington, 1994). Our three items are adapted from Mauger et al. (Mauger, Perry, and Freeman, 1992).

There is some evidence in experimental studies of correlations between high levels of forgiveness and lower levels of blood pressure and negative emotions; other, nonexperimental studies have show forgiveness associated with lower levels of depression and anxiety, and higher levels of self-

esteem (Enright, Gassin, and Wu, 1992). The tendency to forgive may be associated with lower levels of hostility and aggression (Coyle and Enright, 1997), and lower psychopathology on the MMPI (Gordon and Baucom, 1998). In the psychotherapeutic literature, healing, in the spiritual sense, is often linked with forgiveness; however, research in this area has hardly begun.

DAILY SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE This domain measures the individual's emotional perception of the transcendent in daily life. The items capture feelings of direct interaction with, or immersion in, the transcendent, rather than simply a cognitive understanding of it. They aim to capture aspects of ordinary, day-to-day spiritual experience, rather than rare, extraordinary experiences of intense mysticism. Daily spiritual experience may be evoked by a religious context or by ordinary events in everyday life, in nature, with other people, or in solitude. They are intended to reflect experiences of spirituality that include, but are not limited to, the Judeo-Christian tradition. The six items were developed from the research literature, theological works, discussions with representatives of various religious traditions, and current scales attempting to measure some aspect of spiritual experience (Hood et al., 1995; Elkins et al., 1988; Kass et al., 1990).

Existing scales of extraordinary mystical or spiritual experiences have shown that they may be associated with psychological well-being (Hood et al., 1995), but there is little empirical work that links the ordinary spiritual experiences of daily life with physical health outcomes. However, one of the questions most strongly predictive of positive health outcomes in the Oxman et al. (1995) study of cardiac surgery taps one of these dimensions (strength and comfort from my religion). The emotional and physical feelings described by these items may buffer individuals from stress-related illnesses (Cohen, Kessler, and Underwood-Gordon, 1995). Positive emotional experiences have also been seen to have beneficial effects on the immune system, independent of the negative effects of stress (Roberts et al., 1995; Stone and Bovbjerg, 1994). Endorsing a "sense of deep peace" may reflect a condition that leads to, or emanates from direct neurological and endocrine processes similar to those identified during meditation (Delmonte, 1985). This domain offers the opportunity to assess potential effects on physical

and mental health of spiritual experiences in daily life, apart from participation in religious services.

OVERALL SELF-RANKING The final domain asks the individual to rate themselves with respect to their overall religiousness and spirituality. For many respondents, these answers will be closely correlated; Zinnbauer et al. (1997) find that 74 percent of their diverse sample identify themselves as both religious and spiritual. Self-identification of religiousness or spirituality may be an important variable on which to stratify populations since the predictability of specific domains may vary by this self-perception. It may also be of interest to estimate the prevalence of individuals who identify themselves as spiritual but not religious, and to compare the health of this group with that of the conventionally religious group. Global self-report measures (of health, for example) can be very sensitive to subjective states, even when compared with well-crafted multiple-item measures; this domain provides a yardstick against which other domains can be measured.

PHASE II

Methods

The 33 items were fielded in the 1998 General Social Survey (GSS) of the University of Chicago National Opinion Research Center (NORC). This is a nationally-representative household survey which samples English-speaking persons in the U.S. over 18 years of age (Davis and Smith, 1995). The 1998 survey employed split-sample balloting; the number of respondents completing the NIA / Fetzer module was 1445, representing a response rate of 75.6%. The 1998 GSS also contained a module for a comparative international study of religious values. These items, combined with the items on religion usually present in the GSS provided us with opportunities for validity testing. Table 1 shows the items as administered; wording for response categories can be found in Davis and Smith (1998).

Analysis of the data was performed in SAS. Principal components factor analysis with orthogonal rotation was carried out within and across related domains. Cronbach's alphas were

estimated for the resulting indices. Finally, Pearson correlation coefficients were estimated for all indices, single items, and a selected set of additional previously-validated religion items from the GSS.

Results

Univariate. Table 2 shows univariate statistics for individual items in each domain. None of the items had extremely skewed distributions, nor did any have a large proportion of missing data. As this is a nationally-representative sample, Table 2 describes the religious life of the U.S. population. Consistent with other surveys on the subject, the 1998 GSS shows a moderately high level of religious interest and involvement on the part of the American public.

Fifty-four percent of the sample is Protestant, 26 percent Catholic, just under 2 percent is Jewish, and nearly 14 percent reports having no religion. Thirty-nine percent say they have had a religious experience that changed their life. Average attendance at religious services is closest to once a month, with about 49 percent attending at least once a month. Of those who reported having a congregation, about two-thirds said they would expect to receive some or a great deal of help if they were sick or had problems, and well over half said their congregation never made too many demands or was critical of them. Over 50 percent of U.S. households donate money to their local congregation; among those who give anything, the median level of giving is $600 per year. For respondents with nonmissing data on both giving and family income, we created a ratio of religious giving-to-total income. Within this group, 5 percent were at or above the "tithing" level of 10 percent.

Over two-thirds of the sample say they pray privately at least once a week, with half praying at least once a day. By contrast, 46 percent say they never meditate. With respect to the types of religious coping, 43 percent of respondents say that they look to God for strength and comfort, and 85 percent say they have never felt that God had abandoned them. Only about 27 percent of the sample say that most or all of the time they try to make sense of a situation without relying on God.

Fifty-eight percent strongly believe that God is watching over them, and 70 percent believe that there is life after death. Respondents were slightly less likely to say that they always forgave themselves

(43 percent) than that they always forgave others (46 percent), and much more likely to feel (72 percent) that God always forgives them. In daily life, about 40 to 50 percent of respondents have some spiritual feelings at least once a day, while only about 6 percent say they never feel a sense of deep inner peace or feel touched by the beauty of nature, and only about 10 percent say they never perceive God's presence or love, or desire to be closer to God. Nineteen percent of the U.S. population considers itself "very religious", and another 42 percent say they are "moderately religious". Slightly more (22 percent) say they are "very spiritual" and slightly fewer say they are "moderately spiritual", making the proportion in these two top categories almost identical for religiousness and spirituality. Slightly more respondents (15 percent) are willing to say they are "not religious" than "not spiritual" (12 percent).

Table 2 also shows that women score significantly higher than men on virtually every item in the domains of public activity, private activity, coping, intensity, forgiveness, spiritual experience, and beliefs. However, women were not more likely to have had a religious experience that changed their life, they did not give more of their household income to their congregation, nor did they feel more supported by their congregation, and in fact women were *more* likely to feel that their congregation was critical of them.

Reliability. Table 3 shows alpha reliabilities and item-total correlations for the multi-item domains. Initially we performed a factor analysis using all the items which could be thought of as "religious activity", including the items from the public practices, private practices, and commitment domains. This analysis produced two factors, one containing all of the public and private practices, and the other consisting of just the commitment measure (donating money). However, we decided for theoretical reasons to keep the public and private practices items separate, as they would likely behave differently in non-healthy populations. The α for the two public practices items is .82, and for the three private practices is .72. Scales for both were constructed by creating z-scores for each item and summing.

The analysis for the four congregation support items, on the other hand, produced two factors when we had proposed only one domain. The two items assessing positive support show α=.86, while

the two assessing negative interactions show α=.64. With the 4-item scale α equals only .51, thus we recommend considering the four items as two pairs of items. A similar situation occurred with the six coping items: two clear factors emerged, one for the positively-phrased items of thinking that life is part of a larger force, working with God, and looking for strength and comfort (α=.81), and one for the two negative items of feeling that God is punishing or abandoning (α=.54). The negative coping item of "making sense of the situation without God" had a weak negative loading on the positive coping factor, and we decided to eliminate it from the scale.

The three items measuring different types of forgiveness factored together (α=.66). The items measuring intensity of spirituality/religiousness show α=.77. The four belief items factored together and show α=.64. And finally, the newly-developed scale for daily spiritual experiences contained just a single factor and has α=.91. Thus, these analyses produce moderately good-to-excellent reliability statistics for 9 scales, leaving us with 3 stand-alone items with distinctive response scales, for religious affiliation, dollars contributed, and having had a life-changing religious experience.

Validity. The *content validity* of the questionnaire was a major focus of the effort. Many areas of religious experience with potential relevance to human health were considered for inclusion, whether or not there were existing scales to measure them. Our domains span behavioral, cognitive, social, biographical, and psychological dimensions of religiousness in the Judeo-Christian context; while we cannot be sure that no content areas were omitted, several of our domains are entirely original for this effort, constituting a primary contribution to content validity. As we noted at the outset of this paper, the content validity of measures of religiousness in health research has been uniformly poor; this area had the most potential for improvement.

The *discriminant validity* of the domains was also examined. Conventionally the term discriminant validity refers to the assessment of new instruments when standard measures are available for related but differentiable phenomena. We use it in an effort to identify any possible redundancy between domains in our multidimensional instrument. If the items developed for one domain overlap in

content with another, and if their indices are highly correlated, then the discriminatory power of the measures is called into question.

We assess discriminant validity with the correlation matrix presented in Table 4. The upper part of the triangle shows zero-order correlations between all of the Fetzer / NIA indices and items. About 80 percent of the between-domain correlations are statistically significant at $p<.01$. Those that are not involve the two negatively-phrased indicators (congregation problems and negative coping); the signs, however, are negative as expected. No other pairwise correlations in the matrix have negative signs. At the top end, three correlations of .7 are obtained between the indices for daily spiritual experience, with private practices, positive religious coping, and intensity, domains which stress subjective aspects of religiousness/spirituality. These are not exceptionally high correlations, however, and the domains clearly have different behavioral and cognitive emphases. All other pairwise correlations in the table range from .0 to .6, with half below .3.

There are a few additional findings related to discriminant validity to note. First, lines 9 and 10 allow us to compare the unadjusted variable for dollars given to congregation with the ratio of dollars given to total income. The two measures are correlated .53, but the ratio measure has a consistently higher correlation with nearly every one of the other domain indices, suggesting that it should be preferred. The ratio form actually has a higher correlation with the public practices measure than it does with the unadjusted dollars given measure. Second, the correlations for the positive and negative indicators for religious coping and support have no significant correlation with each other, confirming the findings from the factor analysis and suggesting that in both cases these concepts do not represent polar ends of a continuum. In short, we find the domains related to each other as we would expect, but also sufficiently different that they appear to represent differentiable aspects of religious experience that do not fully covary with any other measure in the group.

Finally, we assess the *convergent validity* of our measures with four single items that were fielded simultaneously in the 1998 GSS and were closely related to several of our own domains/items;

the text for the questions can be found at the bottom of the table Our general hypothesis for establishing convergent validity is that these additional items should have their highest correlation with the NIA/Fetzer index or item to which they are most similar in content.

The first item, for in-home hours spent in religious activities, should be most highly correlated with our private practices measure. In fact, it has its highest correlation (.50) with the following item, for hours spent in religious activities outside the home, to which it is closely related in wording, but its next-highest correlation is with private practices (.48). Second, the number of hours spent in religious activities outside the home should be most closely related to our measure of public practices. The findings show that it also has its highest correlation with the previous item, for hours spent in-home, but its second-highest correlation (.44), is with our public practices index, as hypothesized.

Also just as we hypothesized, the GSS item for having been "born again" is most highly correlated with our item for having had a life-changing religious experience. The GSS tracks trends in American culture; for this purpose the "born again" language is suitable, but for the purposes of health research, and in the interest of being inclusive of diverse religious/spiritual experiences, we prefer our own wording. Finally, we thought the GSS question about whether the respondent was "a *strong* (Lutheran, Conservative Jew, etc.)" would be most closely associated with our religious intensity index, for how strongly religious/spiritual the respondent was. In fact, the highest correlation (.61) for this GSS variable was with the public practices index, which should not really be surprising, given the question's emphasis on institutional affiliation. The second highest correlation (.59) for the GSS variable is with the intensity index. Overall, we conclude that our measures converge very well with measures of similar concepts, some of which are standard in the literature. In each case, however, we feel that our measures are preferable, because they contain at least two items (with one exception), hence reducing measurement error, and because they are worded for the inclusiveness of diverse religious and spiritual traditions.

Conclusion

This paper has described the components of the NIA/Fetzer Short Form for the Measurement of Religiousness and Spirituality. The instrument is not intended to be a comprehensive measure of all aspects of religion and spirituality; it has the limited goal of assessing aspects of these phenomena which may bear some relationship to health. That religiousness and spirituality have any effect at all on health may be a relatively new idea for researchers who have become accustomed to considering psychosocial factors such as marital status, or social support, in their models. One of the major barriers to research has been the absence of reliable and validated measures for the concept.

This paper has presented the arguments underpinning the domains of religiousness and spirituality that the group identified as relevant to health, and proposed items that represent those domains. The items were pilot-tested in several small projects, and then fielded in a nationally representative sample of American adults. Findings from the 1998 General Social Survey showed that all of the indicators of religious and/or spiritual experience were endorsed by substantial numbers of respondents; that the items formed reliable indices within domains; that the indices were moderately but not highly correlated with each other; and that they had the expected relationships with other measures of the concepts. In short, the instrument has the appropriate characteristics of reliability and validity to be used in further research.

There are limitations to the analysis, however. One weakness of the instrument is the small number of items for each domain. The psychometric weakness of indicators with only one, two, or three items is that they are less stable and more prone to measurement error than longer scales. The set of items represents compromises reached in the interest of the brevity of the instrument as a whole and inclusiveness of all the domains that had been identified as relevant. A second limitation is that while the theoretical basis for the relationship of each domain to health was strong, the empirical relationships for these measures are still untested. A third limitation is that, while the GSS data represent the nation's religious diversity as a whole, there are insufficient numbers of the small but important groups of non-Judeo-Christians, for whom this instrument may be less relevant. This presentation of the conceptual

basis and descriptive characteristics of the instrument is only a first step.

The goal of the working group project was to develop a set of items and scales that could be used freely, as a whole, or in part, by other researchers, to suit the objectives of their own studies of religion and health. The General Social Survey data reported in this paper are also publicly available for further research. Systematic research on religion and health is only at a beginning stage. The complexity of the construct, and the large number of potential mechanisms at work, will require a very large number of studies in different settings, with different populations of patients and healthy respondents of different ages, before a clear picture can emerge of what the important domains and mechanisms really are. As a group the authors have no interest in promoting the use of these items other than to foster research in a field we collectively consider very important.

The data demonstrate clearly that religiousness and spirituality are abundant resources in the lives of many Americans. Their role in health and illness, however, is likely to be far too complex to be so quickly assessed. The development of a multidimensional instrument is merely a start, but it is an important first step to the broad program of research which will be required if we are to focus on the heretofore overlooked role of religion and spirituality in health.

References

Affleck, G., Tennen, H. 1991. Social comparison and coping with major medical problems. In: Suls J, Wills, T (Ed.), Social Comparison: Contemporary Theory and Research. Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 369-393.

Ai, A.L., Dunkle, R.E., Peterson, C. et al. 1998. The role of private prayer in psychological recovery among midlife and aged patients following cardiac surgery. Gerontologist 38, 591-601.

Beecher, H.K. 1966. Relationship of significance of wound to pain experienced. Journal of the American Medical Association 161, 1609-1613.

Benson, H. 1975. The Relaxation Response. New York, Avon.

Benson, H. 1996. Timeless Healing. New York, Simon & Schuster.

Benson, P.L. Donahue, M.J. 1989. Ten-year trends in at-risk behaviors: A national study of black adolescents. Journal of Adolescent Research 4, 125-139.

Benson, P.L., Elkin, C.H. 1990. Effective Christian Education: A National Study of Protestant Congregations. Minneapolis, Search Institute.

Berger, P.L. 1967. The Sacred Canopy. New York, Doubleday.

Berkman, L.F., Syme, S.L. 1979. Social networks, host resistance, and mortality: A nine-year follow-up study of Alameda County residents. American Journal of Epidemiology 109, 186-204.

Bowker, J. 1970. Problems of Suffering in the Religions of the World. Cambridge, Cambridge.

Bradley, D.E. 1995. Religious involvement and social resources: Evidence from the data set "Americans' Changing Lives." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 34, 259-267.

Brindley, D., Rolland, Y. 1989. Possible connections between stress, diabetes, obesity, hypertension and altered lipoprotein metabolism that may result in atherosclerosis. Clinical Science 77, 453-461.

Bygren, L.O., Konlaan, B.B., Johansson, S.E. 1996. Attendance at cultural events, reading books or periodicals, and making music or singing in a choir as determinants for survival: Swedish interview survey of living conditions. British Medical Journal 313,1577-1580.

Cohen, S., Kessler, R., Underwood-Gordon, L. 1995. Measuring Stress: A Guide for Health and Social Scientists. New York: Oxford.

Coyle, C.T., Enright, R.D. 1997. Forgiveness intervention with postabortion men. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 65, 1042-6.

Delmonte, M.M. 1985. Biochemical indices associated with meditation practice: A literature review. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews 9, 557-61.

Davis, J.A., Smith, T.W. 1998. General Social Survey Cumulative File. University of Michigan, Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Ann Arbor, MI.

Eisenberg, D.M., Kessler, R.C., Foster, C., et al. 1993. Unconventional medicine in the United States: Prevalence, costs, and patterns of use. New England Journal of Medicine 328, 246-252.

Elkins, D.N., Hedstrom, L.J., Hughes, L.L., et al. 1988. Toward a humanistic-phenomenological spirituality: Definition, description, and measurement. Journal of Humanistic Psychology 28, 5-18.

Ellison, C.G. 1991. Religious involvement and subjective well-being. Journal of Health & Social Behavior 32, 80-99.

Ellison, C.G. 1992. Are religious people nice people? Evidence from the National Survey of Black Americans. Social Forces 71(2):411-430.

Ellison, C.G. 1994. Religion, the life stress paradigm, and the study of depression. In Levin, J.S.(Ed.), Religion in Aging and Health. Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Ellison, C.G., George, L.K. 1994. Religious involvement, social ties, and social support in a southeastern community. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 33, 46-61.

Ellison, C.G., Levin, J.S. 1998. The religion-health connection: Evidence, theory, and future directions. Health Education & Behavior 25, 700-720.

Enright, R.D., Gassin, E., Wu, C.R. 1992. Forgiveness: A developmental view. Journal of Moral Education 21, 99-114.

Gardner, J,W., Lyon, J.L. 1982. Cancer in Utah Mormon men by lay priesthood level. American Journal of Epidemiology 116, 243-257.

Gartner, J., Larson, D.B., Allen, G.D. 1991. Religious commitment and mental health: A review of the empirical literature. Journal of Psychology and Theology 19, 6-25.

Gordon, K.C., Baucom, D.H, 1998. Understanding betrayals in marriage: A synthesized model of forgiveness. Family Process 37, 425-49.

Gorsuch, R.L. 1995. Religious aspects of substance abuse and recovery. Journal of Social Issues 51, 65-83.

Gritzmacher, S.A., Bolton, B., Dana, R.A. 1988. Psychological characteristics of Pentecostals: A literature review and psychodynamic synthesis. Journal of Psychology & Theology 16, 233-245.

Hoge, D.R. A validated intrinsic religious motivation scale. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 11, 369-376.

Hood, R.W., Spilka, B., Hunsberger, B. et al. 1995. The Psychology of Religion. 2nd Ed. New York, Guilford.

House, J.S., Landis, K.L., Umberson, D. 1988. Social relationships and health. Science 241,540-545.

Hummer, R.A., Rogers, R.G., Nam, C.B., et al. 1999. Religious involvement and U.S. adult mortality. Demography 36, 273-285.

Iannaccone, L.R. 1994. Why strict churches are strong. American Journal of Sociology 99, 1180-1211.

Idler, E.L. 1995. Religion, health, and nonphysical senses of self. Social Forces 74, 683-704.

Idler, E.L., Kasl, S.V. 1992. Religion, disability, depression, and the timing of death. American Journal of Sociology 97, 1052-1079.

Idler, E.L., Kasl, S.V. 1997a. Religion among disabled and nondisabled elderly persons I: Cross-sectional patterns in health practices, social activities, and well-being. Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences 52B, S294-S305.

Idler, E.L., Kasl, S.V. 1997b. Religion among disabled and nondisabled elderly persons II: Attendance at

religious services as a predictor of the course of disability. Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences 52B, S306-S316.

Jiang, W., Babyak, M., Krantz, D. 1996. Mental stress-induced myocardial ischemia and cardiac events. Journal of the American Medical Association 275, 1651-1656.

Jarvis, G.K., Northcott, H.C. 1987. Religion and differences in morbidity and mortality. Social Science & Medicine 25, 813-824.

Kamarck, T., Jennings, J.R. 1991. Biobehavioral factors in sudden cardiac death. Psychological Bulletin 109, 42-75.

Kaplan, B., Munroe-Blum, H., Blazer, D. 1993. Religion, health, and forgiveness: Traditions and challenges. In Levin, J. (Ed.), Religion in Aging and Health. Thousand Oaks, Sage, pp.52-77.

Kaplan, M. 1996. Ambushed by spirituality. Time, p. 62, June 24.

Kark, J.D., Shemi, G., Friedlander, Y., et al. 1996. Does religious observance promote health? Mortality in secular vs religious kibbutzim in Israel. American Journal of Public Health 86, 341-346.

Kass, J.D., Friedman, R., Leserman, J., et al. 1990. Health outcomes and a new index of spiritual experience. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 30, 203-211.

Kendler, K.S., Gardner, C.O., Prescott, C.A. 1997. Religion, psychopathology, and substance use and abuse: A multimeasure, genetic-epidemiologic study. American Journal of Psychiatry 154, 322-328.

King, M.B., Hunt, R.A. 1975. Measuring the religious variable: A national replication. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 14, 13-22.

Koenig, H.G., Ford, S.M., George, L.K., et al. 1993. Religion and anxiety disorder: An examination and comparison of associations in young, middle-aged, and elderly adults. Journal of Anxiety Disorders 7, 321-342.

Koenig, H.G., George, L.K., Cohen, H.J. et al. 1998. The relationship between religious activities and cigarette smoking in older adults. Journal of Gerontology: Medical Sciences 53A, M426-M434.

Koenig, H.G., George, L.K., Meador, K.G., et al. 1994. Religious affiliation and psychiatric disorders among Protestant baby boomers. Hospital & Community Psychiatry 45, 586-596.

Koenig, H.G., George, L.K., Meador, K.G., et al. 1994. Religious practices and alcoholism in a southern adult population. Hospital & Community Psychiatry 45, 225-231.

Koenig, H.K., George, L.K., Peterson, B.L. 1998. Religiosity and remission of depression in medically ill older patients. American Journal of Psychiatry 155, 536-542.

Koenig, H.G., Idler, E.L., Kasl, S.V., et al. 1999. Religion, spirituality, and medicine: A rebuttal to skeptics. International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine 29:123-131.

Koenig, H.G., McCullough, M., Larson, D.B. In press, 2000. Religion and health: A century of research reviewed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Krause, N. 1995. Religiosity and self-esteem among older adults. Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences 50B, P236-P246.

Krause, N. 1997. Anticipated support, received support, and economic stress among older adults. Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences 52B, P284-P293.

Levin, J.S. 1989. Religious factors in aging, adjustment, and health: A theoretical overview. In Clements, W.M. (Ed.), Religion, Aging and Health: A Global Perspective. New York, Haworth.

Levin, J.S. 1997. Age differences in patterns and correlates of the frequency of prayer. Gerontologist 37, 75-88.

Levine, S.P., Towell, B.L., Suarez, A.M. 1985. Platelet activation and secretion associated with emotional stress. Circulation 71, 1129-1134.

Mattlin, J.A., Wethington, E., Kessler, R.C. 1990. Situational determinants of coping and coping effectiveness. Journal of Health & Social Behavior 31, 103-122.

Mauger, P.A., Perry, J., Freeman, T., et al. 1992. The measurement of forgiveness: Preliminary research. Journal of Psychology & Christianity 11, 170-180.

McCullough, M., Worthington, E. 1994. Models of interpersonal forgiveness and their applications to

counseling: Review and critique. Counseling & Values 39, 2-14.

McIntosh, D.N., Silver, R.C., Wortman, C.B. 1993. Religion's role in adjustment to a negative life event: Coping with the loss of a child. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology 65, 812-821.

National Institute on Aging / Fetzer Institute. 1999. Multidimensional Measurement of Religiousness/Spirituality for Use in Health Research. Kalamazoo, MI: John E. Fetzer Institute.

Oxman, T.E., Freeman, D.H., Manheimer, E.D. 1995. Lack of social participation or religious strength and comfort as risk factors for death after cardiac surgery in the elderly. Psychosomatic Medicine 57, 5-15.

Pargament, K.I. 1997. The Psychology of Religion and Coping: Theory, Research, Practice. New York: Guilford.

Pargament, K.I., Koenig, H.G., Perez, L. In press. The many methods of religious coping: Development and initial validation of the RCOPE. Journal of Clinical Psychology.

Pargament, K.I., Smith, B.W., Koenig, H.G., Perez, L. 1998. Patterns of negative and positive religious coping with major life stressors. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 37, 710-724.

Phillips, R.L., Kuzma, J.W., Beeson, W.L., et al. 1980. Influence of selection versus lifestyle on risk of fatal cancer and cardiovascular disease among Seventh-Day Adventists. American Journal of Epidemiology 112, 296-314.

Pollner, M. 1989. Divine relations, social relations and well-being. Journal of Health & Social Behavior 30, 92-104.

Pressman, P., Lyons, J.S., Larson, D.B., et al. 1990. Religious belief, depression, and ambulation status in elderly women with broken hips. American Journal of Psychiatry 147, 758-760.

Princeton Religion Research Center. 1994. Importance of religion climbing again. Emerging Trends, 16, 1-4.

Roberts, A.H., Kewman, D.G. et al. 1995. The power of nonspecific effects in healing: Implications for psychosocial and biological treatments. Clinical Psychology Review 13, 375-391.

Roof, W.C., McKinney, W. 1990. American Mainline Religion. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Rook, K.S. 1984. The negative side of social interaction: Impact on psychological well-being. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology 46, 1097-1108.

Schwartz, S.H,, Huismans, S. 1995. Value priorities and religiosity in four Western religions. Social Psychology Quarterly 58, 88-107.

Seeman, T.E., McEwen, B.S. 1996. Impact of social environment characteristics on neuroendocrine regulation. Psychosomatic Medicine 58, 459-471.

Siegel, J.M., Kuykendall, D.H. 1990. Loss, widowhood, and psychological distress among the elderly. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology 58, 519-524.

Smith, T.W. 1990. Classifying Protestant denominations. Review of Religious Research 31, 225-246.

Stark, R., Glock, C. 1968. Patterns of Religious Commitment. Berkeley, University of California.

Stone, A.A., Bovbjerg, D.H. 1994. Stress and humoral immunity: A review of the human studies. Advances in Neuroimmunology 4, 49-56.

Strawbridge, W.J., Cohen, R.D., Shema, S.J., et al. 1997. Frequent attendance at religious services and mortality over 28 years. American Journal of Public Health 87, 957-961.

Taylor, R.J., Chatters, L.M. 1991. Nonorganizational religious participation among elderly black adults. Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences 46:S103-S111.

Turner, J.A., Deyo, R.A., Loeser, J.D., et al 1994. The importance of placebo effects in pain treatment and research. Journal of the American Medical Association 271(20):1609-1614.

Vaux, K. 1976. Religion and health. Preventive Medicine 5:522-536.

Wallace, J.M., Forman, T.A. 1998. Religion's role in promoting health and reducing risk among American youth. Health Education & Behavior 25(6):721-741.

Watson, P.J., Morris, R.J., Hood, R.W. 1988. Sin and self-functioning, part I: Grace, guilt, and self-consciousness. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 16:254-269.

Woodward, K.L. 1997. Is God listening? Newsweek, 31(3): 57-64.

Zinnbauer, B.J., Pargament, K.I., Cole, B.C., et al. 1997. Religion and spirituality: Unfuzzying the fuzzy. J Scientific Study of Religion, 36:549-564.

Table 1. NIA / Fetzer Domains and Instrument

Domain	Testable relevance to health	1998 GSS item wording [1]	GSS variable and response scale
Affiliation	Denomination-specific proscriptions for lifestyle risk factors: alcohol, diet, smoking	What is your religious preference? Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion? [If Protestant: What specific denomination is that?] [If Jewish: Do you consider yourself Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, or none of these?]	RELIG[2] DENOM[3] JEW[4]
History	Life-changing experience fostering behavior change Exposure to integrated body/mind/spirit states	Did you ever have a religious or spiritual experience that changed your life?	RELEXP[5,20]
Public practices	Exposure to integrated body/mind/spirit states Conformity to risk-reducing behaviors Exposure to social networks and sources of support	How often do you attend religious services? How often do you take part in the activities or organizations of a church or place of worship other than attending services?	ATTEND[6,21] RELACTIV[7,21]
Private practices	Exposure to integrated body/mind/spirit states	How often do you pray privately in places other than at church or synagogue? Within your religious or spiritual tradition, how often do you meditate? How often have you read the Bible in the last year?	PRIVPRAY[8,20,21] MEDITATE[8,20,21] READWORD[9,20,21]
Support	Access to instrumental assistance and expressions of caring Reduction of stress through resolution of conflict Encouragement of compliance with medical treaments Reduction of health risk behaviors Access to medical care and health information through referral networks	If you were ill, how much would the people in your congregation help you out? If you had a problem or were faced with a difficult situation, how much comfort would the people in your congregation be willing to give you? How often do the people in your congregation make too many demands on you? How often are the people in your congregation critical of you and the things you do?	CONGHLP1[10,20] CONGHLP2[10,20] CONGHRM1[11] CONGHRM2[11]

Coping	Reduction of negative impact of stressful life events	Think about how you try to understand and deal with major problems in your life. To what extent is each of the following involved in the way you cope: I think about how my life is part of a larger spiritual force. I work together with God as partners. I look to God for strength, support, guidance. I feel that God is punishing me for my sins or lack of spirituality. I wonder whether God has abandoned me. I try to make sense of the situation and decide what to do without relying on God.	 COPE1[12,20] COPE2[12,20] COPE3[12,20] COPE4[12,20] COPE5[12,20] COPE6[12,20]
Beliefs and values	Opportunities for social comparison promote personal well-being Reduction of stress through provision of hope	I believe in a God who watches over me. I feel a deep sense of responsibility for reducing pain and suffering in the world. Do you believe there is life after death? I try hard to carry my religious beliefs over into all my other dealings in life.	GODWATCH[13,20,21] LESSPAIN[13,20,21] POSTLIFE[14,20,21] RELLIFE[13,20,21]
Commitment	Enhancement of well-being through concern for others	During the last year how much money did you and the other family members in your household contribute to each of the following: To your local congregation?	 GIVECONG[15]
Forgiveness	Reduction of stress through resolution of conflict	Because of my religious or spiritual beliefs: I have forgiven myself for things that I have done wrong. I have forgiven those who hurt me. I know that God forgives me.	 FORGIVE1[16,20] FORGIVE2[16,20] FORGIVE3[16,20]
Spiritual experience	Exposure to integrated body/mind/spirit states	The following questions deal with possible spiritual experiences. To what extent can you say you experience the following: I feel God's presence. I find strength and comfort in my religion. I feel deep inner peace or harmony. I desire to be closer to or in union with God. I feel God's love for me, directly or through others. I am spiritually touched by the beauty of creation.	 FEELGOD[17,20] RELCMFRT[17,20] HARMONY[17,20] UNIONGOD[17,20] GODLOVE[17,20] BEAUSPRT[17,20]
Religious intensity	Indicator of feelings of self-worth	To what extent do you consider yourself a religious person? To what extent do you consider yourself a spiritual person?	RELPERSN[18,20] SPRTPRSN[19,20]

[1] 1998 General Social Survey, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago
[2] 1=Protestant; 2=Catholic; 3=Jewish; 4=None; 5=Other; 6=Buddhism; 7=Hinduism; 8=Other Eastern; 9=Moslem/Islam; 10=Orthodox-Christian; 11=Christian; 12=Native American; 13=Interdenominational
[3] Detailed coding for Protestant denominations available from the authors or the General Social Survey
[4] 1=Orthodox; 2=Conservative; 3=Reform; 4=None of these
[5] 1=Yes; 2=No
[6] 0=Never; 1=Less than once a year; 2=About once or twice a year; 3=Several times a year; 4=About once a month; 5=2-3 times a month; 6=Nearly every week; 7=Every week; 8=Several times a week

[7] 1=Never; 2=Less than once a year; 3=About once or twice a year; 4=Several times a year; 5=About once a month; 6=2-3 times a month; 7=Nearly every week; 8=Every week; 9=Several times a week; 10=Once a day; 11=Several times a day

[8] 1=More than once a day; 2=Once a day; 3=A few times a week; 4=Once a week; 5=A few times a month; 6=Once a month; 7=Less than once a month; 8=Never

[9] 1=Several times a day; 2=Once a day; 3=Several times a week; 4=Once a week; 5=Less than once a week; 6=Not read

[10] 1=A great deal; 2=Some; 3=A little; 4=None

[11] 1=Very often; 2=Fairly often; 3=Once in a while; 4=Never

[12] 1=A great deal; 2=Quite a bit; 3=Somewhat; 4=Not at all

[13] 1=Strongly agree; 2=Agree; 3=Disagree; 4=Strongly disagree

[14] 1=Yes; 2=Undecided; 3=No

[15] Actual $ amount coded. Our giving-to-income ratio variable = GIVECONG/INCOME98(midpoints of intervals)

[16] 1=Always or almost always; 2=Often; 3=Seldom; 4=Never

[17] 1=Many times a day; 2=Every day; 3=Most days; 4=Some days; 5=Once in a while; 6=Never or almost never

[18] 1=Very religious; 2=Moderately religious; 3=Slightly religious; 4=Not religious at all

[19] 1=Very spiritual; 2=Moderately spiritual; 3=Slightly spiritual; 4=Not spiritual at all

[20] Score was reverse coded so that higher score = more religious

[21] Score was transformed to z score before summing with other items

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for NIA/Fetzer Religion and Spirituality Items.

	Range	Mean	SD	Female Mean	Male Mean	p: $\mu_f = \mu_m$
Public Activity						
Service attendance	0 – 8	3.63	2.77	3.91	3.28	***
Other public activities	1 – 11	3.43	2.71	3.60	3.22	*
Private Activity						
Private prayer	1 – 8	5.49	2.50	5.98	4.90	***
Meditation	1 – 8	3.39	2.72	3.53	3.23	*
Bible reading	1 – 6	2.22	1.42	2.37	2.03	***
Congregation Support						
Help with illness	1 – 4	3.17	.94	3.20	3.13	
Help with problem	1 – 4	3.32	.88	3.24	3.29	
Makes too many demands	1 – 4	3.50	.73	3.53	3.46	
Critical of R	1 – 4	3.67	.67	3.72	3.59	**
Coping						
Life is part of larger force	1 - 4	2.36	1.05	2.50	2.21	***
Work with God	1 - 4	2.48	1.04	2.65	2.27	***
Look to God for strength	1 - 4	2.94	1.09	3.14	2.71	***
Feel God is punishing	1 - 4	3.69	.64	3.71	3.67	
Wonder if abandoned	1 - 4	3.83	.49	3.84	3.83	
Make sense without God	1 - 4	2.97	1.02	3.11	2.80	***
Intensity						
Religious strength	1 – 4	2.65	.95	2.75	2.52	***

Spiritual strength	1 - 4	2.72	.94	2.83	2.59	***
Forgiveness						
Forgiven self	1 - 4	3.19	.88	3.28	3.08	***
Forgiven others	1 - 4	3.29	.81	3.34	3.23	**
Know that God forgives	1 - 4	3.61	.77	3.69	3.52	***
Spiritual Experience						
Feel God's presence	1 - 6	3.77	1.67	3.99	3.52	***
Find comfort in religion	1 - 6	3.77	1.66	4.02	3.47	***
Feel inner peace	1 - 6	3.74	1.40	3.89	3.55	***
Desire to be closer to God	1 - 6	3.86	1.62	4.07	3.60	***
Feel God's love	1 - 6	3.89	1.59	4.09	3.64	***
Touched by creation	1 - 6	4.29	1.51	4.47	4.08	***
Beliefs and Values						
Carry over beliefs	1 - 4	2.93	.88	3.04	2.79	***
God watches over	1 - 4	3.44	.78	3.56	3.30	***
Desire to reduce pain	1 - 4	2.72	.82	2.78	2.66	**
Belief in afterlife	1 - 3	2.55	.76	2.57	2.51	
Commitment						
Giving amount (in $1000s)	0 - 60	.88	3.72	.77	1.02	
Giving ratio	0 - 0.10	.01	.03	.01	.01	
History						
Religious experience	0 - 1	.39	.49	.38	.40	

Table 3. Reliability Tests for NIA/Fetzer Indices.

Index	Overall α	Items	*r* with total
Public religious activities	.82	Religious service attendance	.70
		Other public religious activities	.70
Private religious activities	.72	Private prayer	.55
		Meditation	.51
		Bible reading	.56
Congregation benefits	.86	Congregation help with illness	.76
		Congregation with problems	.76
Congregation problems	.64	Congregation makes too many demands	.47
		Congregation is critical	.47
Positive religious coping	.81	Life is part of a larger force	.58
		Work with God as a partner	.75
		Look to God for support	.65
Negative religious coping	.54	Feel that God is punishing	.37
		Wonder if God has abandoned	.37
Religious intensity	.77	Religious person	.63
		Spiritual person	.63
Forgiveness	.66	Forgiven self	.47
		Forgiven others	.50
		Know that God forgives	.43
Daily spiritual experiences	.91	Feel God's presence	.77
		Find comfort in religion	.81
		Feel deep inner peace	.70
		Desire to be closer to God	.79
		Feel God's love	.82
		Touched by beauty of creation	.63
Beliefs and values	.64	God watches over me	.51
		Responsibility to reduce pain and suffering	.34
		Life after death	.30
		Carry beliefs to other areas of life	.56

Table 4. Zero-order Correlations Between NIA/Fetzer Items and Indices and Key GSS Items.

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5	v6	v7	v8	v9	v10	v11	v12	v13	v14	v15	v16	v17
NIA/Fetzer Indices and Items																	
v1: Life-changing experience	-																
v2: Public practices	**.32**	-															
v3: Private practices	**.47**	**.62**	-														
v4: Congregation benefits	**.21**	**.34**	**.31**	-													
v5: Congregation problems	**-.12**	**-.12**	**-.16**	-.04	-												
v6: Positive religious coping	**.41**	**.54**	**.67**	**.30**	**-.10**	-											
v7: Negative religious coping	.06	-.05	-.00	**-.12**	**-.15**	.05	-										
v8: Beliefs	**.38**	**.49**	**.57**	**.33**	**-.11**	**.67**	.03	-									
v9: $ given to congregation	**.12**	**.27**	**.21**	**.12**	-.04	**.15**	-.04	**.15**	-								
v10: Giving-to-income ratio	**.25**	**.56**	**.48**	**.23**	**-.15**	**.37**	-.03	**.33**	**.53**	-							
v11: Forgiveness	**.22**	**.35**	**.42**	**.23**	.00	**.48**	**-.09**	**.46**	**.10**	**.24**	-						
v12: Daily spiritual experience	**.41**	**.58**	**.70**	**.39**	**-.13**	**.76**	-.00	**.67**	**.15**	**.40**	**.52**	-					
v13: Religious intensity	**.42**	**.57**	**.65**	**.34**	**-.13**	**.69**	-.02	**.64**	**.17**	**.37**	**.44**	**.72**	-				
Related GSS variables																	
v14: In-home activity amount[1]	**.26**	**.37**	**.48**	**.18**	**-.09**	**.36**	-.00	**.29**	**.10**	**.32**	**.22**	**.39**	**.36**	-			
v15: Outside home activity amount[2]	**.21**	**.44**	**.36**	**.20**	**-.09**	**.30**	-.03	**.24**	**.16**	**.42**	**.21**	**.31**	**.30**	**.50**	-		
v16: Born again[3]	**.52**	**.37**	**.49**	**.25**	**-.14**	**.43**	.06	**.40**	**.11**	**.31**	**.29**	**.43**	**.42**	**.26**	**.22**	-	
v17: Strength of affiliation[4]	**.31**	**.61**	**.55**	**.26**	**-.11**	**.51**	-.06	**.49**	**.20**	**.44**	**.35**	**.54**	**.59**	**.33**	**.30**	**.35**	-

Note: Coefficients in bold are significant at $p < .01$.

[1]"In the past month, about how many hours have you spent doing religious activities in your home (such as time spent praying, meditating, reading religious books, listening to religious broadcasts, etc.)?"

[2]"In the past month, about how many hours have you spent doing religious services activities outside your home (such as attending religious services, prayer roups, Bible studies, fellowship meetings, church leadership meetings, etc.)?"

[3]"Would you say you have been "born again" or have had a "born again" experience - that is, a turning point in your life when you committed yourself to Christ?"

[4]"Would you call yourself a strong (PREFERENCE NAMED ABOVE) or not a very strong (PREFERENCE NAMED ABOVE)?"