

Differences in Spirituality

A Comparison of Adult Degree Completion Students and
Traditional-aged Students within Member Institutions of the
Council for Christian Colleges & Universities

Presented at the Inaugural Meeting of the
Council for Christian Colleges & Universities'
Center for Research in Adult Learning

By

Chris Olson, Ed.D.
Azusa Pacific University

May 11 – 13, 2009
Indiana Wesleyan University

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
List of Tables	2
Findings.....	4
Between adult and traditional-aged students	4
Within the Adult Sample According to age.....	8
Relational Spirituality Literature	11
Object relations and attachment theories	12
Connecting relational psychology to a theologically-based spirituality	13
The Furnishing the Soul model of relational spirituality	13
Connecting to God and Knowing God:	14
Attachment to God:.....	14
Spiritual Transformation:.....	14
Spiritual Tipping Points:	14
Furnishing the Soul:.....	15
Reliability and validity.....	16
References.....	17

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Comparison of mean scores for adults and traditional-aged students according to the five conceptual domains, separating the three sub-domains of Attachment to God</i>	4
Table 2 <i>Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adults and Traditional-aged participants under the Conceptual Domain Connecting with God</i>	5
Table 3 <i>Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adults and Traditional-aged participants under the Conceptual Domain Knowing God</i>	5
Table 4 <i>Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adults and Traditional-aged participants under the Conceptual Domain Attachment to God – Secure</i>	6

Table 5 <i>Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adults and Traditional-aged participants under the Conceptual Domain Attachment to God – Anxious</i>	6
Table 6 <i>Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adults and Traditional-aged participants under the Conceptual Domain Furnishing the Soul</i>	7
Table 7 <i>Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adult Participants 25 to 39 years and 40 years and older under the Conceptual Domain Connecting with God</i>	8
Table 8 <i>Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adult Participants 25 to 39 years and 40 years and older under the Conceptual Domain Knowing God</i>	8
Table 9 <i>Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adult Participants 25 to 39 years and 40 years and older under the Conceptual Domain Attachment to God – Secure</i>	9
Table 10 <i>Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adult Participants 25 to 39 years and 40 years and older under the Conceptual Domain Attachment to God – Anxious</i>	9
Table 11 <i>Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adult Participants 25 to 39 years and 40 years and older under the Conceptual Domain Furnishing the Soul</i>	10
Table 12 <i>Program Impact Measures for Adult Students Including Differences Between Adults and Traditional-aged Students</i>	11

Findings

Between adult and traditional-aged students

Findings for Differences between Adults and Traditional-aged students in measures of spirituality grouped under the relative conceptual domains of the *Furnishing the Soul Inventory*.

Table 1

Comparison of mean scores for adults and traditional-aged students according to the five conceptual domains, separating the three sub-domains of Attachment to God

<u>Conceptual Domain</u>	<u>Adults</u> <i>N</i> = 278		<u>Traditional-aged</u> <i>N</i> = 375		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Connecting to God	4.79	.84	4.67	.67	651	-2.01*
Knowing God	3.47	.80	3.31	.62	651	-2.97*
Attachment to God						
Secure Attachment	4.60	.81	4.52	.65	651	-1.36
Anxious Attachment	2.17	.75	2.66	.75	651	8.23**
Distant Attachment	2.93	.61	2.82	.59	651	-2.22*
Spiritual Tipping Points	4.57	.76	4.66	.70	651	1.41
Furnishing the Soul	3.74	.91	3.81	.72	651	1.22

**p* < .05 ** *p* < .001

Table 2

Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adults and Traditional-aged participants under the Conceptual Domain Connecting with God

	<u>Adults</u>		<u>Traditional-aged</u>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
<u>Spirituality Scale</u>						
Connecting through Intimacy	4.64	1.04	4.35	1.02	651	-3.51**
Connecting through Suffering	4.54	1.03	4.56	.82	514.42	.29
Connecting through Meaning	5.14	.90	5.17	.81	651	.38
Connecting through Seeing through God's Eyes	4.64	.93	4.56	.69	492.03	-1.24
Connecting through Gratitude	5.30	.77	4.97	.69	651	-5.82**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 3

Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adults and Traditional-aged participants under the Conceptual Domain Knowing God

	<u>Adults</u>		<u>Traditional-aged</u>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
<u>Spirituality Scale</u>						
Knowing through Prayer	3.33	.79	3.19	.64	518.22	-2.50*
Knowing through Spiritual Training	3.10	.77	2.97	.60	500.79	-2.28*
Knowing through Awareness of God's Presence	4.45	1.10	4.20	.97	549.01	-2.96*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 4

Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adults and Traditional-aged participants under the Conceptual Domain Attachment to God - Secure

	<u>Adults</u>		<u>Traditional-aged</u>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
<u>Spirituality Scale</u>						
Secure Attachment Filter	4.64	1.00	4.54	.76	496.85	-1.29
Secure-Forgiveness Attachment Filter	4.54	.76	4.38	.74	651	-2.67*
Secure Realistic-Acceptance Attachment Filter	4.60	1.19	4.69	.90	479.39	-1.03

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 5

Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adults and Traditional-aged participants under the Conceptual Domain Attachment to God - Anxious

	<u>Adults</u>		<u>Traditional-aged</u>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
<u>Spirituality Scale</u>						
Anxious Attachment Filter	1.91	.74	2.20	.76	651	4.99**
Anxious-Disappointment Attachment Filter	2.37	1.12	3.08	1.13	651	7.95**
Anxious-Instability Attachment Filter	2.25	1.11	2.71	1.04	651	5.43**
Distant Attachment Filter	2.93	.61	2.82	.59	651	-2.22*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

A t-test comparing the means of adult students with that of traditional-aged students for the Spiritual Tipping Points scale revealed no significant difference. Results for adults and traditional-aged students for the openness scale were: ($M = 4.57$, $SD = .76$), ($M = 4.66$, $SD = .70$), $t(651) = 1.41$, $p = .16$ respectively.

Table 6

Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adults and Traditional-aged participants under the Conceptual Domain Furnishing the Soul

<u>Spirituality Scale</u>	<u>Adults</u>		<u>Traditional-aged</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>		
Furnishing the Soul through Commitment	4.09	1.09	4.19	.81	490.50	1.21
Furnishing the Soul through Prayer	4.48	1.19	4.35	.89	492.30	-1.56
Furnishing the Soul through Spiritual Training	2.79	.94	3.04	.82	545.44	3.64**
Furnishing the Soul through Community	3.84	1.21	4.12	.99	525.45	3.23*
Furnishing the Soul through Loving Others	4.30	1.02	4.22	.84	528.16	-1.00
Furnishing the Soul through Serving Others	3.66	.91	3.44	.82	558.08	-3.12*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Within the Adult Sample According to age

Findings for Differences within the Adult sample according to age in measures of spirituality grouped under the relative conceptual domains of the *Furnishing the Soul Inventory*.

Table 7

Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adult Participants 25 to 39 years and 40 years and older under the Conceptual Domain Connecting with God

<u>Spirituality Scale</u>	<u>25 – 39 years</u> <u>(N = 135)</u>		<u>40 years and</u> <u>older (N = 142)</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>		
Connecting through Intimacy	4.51	1.12	4.77	.95	275	-2.06*
Connecting through Suffering	4.47	1.12	4.61	.94	275	-1.09
Connecting through Meaning	5.08	.99	5.21	.80	275	-1.28
Connecting through Seeing through God's Eyes	4.54	.98	4.75	.87	275	-1.86
Connecting through Gratitude	5.27	.71	5.33	.83	275	-.65

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 8

Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adult Participants 25 to 39 years and 40 years and older under the Conceptual Domain Knowing God

<u>Spirituality Scale</u>	<u>25 – 39 years</u> <u>(N = 135)</u>		<u>40 years and</u> <u>older (N = 142)</u>		<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>		
Knowing through Prayer	3.17	.86	3.50	.68	255 ^{NTP}	-3.43*
Knowing through Spiritual Training	2.93	.83	3.26	.67	257	-3.57**
Knowing through Awareness of God's Presence	4.30	1.15	4.59	1.04	275	-2.26*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 9

Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adult Participants 25 to 39 years and 40 years and older under the Conceptual Domain Attachment to God - Secure

	<u>25 – 39 years</u> <u>(N = 135)</u>		<u>40 years and</u> <u>older (N = 142)</u>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
<u>Spirituality Scale</u>						
Secure Attachment Filter	4.57	1.05	4.71	.94	275	-1.12
Secure-Forgiveness Attachment Filter	4.45	.80	4.62	.72	275	-1.79
Secure Realistic-Acceptance Attachment Filter	4.51	1.21	4.69	1.18	268	-1.22

Table 10

Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adult Participants 25 to 39 years and 40 years and older under the Conceptual Domain Attachment to God - Anxious

	<u>25 – 39 years</u> <u>(N = 135)</u>		<u>40 years and</u> <u>older (N = 142)</u>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
<u>Spirituality Scale</u>						
Anxious Attachment Filter	1.99	.79	1.82	.68	275	1.96*
Anxious-Disappointment Attachment Filter	2.46	1.18	2.29	1.06	275	1.30
Anxious-Instability Attachment Filter	2.36	1.15	2.15	1.06	275	1.54
Distant Attachment Filter	2.95	.64	2.90	.59	275	.68

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

A t-test comparing the mean of adult students 25 to 39 years with that of adults 40 years and older for the Spiritual Tipping Points scale revealed no significant difference. Results for adults 25 to 39 years and adults 40 years and older for the Tipping Points scale were: ($M = 4.53$, $SD = .76$), ($M = 4.62$, $SD = .76$), $t(275) = -.98$, $p = .33$ respectively.

Table 11

Group Differences for Dependent Variables Between Adult Participants 25 to 39 years and 40 years and older under the Conceptual Domain Furnishing the Soul

	<u>25 – 39 years</u>		<u>40 years and</u>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
	<u>(N = 135)</u>		<u>older (N = 142)</u>			
<u>Spirituality Scale</u>	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>		
Furnishing the Soul through Commitment	3.92	1.13	4.26	1.04	275	-2.59*
Furnishing the Soul through Prayer	4.24	1.26	4.71	1.06	262	-3.33*
Furnishing the Soul through Spiritual Training	2.61	.95	2.97	.90	274	-3.23*
Furnishing the Soul through Community	3.73	1.30	3.94	1.12	265	-1.45
Furnishing the Soul through Loving Others	4.17	1.08	4.43	.94	265	-2.12*
Furnishing the Soul through Serving Others	2.57	.95	3.74	.88	275	-1.54

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 12

Program Impact Measures for Adult Students Including Differences Between Adults and Traditional-aged Students

<u>Impact Item</u>	<u>Adults</u> (N = 278)			<u>Traditional- aged (N = 375)</u>			<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>
	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>		
Mentoring Faculty	140	5.32	1.29	324	5.55	1.26	258.5	1.73
Staff / Administration Relationships	219	5.51	1.32	359	5.46	1.47	499.2	-.37
Student Relationships	226	5.47	1.21	367	5.51	1.47	591	.33
Traumatic Event	219	5.93	1.20	332	5.59	1.34	549	-3.05*
Cultural Diversity	171	5.39	1.23	333	4.60	1.35	371.1	-6.60**
Exposure to Cultural Diversity Issues	154	5.32	1.12	324	4.66	1.34	359	-5.65**

Relational Spirituality Literature

Relational spirituality is part of an emerging field of relational psychology which focuses on the relational aspects of human development. This section of the report will summarize the psychological constructs – object relations and attachment theories – that combine to frame a relational psychology; it will also describe the nature of the connection between the psychological constructs and a theologically-based spirituality. Finally, this section will review the *Furnishing the Soul Inventory* (FSI) and the *Furnishing the Soul* model of relational spirituality.

A relational approach to understanding mental and spiritual health is emerging in many disciplines such as neuroscience, psychoanalysis, psychotherapy, and theology (Paloutzian & Park, 2005; Shults & Sandage, 2007). Hall (2007b) traces the relational approach in psychology back to the 1940s and 1950s, citing the work of Fairbairn and Bowlby. In a departure from Freud's drive theory, these researchers developed their relational psychoanalytic models as means for explaining psychopathology. Fairbairn's theory has come to be known as object relations whereas Bowlby is credited with pioneering attachment theory. Although these two theories developed separately over the past 50 years, in the last 15 years they have merged to provide a relational approach for understanding spirituality.

Object relations and attachment theories

Object relations theory provides an explanation for how self-image is developed (Wulff, 1997). Self-image relates to how one feels he or she is perceived by others. These perceptions are formed very early in infancy through relationships with primary caregivers. Early primary caregivers contribute to forming what is known in the object relations field as the God-image (Hall & Gorman, 2003). The God-image is a label for one's perspective of God, including one's perspective of how God feels toward him or her (Byrd, & Boe, 2001; Hall, Halcrow, & Hill, 2005). Hall (2007b) claims that one's spirituality, or way of relating to and experiencing God, is a reflection of the "deep structure of internalized relationships with emotionally significant others" (p. 26). From an object relations perspective, spirituality or subjective experiences of God are connected to the "gut level" experiences of early and current "emotionally significant relationships" (p. 17).

Attachment theory provides an explanation for relationship styles (Hall, Halcrow, & Hill, 2005). Relationship style, or what is known as an attachment filter, relates to how one typically feels and behaves in his or her primary relationships. Similar to object relations theory, attachment theory proposes that these attachment filters are formed at infancy through interactions with primary caregivers (Hall & Gorman, 2003; Kirkpatrick, 1998). Labels for the different types of attachment filters help to describe the relational dynamic of the individual; these labels include secure, insecure, fearful, preoccupied, avoidant, anxious, and dismissing (Hall, Halcrow, & Hill, 2005; Kirkpatrick, 1997). Relational health is assessed by the extent to which one manifests a secure attachment filter. Essentially, an individual with a secure attachment filter is not fearful or anxious about how others feel toward him or her and consequently has the capacity to have close, loving, and caring relationships (Hall, 2006).

The relational qualities of the above two theories imply an emotional component. Hall (2004; 2007b) confirms that emotions are integral to relational functioning. Accordingly, it is the emotions associated with the early relationships with primary caregivers that contribute to forming one's relational dynamics throughout life.

These early emotions reside in what Hall identifies as the implicit level of memory or knowledge. Implicit memories are not memories that can be articulated, but are those that exist and are recalled through emotions, sensations, or feelings, at what Hall calls the "gut level" (Hall, 2007a; 2007b). Implicit memory and knowledge is in contrast with explicit memory or knowledge. Explicit knowledge is that which can be recalled and articulated through words, referred to by Hall as "head knowledge." It is the implicit memories and the emotions associated with them that form attachment filters and shape how an individual relates with others.

These implicit, non-verbal memories are powerful at shaping how one relates to others because there is a neurobiological aspect to them. When relational implicit memories are formed in the infant through interactions with primary caregivers, neurobiological pathways are formed. These pathways facilitate a powerful influence over the relational dynamics with emotionally significant others, for better or worse, throughout one's life. Implicit memory or knowledge is so powerful that it is more influential over one's relational dynamics than explicit knowledge. A lack of alignment between implicit and explicit memories or knowledge is often manifested in insecure attachment filters, or anxious and fearful relational dynamics.

To experience change or development in one's relational dynamics, change must take place at the implicit level of memory and knowledge, which is difficult because of the non-verbal quality and the neurobiological components at this level. The goal in a relational development approach is to bring the two types of memory into alignment so that there is no conflict or

contradiction between them. This type of change is not facilitated through direct action, but can be facilitated indirectly through specific types of relational connections (Hall, 2007a). These types of connections will be described when examining Hall's *Furnishing the Soul* model. Ultimately, Hall claims that these two theories – object relations and attachment – together with developments in neuroscience and narrative psychology indicate that people are “hard-wired” to connect.

Connecting relational psychology to a theologically-based spirituality

Connecting these two psychological constructs to research on spirituality is a result of the growing evidence for a relationship between psychological and spiritual maturity, health and well-being (Hall, 2004; Leffel, 2007; McMinn & Hall, 2000; Moon, 2002; Shults & Sandage, 2006). Simpson, Newman, and Fuqua (2007) maintain that the driving force behind the relational model of spirituality is that there is empirical support for a correlation between emotional health and spiritual health. Specifically, researchers have found that one's relational dynamic at infancy is a predictor of one's relational spirituality in adulthood (Byrd, & Boe, 2001; Granqvist et al., 2007; Hall, 2004; Hall, Halcrow, & Hill, 2005; Kirkpatrick, 1998).

In addition to the connection between spirituality and psychology, the literature reveals growing support for the proposition that there is a solid theological basis for linking relationships with others to a relationship with God (Hall, 2007a; Hall, Brokaw, Edwards, & Pike, 1998; Hall & Edwards, 1996; Simpson, Newman, & Fuqua, 2008). The field of relational spirituality is not limited to an approach from a theological basis, as there are broader definitions of the construct that can include people without a Christian orientation (Faver, 2004; Hill et al., 2000; Sandage & Shults, 2007)., This assessment however, is based on an approach to relational spirituality from a Christian theological tradition.

As with object relations and attachment theories, the Christian tradition defines people as relational beings. This relational nature of humanity is cited in passages from both the Old and New Testaments. The biblical creation story indicates that humankind was created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26). The triune godhead is three persons existing in perfect relationship: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. As God's creation, humans must also exist in relationship. The relational characteristic of God's image is to be manifested through relationships between people. The New Testament indicates that God is love (I Jn. 4:8). The Greatest Commandment further qualifies the relational aspect of humanity as love of self, God, and others (Mk. 12:28-31). Additionally, there is biblical support for a correlation between the quality of one's relationship patterns with others and with God (I Jn. 4:20-21). Hall (2007a) has developed a model of relational spirituality – *Furnishing the Soul* – that is based on object relations and attachment theories and has a Christian theological orientation.

The Furnishing the Soul model of relational spirituality

This assessment is based on Hall's relational spirituality model as measured by the *Furnishing the Soul Inventory* (FSI) (Hall, 2007c). The FSI is a psychometric multidimensional tool designed to assess relational spirituality based on object relations, attachment, and theological theories. Because of the complex nature of a construct like spirituality, a multidimensional assessment tool is necessary (Hill & Hood, 1999). The multidimensionality of the FSI is part of a new development in the study of religion and spirituality referred to as a multilevel interdisciplinary paradigm. Zinnbauer and Pargament (2005) characterized Hall's

work with the FSI on relational spirituality as being on the “leading edge” of this new development.

The FSI is a self-reporting web-based survey instrument with 187 items. Hall’s approach to relational spirituality organizes 22 measures of spirituality under five conceptual domains: Connecting to God, Knowing God, Attachment to God, Spiritual Tipping Points, and Furnishing the Soul. The FSI assesses both the vitality of one’s relational spirituality as well as how one is participating in the process of spiritual transformation.

Connecting to God and Knowing God: In assessing the vitality of one’s relational spirituality, the FSI provides a “snap shot” through the first three conceptual domains by focusing on emotions associated with various relational dynamics. The first two domains, Connecting to God and Knowing God, assess relational qualities one has toward God, the third domain, Attachment to God, assesses the relational qualities one has toward others. To assess the relational qualities one has toward God, the connecting domain measures how one feels toward God in terms of intimacy, in times of suffering, in finding meaning, in terms of seeing through God’s eyes, and having a sense of gratitude. The scales under this domain are based on the proposition presented earlier that there is a neurobiological component to relational dynamics, described by Hall (2007a) as individuals being “hard-wired” to connect. The Knowing God domain measures how one feels toward God in times of prayer, the focus of spiritual training or practices, and the extent to which one senses God’s guidance in decisions and presence in life. The scales under this domain are designed to tap into the implicit memories and knowledge described earlier by Hall as “unthought knows.”

Attachment to God: The third domain, Attachment to God, continues with an emotional focus by measuring the relational dynamics one has with others, but with a view toward God. For example, one item in the secure attachment scale states “I feel comfortable discussing with others how my relationship with God affects me currently” (Hall, 2007c). The scales under this domain are intended to assess and identify one’s relational style as defined by an attachment filter. Each of the seven scales assesses a different attachment filter, which include secure, realistic acceptance, forgiveness, preoccupied or anxious, disappointment, instable, and distant. The first three filters reflect a healthy or secure relational style, the next three reflect an anxious or fearful style, and the last reflects a distant relational style. One scoring high in the first three attachment scales demonstrates a capacity for loving and caring for others. In contrast, one scoring high in the last four scales demonstrates a level of preoccupation or anxiety and distance in relationships that hinders the potential to care for and love others. Understanding one’s attachment filter also provides understanding for the scores under the first two domains, Connecting to and Knowing God. It is attachment filters and the implicit memories associated with them that shape one’s relation style with others and with God.

Spiritual Transformation: The fourth and fifth domains assess how spiritual change works and the extent to which one is participating in it. In the *Furnishing the Soul* model, spiritual change or transformation translates into change in one’s attachment filter and in one’s sense of closeness and connection with God, identified by Hall as spiritual vitality. These changes are then manifest in a change in one’s capacity to love and care for others. Spiritual Tipping Points, which is the fourth domain, assesses the extent to which one is open to experiencing spiritual change, or is “tipping” toward change.

Spiritual Tipping Points: Openness in terms of spirituality can be traced back to Batson’s religion as Quest scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991a, 1991b). The Quest scale was Batson’s contribution to the then-current approach to studying religion which was based on

Allport and Ross's (1967) extrinsic–intrinsic model (E/I). The E/I model assessed religion in terms extrinsic motivations (religion used as a means to an end) or intrinsic (religion used as an end in itself) (Kirkpatrick & Hood, 1990). Batson proposed another motivation that one could have toward religion involved approaching religion as a quest. One with a quest motivation would approach religion with an open mind; this individual would be open to asking existential questions and typically was more interested in dialog than finding the “answer” (Batson, Eidelman, Higley, & Russell, 2001). This quality of openness to dialog suggests a cognitive dimension to the Spiritual Tipping Points concept. Genia (1997) added to the study of spiritual openness by developing the *Spiritual Experience Index* (SEI) (Reinert & Bloomingdale, 2000; Watson & Morris, 2005). The SEI was developed in response to some of the weaknesses of both Batson's and Allport's models. Batson's model faced reliability and validity concerns, and Genia pointed out that Allport's model was developed with an orientation for religiously involved Protestants.

In Hall's *Furnishing the Soul* model, the domain labeled Spiritual Tipping Points assesses one's openness in terms of spirituality. Spiritual openness is one of two concepts in Hall's *Furnishing the Soul* model that contributes to understanding the process of spiritual transformation, the other is what Hall labels as Furnishing the Soul. In Hall's model, spiritual transformation does not happen through direct individual effort, but is an indirect result of two phenomena: changes at the implicit memory level and experiences of certain types of relational connections. Spiritual Tipping Points and Furnishing the Soul are the two domains that tap into assessing an individual's potential for experiencing spiritual transformation. To reiterate, it is the implicit memories that shape one's attachment filter, and it is the attachment filters that shape one's relational spirituality.

Furnishing the Soul: Furnishing the Soul is the fifth domain in Hall's FSI and assesses six components of spirituality that are conducive to creating the relational connections associated with spiritual transformation. These spirituality components include spiritual commitment, prayer, spiritual training, spiritual community, loving others, and serving others. These components are assessed as they are demonstrated through spiritual practices. For example, spiritual commitment is assessed in terms of time spent reading and studying the Bible, time spent serving at church, how one's faith influences his or her finances, or sharing one's faith with others. The domains Spiritual Tipping Points and Furnishing the Soul assess two relational aspects that work together in influencing changes at the implicit memory level, and consequently changes or transformation in relational spirituality.

It is important to consider these last two domains in terms of how they relate to higher education. The cognitive dimension of Spiritual Tipping Points – one's openness to dialog and new perspectives – is consistent with some concepts found in adult learning theory, such as collaborative learning, critical reflection, and exposure to cultural diversity. The FSI assesses spiritual practices that are best experienced in a close spiritual community such as church or a cohort-based non-traditional program.

Reliability and validity

The internal reliability and validity of the FSI were initially established with a sample of 371 students from a private, Protestant university in Southern California who were administered 158 items from 21 different spirituality scales. Students in the sample had a mean age of 18.6 years, ranging from 17 to 26. Adequate to good internal consistency was demonstrated by Cronback's coefficient alphas close to or above .70. One exception was noted on the feeling distant from God scale, which had an alpha of .52. The mean alpha for all scales, excluding the dismissing God attachment scale was .85 (Hall, 2006). Twenty-two scales measuring similar constructs were correlated with the original 21 FSI scales to establish construct validity. A different sample was utilized for these analyses. This sample consisted of 483 students from a Protestant university; they had a mean age of 18.06 years ranging from 16 to 48. Overall, the FSI scales correlated significantly with the similar scales, demonstrating good construct validity for the FSI measures of spirituality.

Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were run on the 21 FSI scales. The outcome of these analyses provided good evidence that the FSI scales are "unidimensional constructs with stable psychometric properties" (Hall, personal communication, December 12, 2007). A benchmark for item loading was set at .30 or above to establish factor identity. The lowest pattern loading in all the 21 scales was .51. According to the fit indices from the confirmatory factor analyses, the theoretical model of the FSI is a good fit to the data. An additional scale labeled gratitude was added to the FSI at a later date, bringing the total number of scales in the FSI to 22.

References

- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5(4), 432-443.
- Batson, C. D., & Schoenrade, P. A. (1991a). Measuring religion as quest: 1) Validity concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 30(4), 416-429.
- Batson, C. D., & Schoenrade, P. A. (1991b). Measuring religion as quest: 2) Reliability concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 30(4), 430-447.
- Batson, C. D., Eidelman, S. H., Higley, S. L., & Russell, A. A. (2001, March). "And who is my neighbor?" II: Quest religion as a source of universal compassion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40(1), 39-51.
- Byrd, K. R., & Boe, A. (2001) The correspondence between attachment dimensions and prayer in college students. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 11(1), 9-24.
- Faver, C. A. (2004, April). Relational spirituality and social caregiving. *Social Work* 49(2), 241-249.
- Genia, V. (1997, June). The spiritual experience index: Revision and reformulation. *Review of religious Research* 38(4), 344-361.
- Granqvist, P., Ivarsson, T., Broberg, A. Gkull, B. (2007). Examining relations among attachment, religiosity, and new age spirituality using the adult attachment interview. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(3), 590-601.
- Hall, T. W. (2004) Christian spirituality and mental health: A relational spirituality paradigm for empirical research. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 23(1), 66-81.
- Hall, T. W. (2006). The Spiritual transformation inventory: A Multidimensional measure of relational spirituality for individual assessment. Unpublished manuscript.
- Hall, T. W. (2007a). *Furnishing the soul: How relational connections prepare us for spiritual transformation*. Paper presented at the Leadership Academy of Association of Christian Schools International, Phoenix, AZ.
- Hall, T. W. (2007b). Psychoanalysis, attachment, and spirituality part I: The emergence of two relational traditions. *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 35(1), 14-28.
- Hall, T. W. (2007c). *The furnishing the soul inventory, FSI version 6.1: Adult student version*.
- Hall, T. W. (2009). *Furnishing the soul: The five relational forces that guide spiritual transformation*. Symposium conducted at the Leadership Academy of Association of Christian Schools International, Phoenix, AZ.
- Hall, T. W., Brokaw, B. F., Edwards, K. J., & Pike, P. L. (1998). An empirical exploration of psychoanalysis and religion: Spiritual maturity and object relations development. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37(2), 2-25.
- Hall, T. W., & Edwards, K. J. (1996). The initial development and factor analysis of the spiritual assessment inventory. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 24(3), 233-246.
- Hall, T. W., & Gorman, M. (2003, Spring). Relational spirituality: Implications of the convergence of attachment theory, interpersonal neurobiology, and emotional information processing. *Psychology of Religion Newsletter*, 28(2), 1-12.
- Hall, T. W., Halcrow, S. R., & Hill, P.C. (2005, August). *Internal working model correspondence in implicit spiritual experiences*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Hill, C. P., & Hood Jr., R. W. (Eds). (1999). *Measures of Religiosity*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

- Hill, P. C., Pargament, K. I., Hood, R. W., McCullough, M. E., Swyers, J. P., Larson, D. B., & Zinnbauer, B. J. (2000). Conceptualizing religion and spirituality: Points of commonality, points of departure. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 30(1), 51-77.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1998, September). God as a substitute figure: A longitudinal study of adult attachment style and religious change in college students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(9), 961-974.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1997). A Longitudinal study of changes in religious belief and behavior as a function of individual differences in adult attachment style. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36(2), 207-217.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Hood, R. W. (1990). Intrinsic-extrinsic religious orientation: The boon or bane of contemporary psychology of religion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29(4), 442-462.
- Leffel, M. C. (2007). Emotion and transformation in the relational spirituality paradigm: Part 1. Prospects and prescriptions for reconstructive dialog. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 35(4), 263-280.
- McMinn, M. R., & Hall, T. W. (2000). Christian spirituality in a postmodern era. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 28(4), 251-253.
- Moon, G. W. (2002). Spiritual direction: Meaning, purpose, and implications for mental health professionals. *Journal for Psychology and Theology*, 30(4), 262-275.
- Reinert, D. F., & Bloomingdale, J. R. (2000). Spiritual experience, religious orientation, and self-reported behavior. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 10(3), 173-180.
- Sandage, S. J., & Shults, F. L. (2007). Relational spirituality and transformation: A relational integration model. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 26(3), 261-269.
- Shults, F. L., & Sandage, S. J. (2006). *Transforming spirituality: Integrating theology and psychology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Simpson, D. B., Newman, J. L., & Fuqua, D. R. (2007). Spirituality and personality: Accumulating evidence. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 26(1), 33-44.
- Simpson, D. B., Newman, J. L., & Fuqua, D. R. (2008). Understanding the role of relational factors in Christian spirituality. *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 36(2), 124-134.
- Watson, P. J., & Morris, R. J. (2005). Spiritual experience and identity: Relationships with religious orientation, religious interest, and intolerance of ambiguity. *Review of Religious Research* 46(4), 371-379.
- Wulff, D. M. (1997). *Psychology of religion: Classic and contemporary*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Zinnbauer, B. J., & Pargament, K. L. (2005). Religiousness and spirituality. In Paloutzian, R. F., & Park, C. L. (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (pp. 21-42). New York: Guilford Press.