



Religiosity and perceived emotional intelligence among Christians

Ellen Paek *

Department of Applied Psychology, New York University, 239 Greene Street, New York, NY 10003, USA

Received 15 February 2005; accepted 31 January 2006

Available online 6 May 2006

Abstract

Despite copious studies relating religiosity to various psycho-social criteria, it has not been thoroughly explored in relation to emotional intelligence (EI), the ability to perceive, understand and manage emotions toward adaptive behavior. This study examined the extent to which religiosity, operationalized as religious orientation and behavior, was related to perceived EI self-report measures among 148 church attending adult Christians. Results showed a positive correlation between intrinsic religious orientation and perceived EI, and in particular, its subcomponent emotional understanding, as well as emotional and cognitive empathy. Among behavioral measures of religiosity, only emotional understanding correlated with behavioral indices, though perceived EI overall varied significantly between groups of different levels of religious commitment, as indicated by church status and ministry service. While both attitudinal and behavioral religiosity factors were significantly predictive of perceived EI, the former proved to be more predictive than the latter. Implications of these results and limitations of the study are discussed.

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Emotional intelligence; Religiosity; Religious orientation

* Tel.: +1 425 657 0085.

E-mail address: ellenpaek@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

Researchers in the psychology of religion generally view religiosity, or the level of commitment or adherence to one's religion, as a multidimensional phenomenon with distinct psycho-social correlates (Bergin, 1991; Spilka, 2000). Allport and Ross's (1967) conceptualization of two religious orientations: *intrinsic* and *extrinsic*, serves to illustrate. Intrinsic religious orientation (ROI), which considers religion as an end itself, has been positively correlated with internal locus of control, self-motivation, academic performance, and emotional sensitivity. By contrast, extrinsic religious orientation (ROE), which considers religion as a means to gain social or personal ends, has been negatively correlated with these same outcomes (e.g., Masters & Bergin, 1992). Besides orientation, behavioral indices such as frequency of church attendance have also been empirically associated with a number of positive mental health outcomes, including, lower rates of delinquency, substance abuse, divorce, suicide, and depressive symptomatology (Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993; Wright, Frost, & Wisecarver, 1993). Based on these findings and the growing prevalence of religious adherence in the United States (Eck, 2002), expanding our understanding of religiosity in all the complexities of human experience is vital.

Even though copious research studies have related religiosity to distinct mental health criteria, it has not been thoroughly explored in relation to emotional intelligence (EI), a set of skills in perceiving, understanding and managing emotional information that fosters personal and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). EI has been hailed as being more influential than traditional IQ in determining success in life (Goleman, 1995) with a growing list of psycho-social correlates such as empathy, emotional openness, goal-orientation, life satisfaction, interpersonal satisfaction, and positive social interactions (Lopes, Salovey, & Straus, 2003; Martinez-Pons, 1997; Mayer & Geher, 1996; Salovey, Stroud, Woolery, & Epel, 2002). Yet, despite its pervasive scope, relatively little is known about the factors that might play a role in the develop-

ment of EI skills. One possible factor is religiosity. Significant associations have been found between intrinsic religiosity and dimensions of positive emotional functioning such as empathy and emotional openness (Masters & Bergin, 1992; Watson, Hood, & Morris, 1985; Watson, Hood, Morris, & Hall, 1984; Wiebe & Fleck, 1980). Building upon these preliminary findings, the present study endeavors to fill a gap in the research literature by examining the extent to which religiosity may be related to self-perceived EI. For practical purposes, this study investigated religiosity with respect to Christianity, the largest religious population in the United States (Eck, 2002).

2. Background

2.1. Religious orientation

Allport (1950) originally posited that the underlying motives for religion may be divided into “intrinsic” and “extrinsic” religious orientations. With ROI, religion constitutes an end in itself, providing personal motivation and meaning in life. In contrast, with ROE, religion is “used” as a means for self-serving purposes, such as social standing (Allport & Ross, 1967). Originally conceptualized as bipolar dimensions, the two religious orientations have been shown to be nonlin-

early associated (i.e., inversely curvilinearly related), and as such, are best treated as composing independent scales in measurement (see Burris, 1999 for detailed discussion). While Allport's conceptualization has been challenged by the notion of *quest* (Batson, Naifeh, & Pate, 1978) in which religious maturity is characterized by doubt and tolerance for ambiguity, lack of construct validity for the Quest scale, as indicated by its failure to correlate with other measures of religiousness (Donahue, 1985; Masters & Bergin, 1992), has lessened its utilization.

Indeed, decades of research have yielded a plethora of psychological correlates for religious orientation. Meta-analyses of the research literature show that ROE generally relates to negative outcomes such as anxiety, dogmatism, and prejudice, whereas ROI relates to positive outcomes such as internal locus of control, purpose in life, and lower anxiety (Donahue, 1985; Gartner, Larson, & Allen, 1991). With respect to emotion, a positive association between ROI and adaptive psychological functioning has been shown to extend to the perception and expression of feelings. Wiebe and Fleck (1980) found that intrinsically motivated individuals were more sensitive, empathetic, and open to their emotions than their extrinsically motivated counterparts. Similarly, ROI has been positively correlated with measures of empathy, while ROE was negatively correlated, even after factoring out variance associated with social desirability (Watson et al., 1984). Finally, Watson et al. (1985) found that ROI was associated with two emotionally motivated aspects of empathy: cognitive perspective-taking and altruism, whereas, ROE was inversely related.

2.2. *Perceived EI*

Since the inception of Salovey and Mayer's (1990) representation of EI, competing models and corresponding measures of EI have sprung forth (e.g., Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1995; Schutte et al., 1998). Two alternative conceptions of EI have been proposed: an ability model and a mixed model (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). Ability models define EI as a form of intelligence in which cognitive functions operate on and with emotional content (e.g., Mayer & Salovey, 1997). In contrast, mixed models incorporate adaptive aspects of personality traits with mental competencies (Bar-On, 1997; Schutte et al., 1998).

Derived from Salovey and Mayer's (1990) model of EI is the Trait Meta-Mood Scale (TMMS; Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey, & Palfai, 1995), which assesses trait-related dimensions of mood. The subscales of the TMMS make a direct conceptual link to the ability model; namely, the perception of one's own moods and emotions, the ability to discriminate among one's feelings, and the ability to repair or regulate one's moods. The scale operationalizes "perceived EI," given its subjective nature as a self-report measure (Salovey et al., 2002). In contrast to self-report measures of EI based on mixed models, the TMMS is conceptually driven (Mayer et al., 2000; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004), and has the benefit of "assessing ongoing conscious processes related to emotional thinking" (Mayer et al., 2000, p. 408).

Using the TMMS, Martinez-Pons (1997) found perceived EI to be related to higher task mastery, life satisfaction and less depressed mood. Similarly, Salovey et al. (1995) noted that high scores on the mood regulation subscale of the TMMS were associated with lower depression, greater optimism, and lower distress. Salovey et al. (2002) found that the ability to distinguish between moods and repair them was related to lower depression, lower social anxiety and greater interpersonal satisfaction.

2.3. Related research

Complementary to the exploration of religiosity and EI is the debate (Gardner, 2000) surrounding *spiritual intelligence*, or “the adaptive use of spiritual information to facilitate everyday problem solving and goal attainment” (Emmons, 2000, p. 59). Since no measure of spiritual intelligence exists, establishing a relationship between a spiritual construct such as religious orientation and emotional problem solving abilities would support the idea that spirituality engages adaptive skills.



3. Study

Given that perceived EI, ROI, and religious activity have all been associated with positive mental health outcomes, it is worth considering their relationship to each other. As cited before, intrinsically oriented individuals display more emotional sensitivity and empathy, intimating that perhaps religiosity fosters emotional skill development. If so, one can hypothesize that individuals with higher ROI will manifest higher perceived EI. Furthermore, since religious practices have been shown to facilitate self-regulation and management of goal conflicts (Emmons, 1999), which entails emotional management, one can hypothesize that those who participate more actively in religious activities will display higher perceived EI. Hence, this study investigated the relations between two major components of religiosity – religious orientation and religious activity (Spilka, 2000) – and core elements of self-perceived EI; namely, perceiving, understanding, and regulating emotions, as well as empathy (Salovey et al., 1995; Salovey et al., 2002).


3.1. Instruments

3.1.1. Trait meta-mood scale, short form (TMMS)

Perceived EI was measured with the TMMS, a 30-item scale that assesses the ability to reflect upon and manage one's own emotions. Factor analysis (Salovey et al., 1995) yielded three subscales: Attention to Feelings (AF), the ability to notice and think about one's emotions; Clarity of Feelings (CF), or the ability to understand one's moods; and Mood Repair (MR), or the ability to moderate one's feelings. Responses to the self-report items are recorded along a Likert scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly Disagree”) to 5 (“Strongly Agree”). The internal consistencies of the subscales in this study, as measured by Cronbach's alphas, were: AF = .79, CF = .80, and MR = .35. Regarding the low alpha for MR, an item by item reliability analysis revealed that three of the six items in the subscale had item-total correlations close to zero. However, even in previous studies, MR had the greatest variability in reliability with the low end of the range being marginal at .62 (e.g., Salovey et al., 1995).

3.1.2. Perspective-taking and Empathic concern subscales, Interpersonal reactivity index (IRI)


The IRI (Davis, 1980) is a 28-item multidimensional measure of empathy that integrates both cognitive and emotional aspects of empathy. Among its four subscales, the Perspective-Taking (PT) and Empathic Concern (EC) scales, described as being closely related to EI (Schutte & Malouff, 1999), were employed in this study as EI proxy variables. The PT scale measures a cogni-

tively-based ability to assume the others' viewpoints. The EC scale assesses the tendency to feel concern for others when they have negative experiences. Respondents rate themselves on each item using a Likert scale from 1 ("Does Not Describe Me Well") to 5 ("Describes Me Very Well"). Cronbach's alphas for this study were .74 for PT and .75 for EC. 

3.1.3. *Intrinsic-extrinsic scale – revised (I/E-ROS)*

The I/E-ROS (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989), consisting of items based on the original Allport and Ross (1967) Religious Orientation Scale, was used to measure religious orientation. The 14-item I/E-ROS comprises two subscales: (a) ROI and (b) ROE. The items tap into various religious values, attitudes and behaviors to which participants respond on a Likert scale from 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 5 ("Strongly Agree"). Although Extrinsic can be split into "Extrinsic-Social," or the use of religion for social gain, and (2) "Extrinsic-Personal," or the use of religion for personal comfort, security and protection, this distinction was not utilized due to sample size requirements and low reported reliabilities (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989). The alphas for this study were .66 for ROI and .72 for ROE.

3.1.4. *General survey form*

The purpose of the General Survey Form was to obtain basic demographic information and religious behavior variables. Some items pertaining to religious behaviors were adapted from the Practice Ritual Involvement Index of the Dimensions of Religious Commitment Scale (Glock & Stark, 1966). The religious behavior items in this study included frequency of church attendance, church status, frequency of personal prayer, Bible reading, financial contributions to church and/or missions, and participation in church group activities. 

3.2. *Methods*

3.2.1. *Participants*

The participants ($N = 148$; 72 females, 76 males) were recruited from six Christian churches selected on the basis of their multi-ethnic demographic congregations in four states. Eight Christian denominations were represented in the sample with the three largest groups as follows: Non-denominational 58.8%, Pentecostal 10.8%, and Evangelical 10.1%. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 73 years with a mean of 36. The three major racial/ethnic groups included Caucasian 48.6%, Asian American 26.4%, and African American 18.2%.

3.2.2. *Procedure*

The research instruments were either administered at churches or distributed by mail to interested participants. Over two-thirds of the sample was obtained in group settings. No significant ANOVA differences were found on any variables of interest when the data were grouped by collection method. The participants completed a packet of research instruments measuring perceived EI, empathy, religious orientation, religious activity and demographic variables.

3.3. *Results*

The results presented here constitute a subset of those reported elsewhere (Paek, 2004).

3.3.1. Religious orientation and perceived EI

The correlation matrix in Table 1 reveals that ROI was positively correlated with perceived EI total ($r(146) = .25, p < .01$). In particular, ROI correlated significantly with three of the five components in the following order: emotional understanding ($r(146) = .38, p < .01$), perspective taking ($r(146) = .20, p < .05$), and empathic concern ($r(146) = .19, p < .05$). ROI was unrelated to emotional perception and regulation. ROE, on the other hand, did not correlate with perceived EI total or any subcomponent except for understanding, with which it demonstrated a significant negative correlation ($r(146) = -.27, p < .01$).

3.3.2. Religious behavior and perceived EI

A significant correlation prevailed between perceived EI total and only one of the six religious behavior variables: the number of church group activities individuals participate in ($r(146) = .17, p < .05$). However, closer examination of the subcomponents revealed that the understanding subcomponent displayed significant correlations with four of the six religious behavior variables; namely, number of groups ($r(146) = .31, p < .01$), Bible reading ($r(146) = .27, p < .01$), church attendance ($r(146) = .25, p < .01$), and annual offering ($r(146) = .22, p < .01$), whereas the other subcomponents were unrelated to any of the behavior variables.

3.3.3. Church status, ministry service, and perceived EI

Since church status, the role individuals play in the church, varies in the degree and extent of social interaction, it was hypothesized that participants holding positions of relatively greater involvement would evince higher EI than those of lesser involvement. This hypothesis was tested with a one-way ANOVA analysis. The predictor, church status, comprised five major groups: deacon ($n = 14$), clergy ($n = 23$), lay member “uninvolved” in any group activities ($n = 45$), lay member “involved” ($n = 53$), and other ($n = 13$). Using the perceived EI total score as the outcome, a significant main effect for church status was found, $F(6, 141) = 2.26, p = .04$. Post hoc comparisons only revealed a significant difference between the means of uninvolved lay members and clergy, with the latter having higher perceived EI total, $p < .05$.

To further probe the relationship between religious status and perceived EI total, the five church statuses were grouped into two broader categories of ministry involvement, operationalized as engagement in activities that involve direct serving of others. The first category, “members without ministry involvement,” comprised individuals who attend church but do not serve in any official capacity. The second category, “members with ministry involvement,” referred to those who have served in some capacity. This includes not only members with official titles, such as deacons or ministers, but also laity who are in active service (e.g., Bible study facilitator). A significant main effect was found for the grouped church status, $F(2, 145) = 4.72, p = .01$. Post hoc comparisons indicated that the perceived EI total of members with ministry was significantly higher than that of members without ministry experience, $p < .01$. Other pairwise comparisons were not significant.

Table 2 reports the mean differences between members with and without ministry involvement with respect to the perceived EI and religiosity variables. According to the results of one-way ANOVAs for each respective factor, not only were members with ministry involvement more likely to be intrinsically oriented than members without, $F(2, 145) = 25.05, p < .001$, but, members with ministry involvement were also more likely to attend church more frequently, $F(2, 145) = 48.92, p < .001$, read the Bible more, $F(2, 144) = 21.22, p < .001$, give higher annual offering,

Table 1
Correlation coefficients of emotional intelligence and religiosity variables ($N = 148$)

	Attend	Years	Prayer	Read	Offer	Groups	ROI	ROE	EI Total	Per	Und	Reg	EC
Years	0.15	–											
Prayer	0.33**	–0.04	–										
Read	0.35**	0.09	0.52**	–									
Offer	0.45**	0.11	0.36**	0.41**	–								
Groups	0.28**	0.11	0.31**	0.48**	0.35**	–							
ROI	0.30**	0.07	0.44**	0.60**	0.38**	0.47**	–						
ROE	–0.02	–0.02	–0.10	–0.18*	–0.04	–0.25**	–0.19	–					
EI Total	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.11	0.10	0.17*	0.25**	–0.01	–				
EI Per	–0.05	0.00	–0.02	–0.08	–0.06	–0.04	0.00	0.16	0.75**	–			
EI Und	0.25**	0.16	0.14	0.27**	0.22**	0.31**	0.38**	–0.27**	0.66**	0.07	–		
EI Reg	–0.05	–0.06	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.09	0.13	0.12	0.47**	0.14	0.23**	–	
EC	–0.10	–0.11	0.14	0.11	0.06	0.11	0.19*	0.00	0.09	0.04	0.07	0.11	–
PT	–0.10	–0.07	0.06	0.09	0.10	0.04	0.20*	0.01	0.17*	0.02	0.15	0.28**	0.66**

Note. Attend = frequency of church attendance; Years = years of church attendance; Prayer = frequency of prayer; Read = frequency of bible reading; Offer = annual amount of offering; Groups = number of religious groups; ROI = religious orientation intrinsic; ROE = religious orientation extrinsic; EI Total = perceived emotional intelligence total; Per = emotional perception; Und = emotional understanding; Reg = emotional regulation; EC = empathic concern; PT = perspective taking.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

Table 2

Means and standard deviations of emotional intelligence and religiosity variables for members with and without ministry involvement

Variable	With involvement ^a		Without involvement ^b		$F(2, 145)^c$
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Church attendance	3.59	0.51	2.87	0.55	48.92**
Years attendance	25.31	16.03	21.51	13.13	3.76
Prayer	3.96	0.2	3.55	0.82	19.93**
Bible reading	5.51	0.85	4.41	1.56	21.22**
Annual offering	2.33	0.79	1.71	0.76	15.03**
Number of groups	3	1.44	1.38	1.03	27.54**
Intrinsic orientation	37.45	2.48	34.73	4.11	25.05**
Extrinsic orientation	13.87	4.65	15.33	4.48	2.51
EI Total	114.93	10.26	108.8	12.78	4.72*
Emotional perception	46.14	7.98	45.33	7.32	1.29
Emotional understanding	44.54	5.84	39.84	6.12	11.47**
Emotional regulation	24.25	2.79	23.62	2.9	0.93
Empathic concern	21.57	4.16	21.36	4.42	0.04
Perspective taking	19.07	4.67	18.93	3.77	0.02

^a $N = 100$, except for years attendance where $N = 98$.

^b $N = 45$ except for prayer and bible reading where $N = 44$.

^c Except for years attendance, which had $F(2, 143)$, and prayer and bible reading, which both had $F(2, 144)$.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

$F(2, 145) = 15.03$, $p < .001$, pray more, $F(2, 144) = 19.93$, $p < .001$, and be actively involved in more groups than those who did not serve, $F(2, 145) = 27.54$, $p < .001$.

3.3.4. Predictive value of religious orientation versus behavior

Given the significant correlations between religiosity variables and perceived EI, the relative predictive value of behavioral factors found to be significantly correlated with perceived EI total (i.e., number of groups, grouped church status) was assessed in comparison with an attitudinal measure of religiosity (i.e., ROI) using perceived EI total as the criterion in hierarchical regression analyses. While the linear combination of the three variables was significantly related to perceived EI total, $R^2_{\text{adj}} = .07$, $F(3, 141) = 4.727$, $p = .004$, the attitudinal variable predicted significantly over and above the behavioral variables, $\Delta R^2 = .03$, $F(1, 141) = 4.157$, $p = .043$ whereas the behavioral variables did not predict significantly over and above the attitudinal variable, $\Delta R^2 = .03$, $F(2, 141) = 2.122$, $p = .124$. In short, the behavioral religiosity variables did not contribute a significant amount of explained variance beyond that predicted by the attitudinal religiosity variable.

3.3.5. Predicting religious orientation

In considering whether religiosity might foster emotional skills, the hypotheses have focused so far on EI as the outcome. Treating the two attitudinal measures of religious orientation as a criterion variable, the question of which of the five EI measures (three subscales and two proxies) significantly contributes to the prediction of religious orientation was investigated using multiple regression analyses.

Both regressions predicting ROI and ROE were significant at $F(5,142) = 5.94$, $p < .001$ and $F(5,142) = 4.25$, $p < .001$, respectively. For predicting ROI, only understanding constituted a significant predictor, $\beta = .36$, $t(142) = 4.5$, $p < .001$, despite the fact that significant correlations between ROI and perspective taking as well as ROI and empathic concern were found, as shown in Table 1. For predicting ROE, both understanding and regulation prevailed as significant predictors with $\beta = -.32$, $t(142) = -3.92$, $p < .001$ and $\beta = .18$, $t(142) = 2.1$, $p < .04$, respectively. Although ROE did not evince a significant correlation with regulation in Table 1, in conjunction with understanding, it contributes valuable predictive information for the regression model.

4. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to empirically explore the extent to which religiosity relates to perceived EI. Religiosity was divided into attitudinal and behavioral aspects. In reviewing results pertaining to attitudinal religiosity, ROI was positively correlated with perceived EI total and with its subcomponents of understanding, empathic concern, and perspective-taking, whereas ROE was negatively correlated with understanding. These findings fall in line with Allport and Ross' (1967) theory of religious orientation, which posits that intrinsic and extrinsic motives for religion differ in nature and are associated with dissimilar psycho-social outcomes. Furthermore, the results are consistent with the empirical trend found in previous research showing that ROI relates to adaptive emotional traits, whereas ROE inversely relates to these qualities (e.g., Watson et al., 1984; Wiebe & Fleck, 1980).

Among the subcomponents of EI, emotional understanding was prominent in the results. Only understanding significantly correlated with behavioral religiosity indices. Moreover, in regression analyses, understanding served as the most significant predictor of ROE and ROI. One possible explanation for why understanding, with its emphasis on being able to clearly understand and discriminate among emotions, would stand out in particular deals with spiritual maturity among Christians. According to Bassett and Hill (1998), the ability of Christians to be discerning of "constructive" and "destructive" emotional experiences can be used as an indicator of their "spiritual maturity." Research suggest that "mature" Christians tend to be better than "immature" ones at recognizing the difference between positive and negative aspects of an emotion such as guilt (e.g., Bassett et al., 1990), an ability that falls under emotional understanding.

In considering the significant difference in perceived EI between two church statuses, clergy and uninvolved laity, with the former reporting higher overall EI, a key dissimilarity between them is ministry involvement, which includes serving others. For clergy, ministry spans a wide range of duties, from spiritual teaching and counseling to caring for the sick and needy. Many of these activities are interpersonal in nature, and are hence likely to engage EI skills.

If serving in ministry is indeed a fundamental point of distinction, even individuals who do not hold official church titles but serve actively should report higher perceived EI than those without ministry involvement. This was in fact the case. Moreover, a one-way ANOVA revealed that those who serve in ministry were likely to be more intrinsically motivated, attend church more frequently, read the Bible more, give higher annual offering, and to be involved in more groups. In short, as members with ministry involvement engage in more religious behaviors, they also tend to be more intrinsically oriented and report higher overall EI.

Finally, in contrast to the general contention in the psychology of religion that behavior may be the most convincing indicator of religious commitment (Spilka, 2000), the results indicated the reverse: religious attitudes were more strongly predictive of perceived EI than were religious behaviors. In any case, irrespective of which dimension of religiosity may be the stronger predictor, the finding that aspects of both attitudinal and behavioral factors do significantly predict perceived EI provides empirical support for the conceptualization of religiosity as multidimensional in nature and the inclusion of both aspects of religiosity in measurement.

4.1. Limitations and future directions

Two limitations with the use of the TMMS (Salovey et al., 1995) should be noted. The first regards the low Cronbach's alpha obtained for the emotional regulation subscale in the present sample. While the reason for this is unclear, the low reliability makes it difficult to interpret the failure of the regulation subcomponent to significantly correlate with the major religiosity variables. Therefore, improving the reliability of emotional regulation should be a goal for future research. The second potential limitation is that findings based on the TMMS can be understood only in terms of self-perceived EI, and not other facets of the ability model of EI, such as the interpersonal-focused abilities of perceiving and understanding emotions in others. The addition of performance-based tasks as well as observational methods would likely contribute to increased validity, and potentially expand significant findings into new territories.

Future research can also shed light on the question of whether behavioral and religious factors provide the means by which individuals can become intrinsically motivated and hence, emotionally intelligent, or conversely, whether ROI in an already emotionally intelligent person causes the person to become more actively engaged in religious behaviors. This question can be empirically addressed by experimental design and longitudinal studies.

5. Conclusion

As research in the field of EI continues to accumulate important psycho-social outcomes associated with EI (Mayer et al., 2004), an area that to date has not received much attention is religiosity. The present study sought to address this gap in the literature by exploring the relationship between religiosity and perceived EI. Various facets of religious attitude and behavior were found to be significantly correlated with perceived EI, especially those emotional abilities that involve understanding one's own emotions and the capacity to feel empathy for others and take their perspective. Contributing to the concurrent validity of the construct of EI, the findings of this study serve as a preliminary basis for further research into the religious factors involved in the exercise of keen abilities that fall under the rubric of EI.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Lisa Suzuki, Bob Malgady, and Jacqueline Mattis for their valuable input in reviewing earlier drafts of this study.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1950). *The individual and his religion: a psychological interpretation*. New York: Macmillan.
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432–443.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar-On emotional quotient inventory: Technical manual*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bassett, R. L., Hill, P. C., Pogel, M. C., Lee, M., Hughes, R., & Masci, J. (1990). Comparing psychological guilt and Godly sorrow: do Christians recognize the difference? *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 18, 244–254.
- Bassett, R. L., & Hill, P. C. (1998). The ACE model of emotion: living Jesus Christ while experiencing emotions. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 26(3), 232–246.
- Batson, C. D., Naifeh, S. J., & Pate, S. (1978). Social desirability, religious orientation and racial prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 17, 31–41.
- Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W. L. (1993). *Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bergin, A. (1991). Values and religious issues in psychotherapy and mental health. *American Psychologist*, 46, 394–403.
- Burris, C. T. (1999). Religious orientation scale. In P. Hill & R. W. Hood, Jr. (Eds.), *Measures of religiosity* (pp. 144–151). Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.
- Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85.
- Donahue, M. J. (1985). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(2), 400–419.
- Eck, D. (2002). *A new religious America: how a Christian country has become the world's most religiously diverse nation*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Emmons, R. A. (1999). *The psychology of ultimate concerns: Motivation and spirituality in personality*. New York: Guilford.
- Emmons, R. A. (2000). Spirituality and intelligence: problems and prospects. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 10(1), 57–64.
- Gardner, H. (2000). A case against spiritual intelligence. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 10(1), 27–34.
- 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(1), 6–25.
- Glock, C., & Stark, R. (1966). *Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Gorsuch, R. L., & McPherson, S. E. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E-revised and single-item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28(3), 348–354.
- Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., & Straus, R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, personality, and the perceived quality of social relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 641–658.
- Martinez-Pons, M. (1997). The relation of emotional intelligence with selected areas of personal functioning. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 17, 3–13.
- Masters, K. S., & Bergin, A. E. (1992). Religious orientation and mental health. In J. F. Schumaker (Ed.), *Religion and mental health* (pp. 221–232). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mayer, J. D., & Geher, G. (1996). Emotional intelligence and the identification of emotion. *Intelligence*, 22, 89–113.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and EI: Implications for educators* (pp. 3–31). New York: Basic.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Models of EI. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (pp. 396–420). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2004). Emotional intelligence: theory, findings and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197–215.
- Paek, E. (2004). The role of religiosity in emotional intelligence: an empirical study of Christians. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65 (3-B), pp. 1599.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9, 185–211.

- Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Goldman, S. L., Turvey, C., & Palfai, T. P. (1995). Emotional attention, clarity, and repair: Exploring emotional intelligence using the Trait Meta-Mood Scale. In J. W. Pennebaker (Ed.), *Emotion, disclosure, & health* (pp. 125–154). Washington, DC: APA.
- Salovey, P., Stroud, L. R., Woolery, A., & Epel, E. S. (2002). Perceived emotional intelligence, stress reactivity, and symptom reports: further explorations using the Trait Meta-Mood Scale. *Psychology and Health*, 17(5), 611–627.
- Schutte, N. S., & Malouff, J. M. (1999). *Measuring emotional intelligence and related constructs*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., et al. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 167–177.
- Spilka, B. (2000). Psychology of religion: Empirical approaches. In D. Jonte-Pace & W. B. Parsons (Eds.), *Religion and psychology: Mapping the terrain* (pp. 30–42). New York: Routledge Press.
- Watson, P. J., Hood, R. W., Jr., & Morris, R. J. (1985). Dimensions of religiosity and empathy. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 4(3), 73–85.
- Watson, P. J., Hood, R. W., Jr., Morris, R. J., & Hall, J. R. (1984). Empathy, religious orientation, and social desirability. *Journal of Psychology*, 117, 211–216.
- Wiebe, K. F., & Fleck, J. R. (1980). Personality correlates of intrinsic, extrinsic, and nonreligious orientations. *Journal of Psychology*, 105, 181–187.
- Wright, L. S., Frost, C. J., & Wisecarver, S. J. (1993). Church attendance, meaningfulness of religion, and depressive symptomatology among adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 22(5), 559–568.