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PERSONALITY

Human beings came in different shapes and sizes, each having their own strengths and weaknesses. What is right for one person may not be right for another. There are things that are important for one but don’t make any sense for other. But we need to understand each other and communicate well because we live together in the same world. So by learning about personality, we can improve inter-personal relationships and gain a better understanding and self-knowledge that will help us in defining and achieving our goals.

In psychology, personality is a collection of emotional, thought and behavioral patterns unique to a person that is consistent over time. The word personality originates from the Latin word “persona” meaning theatrical mask. “Persona” implies pretensions, mere appearance, false traits and assumed character and not the real thing. In contrast, personality is who we truly are, which makes us unique, our heritable traits, qualities, and shortcomings. It is what we are defined as: happy, moody, negative, bubbly etc., how we take what happens to us and how we apply it to what we believe and live our life.

PERSONALITY: CONCEPT AND DEFINITIONS
Allport (1937) listed 50 definitions of personality derived from different shades of meaning of the term ranging from external (false, mask like) manner to the true self. He mentioned both inner qualities and behavior, but he emphasized on inner qualities. “Personality is dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment. (Allport, 1937, p.48).

McClelland (1950) defines personality as the most adequate conceptualization of a person’s behavior in all its details that a scientist can give at a moment of time. Theodore Millon and Roger Davis (1989) in their Opus Magnum, “Personality Disorders in Modern Life” define personality as; (A) complex of deeply embedded psychological characteristics that are expressed automatically in almost every area of psychological functioning”. (p.2).

Hogan (1991) believes that personality has two different meanings and the failure to separate those leads to confusion. The first is a person's social reputation, which refers to the way an individual is perceived by others; it is personality from the observer's perspective and is public and verifiable. The second refers to the structures, dynamics, processes, and propensities that explain why a person behaves in a characteristic way; it is private and must be inferred. McCrae and Costa (1989) define personality as enduring emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal, and motivational styles that explain behavior in different situations. Funder (2001) defines personality as "an individual's characteristic pattern of
thought, emotion, and behavior, together with the psychological mechanisms--hidden or not--behind those patterns."

A contemporary definition for personality is offered by Carver and Scheier (2000): “Personality is a dynamic organization, inside the person, of psychophysical systems that create a person’s characteristic patterns of behavior, thoughts, and feelings” (p.5)

- Dynamic Organization: suggests ongoing readjustments, adaptation to experience, continual upgrading and maintaining Personality doesn’t just lie there. It has process and it’s organized.
- Inside the Person: suggests internal storage of patterns, supporting the notion that personality influences behaviors, etc.
- Psychophysical systems: suggests that the physical is also involved in ‘who we are’.
- Characteristic Patterns: implies that consistency/continuity which are uniquely identifying of an individual

Behavior, Thoughts, and Feelings: indicates that personality includes a wide range of psychological experience/manifestation: that personality is displayed in many ways.

- Carver and Sheier (2000, p.5) suggest that the word personality “conveys a sense of consistency, internal causality, and personal distinctiveness”. This issue of “personal distinctiveness is very important. There are certain universal characteristics of the human race and particular features of
individuals. We all for example experience stress and the elevated cortisol that goes with it, and we all suffer the immune suppressive effects thereof. But each of us is unique too.

- An individual's pattern of psychological processes arising from motives, feelings, thoughts, and other major areas of psychological function. Personality is expressed through its influences on the body, in conscious mental life, and through the individual's social behavior" (Mayer, 2005).

Although personality theorists differ in their terminology, most agree that personality is an internal, mental and emotional pattern of response to the environment- a pattern of though, feeling and behavior that affects every aspect of persons life. Personality is a quality that makes one person stands out from others. Personality is responsible for establishing the boundaries by which we live our life and forms the expectations we have of ourselves and of other people. However Mischel (1985) argued that people show so much variability across situations that we cannot make useful predictions about their behavior from personality.

The growing bodies of evidence suggest that people do show a considerable degree of consistency in their behavior across situations (Heatherton & Weinberger, 1994: Steel & Rentsch, 1997) and there are events when an individual shows contrasting patterns of behavior in different situations, these actions may be functionally equivalent for that person (Friedman & Schustack, 1999). Thus our behavior in any given situation is usually a complex function of
both our personality and situational factors in the world (Vansteelandt & Van Mechelen, 1999).

A human being is something more than his body. There is a subtle essence in him, which makes him alive and conscious. Human personality functions at different levels, which can be broadly classified as – Physical, Emotional, Mental, Intellectual, Moral and Spiritual.

The physical level refers to the body, which exists in the case of all beings. The senses and the organs of action are situated in it. The body undergoes continuous change from the birth to death.

The emotional level refers to the various sentiments, which are expressed under different circumstances. It also exists in all beings.

The mental level refers to the mind which is the inner sense that coordinates the sensations and brings together the impressions. Thus a man is able to understand the color, sound, smell, taste, form etc, belonging to a particular object.

The intellectual level represents the higher capacity of mind, which assists a person to judge what is wrong and what is right; what is truth and what is falsehood and the like. All the great achievements of man are due to the fact that he is blessed with intellect.

The moral level springs from the intellectual level. When a man knows the right path, he decides to proceed on it, but this doesn’t always happen. At times he
is aware that what he is doing is wrong that is, he is not prepared to rise to the higher level, though he knows it.

The spiritual level is the highest level reached by a man. Unless a man leads a good, moral life, he cannot expect to rise to this level. It is said in Kathopanishad,

“If a man doesn’t desist from evil conduct, if he doesn’t control his senses and have a balanced and tranquil mind, he cannot realize the Atman by mere intellect”.

The physical, emotional and metal level may be called animal level as they exist in all animals. The intellectual and moral levels may be called the human level as they exist in man. The spiritual level is the divine level. It is needless to say that a man should raise himself from the animal level to the human level and from the human level to the divine level.

**THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO PERSONALITY**

There are several theoretical perspectives on personality in psychology, which involve different ideas about the relationship between personality and psychological constructs.

Some have developed broad theories to explain the origins and make up of personality. Others have focused only on one or two issues, such as the influence of heredity on personality.
One of the most popular and oldest approaches to study personality is the dispositional approach (also called the type-trait approach) which views personality as a combination of stable internal characteristics that define who people are and that motivate them to behave in certain ways. (Allport, 1961: Murray, 1962).

From the beginning of the recorded history attempts have been made to classify people into groups or types. The personality types are used to communicate certain expected behaviors based on similarities. Such efforts have been made since ancient times. Hippocrates (Ca, 460 B.C) an ancient Greek physician suggested that a certain temperament is associated with each of the four body fluids or humors: blood, phlegm, black bile and yellow bile and personality types depends on how much of each humor a person has, resulting in a sanguine, phlegmatic, melancholic or choleric personality type.

Ernest Kretschmer (1921) claimed that there are four main physical types: pyknic type, asthenic type, atheletic type and dysplastic type.

Sheldon (1940) modified Kretschmer’s classification and suggested that difference in physical traits could be expressed as qualitative variation of three basic components; endomorphy, mesomorphy and ectomorphy.

Other type theorists have tried to relate peoples’ physical appearance to the type of personality they develop (Williams, 1967). However research has not supported the validity of compressing human personality into a few types based on facial or bodily characteristics alone. But the possibility of some associations
between body type and personality continues to intrigue investigators (Metzer, 1980).

The difficulty with the type approaches to personality is that the extent or degree of each characteristic is not measured. An individual either does or does not belong to the type, but personality is not that simple. Traits, in contrast, are continuous qualities that individuals possess in different amounts. Traits are distinguishing qualities or characteristics of a person. Traits are a readiness to think or act in a similar fashion in response to a variety of different stimuli or situations.

In general, trait theory assumes that people differ on variables or dimensions that are continuous. People are seen to be different in the amounts or quantities of a characteristic rather than differ in the quality of those characteristics.

According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association, Personality traits are “prominent aspects of personality that are exhibited in a wide range of important social and personal contexts.” In other words, persons have certain characteristics, which partially determine their behavior.

One of the first efforts to identify human traits is the work of Gordon Allport (1961). Allport delineated different kinds of traits or dispositions; Central traits, Secondary traits, Cardinal traits and Common traits.
Central traits are basic to individual’s personality while secondary traits are more peripheral. Common traits are those recognized within a culture and thus vary from culture to culture. Cardinal traits are those by which a person may be strongly recognized.

Allport emphasized the individuality of the individual’s world and the uniqueness of personality, and presented the image of man neither dominated by the “stimulus-response” schema nor the “pleasure-pain” principle. His concept of “functional autonomy” stresses the present moment and the relative unimportance of genetic explications of behavior.

Raymond Cattell (1973) carried a profound research and proposed a two tiered personality structure with sixteen “primary factors”(16PF) and five “secondary factors”. However the most important sub-division of traits involved the distinction between surface traits and the source traits. Surface traits represent group or cluster of the overt variables that seem to go together in many different individuals and circumstances. Source traits; on the other hand seem to determine the manifestations of surface traits.

A different model based on the Cattell’s sixteen-factor model was developed by Hans Eysenck (1970, 1981) who believed that just three traits – extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism were sufficient to describe human personality.
People high on psychoticism show traits as cruelty, hostility, coldness, oddness and rejection of social customs. Those low on psychoticism do not show these traits.

Introversion-Extroversion: Extraverts are sociable and outgoing, enjoy parties and other social activities; take risks and love excitement and change. Introverts tend to be quite, thoughtful and reserve, enjoying, solitary pursuits and avoiding excitement and social involvement.

Neuroticism (also called emotional instability): At one extreme of neuroticism are traits such as moodiness, restlessness, worry, anxiety and other negative emotions. People at the opposite end of this dimension are calm, even tempered, relaxed and emotionally stable.

According to Eysenck, combining varying degrees of emotional-stability and introversion-extraversion produces characteristic combinations of traits. Eysenck’s analysis has considerable research support (Eysenck, 1982) and remains influential. However, more recent factor analytic research has led many trait theorists to believe that five factors and not three, best define the organization of human personality (McCrae and John, 1992).

One of the most prominent models in contemporary psychology is what is known as the five factor model of personality (Digman, 1990). This theory incorporates five different variables into a conceptual model of personality. The five different factors are often referred to as the “Big 5” (Ewen, 1998, p.140). The five-factor theory is among the newest models developed for the description of
personality and this model promises to be among the most practical and applicable models available in the field of personality (Digman, 1990). However Eysenck (1991) felt that, due to overlaps in the five factors and their correlates, in fact, a three-factor model, is more appropriate and accurate.

Ewen (1998, p.141) reported that the big five dominates the landscape of current psychological research. The five factors are extraversion-introversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness (Ewen, 1998).

Neuroticism is the other trait to play a role in most of the contemporary factor models for personality. In some studies, adjustment is examined as a factor, instead of neuroticism. In this case, higher scores will indicate a positive result, consistent with the other four factors. This is because; the term neuroticism has an inherent negative denotation (Bradshaw, 1997). The bases for neuroticism are higher levels of anxiety and volatility. Within these bounds, neuroticism is a dimension of personality defined by stability and low anxiety at one end as opposed to instability and anxiety at the other end, (Pervin, 1989, P.G-7).

Extraversion has long been one of the traits that have appeared in factor analytic models. Extraversion also is sometimes referred to as social adaptability, though the popularity of this term seems to be waning (Zuckerman, 1991). Extraversion is defined as “a trait characterized by a keen interest in other people and external events, and venturing forth with confidence into the unknown” (Ewen, 1998, p.289).
Extraverts are, of course, sociable, but sociability is not the only trait that comprise the domain of extraversion. In addition to liking people and preferring large groups and gatherings, extraverts are also assertive, active, and talkative. They like excitement and stimulation and tend to be cheerful in disposition. They are upbeat, energetic, and optimistic.

As a major dimension of personality, openness to experience is much less well known than neuroticism or extraversion. The elements of openness to experience are active imagination, aesthetic sensitivity, attentiveness to inner feelings, and preference for variety, intellectual curiosity and independence of judgment—have often played a role in theories and measures of personality, but their coherence into a single broad domain has seldom been recognized. The NEO-PI-R openness scale is perhaps the most widely researched measure of this broad domain (McCrae and Costa, 1985a).

Open individuals are curious about both inner and outer worlds, and their lives are experientially richer. They are willing to entertain novel ideas and unconventional values, and they experience both negative and positive emotions more keenly than do closed individuals.

Like extraversion, agreeableness is primarily a dimension of interpersonal tendencies. The agreeable person is fundamentally altruistic. He or she is sympathetic to others and eager to help them, and believes that others will be equally helpful in return. By contrast, the disagreeable or antagonistic person is egocentric, skeptical of others intentions, and competitive rather than cooperative.
It is tempting to see the agreeable side of this domain as both socially preferable and psychologically healthier, and it is certainly the case that agreeable people are more popular than antagonistic individuals. However, the readiness to fight for one’s own interests is often advantageous, and agreeableness is not a virtue on the battlefield or in the courtroom.

A great deal of personality theory, particularly psychodynamic theory, concerns the control of impulses. During the course of development most individuals learn to manage their desires, and the inability to resist impulses and temptations is generally a sign of high neuroticism among adults. But self-control can also refer to a more active process of planning, organizing and carrying out tasks, and individual differences in this tendency are the basis of conscientiousness.

The conscientious individual is purposeful, strong willed, and determined. Digman and Takemoto-Chock (1981) refer to this domain as Will to Achieve. On the positive side, high conscientiousness is associated with academic and occupational achievements; on the negative side, it may lead to annoying fastidiousness, compulsive neatness, or workaholic behavior.

Conscientiousness is an aspect of what was once called character; high conscientiousness scores are scrupulous, punctual, and reliable. Low scores are not necessarily lacking in moral principles, but they are less exacting in applying them, just as they are more lackadaisical in working towards their goals. There is
some evidence that they are more hedonistic and interested in gender (Costa, Busch & McCrae, 1986).

Individuals also differ when viewed by the order of their births. Frank. J. Sulloway (1956) has mounted evidence that birth order is correlated with personality traits: first born are statistically more conscientious, more socially dominant, less agreeable and less open to new ideas compared to later born.

A series of research studies have been carried out to examine how basic and therefore how important are the “Big-Five” dimensions. Although they are far from complete agreement on this point (Friedman & Schustack, 1999), many researchers believe that these dimensions are indeed basic ones. This in indicated, in part, by the fact that these dimensions are ones by which people in many different cultures refer in describing themselves. (Funder & Colvin, 1991), and by the fact that we can often tell where the individuals stand along at least some of these dimensions from an initial meeting with them that lasts for a few minutes (Zebrowitz & Colvins, 1997). Funder and Sneed (1993) and Watson (1989) also found that substantial agreement is obtained for at least some of the big five dimensions.

Although many psychologists view big five dimensions as truly basic, there is not total consensus on this point. The Five Factor Model seems to fail to anticipate behavior in many situations. The same virtues that allow Five Factor Model to hold true across cultural boundaries is its fault in specific situations.
The five variables are too broad (Mc Adams, 1992). Mc Adams accurately sums up this problem by saying, “Because the Big Five operate at such a general level of analysis, trait scores…may not be especially useful in prediction of specific behavior patterns in particular situations (Mc Adams, 1992, p.338).

Block (1995) believe that the methods on which the big five dimensions are based are inadequate. By and large, though, many psychologists view Big-Five as providing important insights into the key dimensions of personality.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

As personality shapes and is shaped by the compelling forces of culture and is both a cause and consequence of society, societal trends are important sources of information for personality theorizing. Spirituality and religiosity are an integral part of human culture and as such they have the potential to shape individual lives and personality and in turn personality psychology is ideally situated to stimulate progress in understanding spiritual and religious influence in the lives of human beings. Personality psychology has long claimed to be concerned with understanding what is central to human functioning. Personality psychologists are said to provide glimpses of what it is like to be human. Religious goals and spiritual beliefs and practices are not only distinctive components of a person, but they are the core of the personality.

The present study entitled “A study of Personality Correlates of Spirituality and Religiosity” is an attempt to understand the link between various domains of
Personality, spirituality and religiosity. Moreover, the relationship between spirituality and religiosity is undertaken in the present study.

Personality is considered as “dimension of individual differences in tendencies to show consistent patterns of thoughts, feelings and actions (McCrae & Costa, 1990). Hence personality and personality traits are considered as dispositions that describe what people are like and how they will react. In contrast, spirituality and religiosity are attitudes that can be located on the attitudinal level along with the concepts like patriotism, nationalism and conservation. Although it has been argued that attitudes share some important characteristics with traits but these are different constructs and their relationship with other variables differs. The main difference between both the constructs is that traits are considered to be better predictors of spontaneous and intuitive behaviors over which one have little cognitive control whereas attitudes are considered as better predictors of goal directed behavior that are under cognitive control. Therefore the study of relationship between personality traits and spiritual and religious attitudes can bring new insights to the research on personality.

SPIRITUALITY: THEORETICAL ANTECEDENTS

The modern science during the last 200 years has achieved enough and given mankind all materialistic comforts but failed to inculcate morality and discipline in man. In this era of spiritual drought and torpor of human soul, it is very much desired that our old age traditional values should be made open to the people of the world. The materialistic evolution can solve the problems related to
hunger, poverty, insanitation, illiteracy, environmental pollution, illness and unemployment but then through the process of spirituality, one can achieve compassion, love, honesty and integrity, peace, tolerance, morality, discipline and humanism without which the very existence of mankind will be at stake. Morality, discipline and meditation is essential for spiritual development.

Throughout history, spirituality has been a major divine force in all the religions of the world, cultures and traditions. Spirituality has become increasingly visible theme in the second half of the 20th century. In the recent years, an increasing amount of theoretical, scientific and professional literature has appeared that is concerned with the exploration of the relevance of the study of spirituality to human functioning and the practice of psychology, medicine and counseling.

Spirituality has become particularly interesting to professional caregivers working with clients suffering from diseases, illness, chronic pain, trauma, the challenges of dying and processes of grief and bereavement.

Spirituality is one of the most important sources of strength and direction in peoples' lives. Spiritual side of human nature remains important to Indian lives. James (1902/1958) and Allport (1961) have considered spirituality as a proper subject for scientific study. Spirituality is a human phenomenon, which exists in almost all persons. (Husain, 2002). Spirituality is a grounding wire, a lens to look at life through, the roots that hold us firmly to the ground and the trunk that holds strong against inclement weather as branches continue to grow and change. Our
spirituality is a picture of our essence, a snapshot of our most basic understanding of ourselves, the world around us, and the world beyond us.

The term spirituality is coined from the Latin word spiritus, meaning “breath of life”. In modern dictionary the word spirituality is a translation of the term Ruhnaiya (in Arabic) derived from the adjective ruhani which means, mind or animating principles as distinct from body. The definition of spirituality provided by the tenth edition of Oxford English Dictionary is as follows: “the quality or condition of being spiritual, attachment to or regard for the thing of the spirit as opposed to material or worldly interest.” Belief in the spiritual reality continues to characterize majority of people, be it belief in a Supreme Being or order, life after death, an ultimate reality or super-natural beings, like angels and demons. Whatever behavioral scientists and health care professional may themselves believe the spiritual side of human remains important to many or most people.

A substantial number of people describe spirituality as the most important source of strength and direction in their lives. We inherent spiritual elements from our parents as well as from the previous elements. Our spiritual essence possesses the assimilated elements of past lives of the community, history, arts, and cosmic world and beyond.

Spirituality has been a proper subject for scientific study. William James (1958), Carl Jung (1933, 1964); Abraham Maslow (1962, 1966, 1970, 1971); Rudolph Otto (1923); John Dewey (1934); Gordon Allport (1950); Mircea Eliade
(1959); Martin Buber (1970); Erich Fromm (1950); Victor Frankl (1963) have explored this concept far more than a century ago. Definitions of spirituality in relevant literature usually included some version of the following words and phrases; feeling connected or belonging to the universe, believing in the power outside one’s self, searching for a sense of meaning or purpose, experiencing transcendence and immanence, seeking one’s ultimate and personal truths, experiencing a numinous quality, knowing unity of the visible and invisible, having an internal relationship between the individual and the Divine, encountering limitless love, and moving towards personal wholeness (Canda, 1955; Decker, 1993; Ganje- Fling & Mc Carthy, 1996; King, 1985: Wulff, 1996). An operational definition of spirituality is yet to come. A great idea of convergence and overlapping were found among the various writers in their implicit descriptions of spirituality. It become increasingly clear that spirituality would not be defined in simple words because it is a complex phenomenon.

One of the first and the foremost frequently cited attempts to define spirituality was by Allport and Ross (1967). They proposed a form of spirituality that was characterized by a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity. This distinction went beyond mere public religious behaviors to the subjective experience of religiousness. Intrinsic religiousness refers to the extent someone internalized and lived by their commitment to their religious beliefs (Park, Meyers & Czar, 1998). This was suggested to demonstrate the cognitive complexity and the capacity to doubt and question their beliefs. Extrinsic religiousness on the
other hand describes an orientation towards an external, self-serving religiousness that is often characterized by conformity to rules. (Allport & Ross, 1967).

**WHAT IS SPIRITUALITY?**

Elkins and others (1988) proposed a humanistic definition and description of spirituality. According to them, “spirituality is a way of being and experiencing that comes about through awareness of a transcendent dimension and that is characterized by certain identifiable values in regard to self, others, nature, life and whatever one considers to be the ultimate” (p. 10).

A functional definition of spirituality which has been adopted by the California state psychological association task force of spirituality and psychotherapy—“courage to look within and to trust”: implying that what is seen and what is trusted appears to be a deep sense of belongingness, of wholeness, of connectedness and of openness of the infinite.

Spirituality which has always been considered to be a natural part of being human, is an innate human capacity to transcend the ego-centric perspective from which people constantly experience and evaluate their lives, opening them to be broader world view, a heightened capacity of loving, and an increased motivation to enhance the greater good (Chandler, Holder & Colander, 1992). According to Vrinte (1996), spirituality is inspired and sustained by transpersonal experiences that originate in the deepest recesses of the human being and they are but natural
modifications of that domain of the human psyche and that contains greater depth of life.

More recent research has gone beyond the boundaries of the formalized religion to define spirituality. For example: Mac Donald (2000) extensively examined both theoretical and empirical literature for common assumptions regarding spirituality from a wide range of sources and reported that a number of points of agreement do exist. Spirituality has been defined as a multidimensional subjective experience (Elliot, 1998; Hamilton & Jackson, 1998, Chew, Fisher, Hunter Ledbetter, Smith, & Vosler , 1991), that includes experiences labeled spiritual, religious, peak, mystical, transpersonal, transcendent and numinous (Mac Donald, 2000), and is often experienced through the practice of spiritual disciplines such as prayer and meditation (Poloma, 1993) irrespective of a specific religious faith (Fisher, 2000).

Elkins (2001), a vocal proponent of humanistic oriented spirituality offers six qualities of spirituality.

(1) Spirituality is universal; (2) it is a human phenomenon; (3) its common core is phenomenological; (4) it is our capacity to respond to numinous; (5) it is characterized by a mysterious energy and (6) its ultimate aim is compassion.

Swinton (2001/2003) has defined spirituality as the outward expression of the inner working of the human spirit. It is an intra, inter and transpersonal experience that is shaped and directed by the experiences of individuals and of the communities within which they live out their lives.
Perrin (2007) defines spirituality in terms of spirit. According to him, the spirit refers to human consciousness, a constitutive dimension of human beings, and to capacity for self consciousness. The spirit involves the deepest dimension of life.

Kabbani (2008) regarded spirituality as a powerful weapon. He called it a struggle between acceptance and non acceptance, belief or unbelief.

**DIMENSIONS OF SPIRITUALITY**

Spirituality is not adequately defined by any single continuum or dichotomous classification; rather, it has many dimensions. Spirituality is better understood as a multidimensional space in which every individual can be located (Larson, Sawyers & McCullough, 1997).

The dimensions of spirituality includes both conscious and awareness aspects. It is the basic substance out of which everything is form. It is everything, which exists between this world and other world. Those who are aware of the spiritual dimension of personality often explain the thing from the phenomenology. The spiritual realm is beyond our five senses. Most of us are bodily conscious (public or private) of the world that centered around us. Spiritual realms taught us how to transcend physical consciousness into spiritual consciousness. Spiritual consciousness is becoming consciousness of the spirit or soul. Spirit is a conscious entity that inhabits the body. Spirit is an ocean of unconditional love. The study of the dimensions or the components of spirituality
is a matter of both serious debate and scientific study. Different scholars describe spirituality into a large number of dimensions. For example: Glock and Stark (1965) described four elements or domains all of which are associated with the context of religion: the experiential, the ritualistic, the intellectual and the consequential. Capps and others (1976) offered six spiritual dimensions within religion; the mythological, ritual, experiential, dispositional, social and directional. Elkins et al (1988) identified nine core dimensions of spirituality: transcendent, meaning and purpose in life, mission in life, sacredness of life, material values, altruism, idealism, and awareness of the tragic and the fruits of spirituality.

Karasu (1999) explained the three ways to spirituality in the context of belief: belief in the sacred, belief in unity and belief in transformation.

Miller and Thorensen (2000) proposed three broad measurement domains; spiritual practices, beliefs and experiences. These three domains are meant to characterize spirituality within and outside the context of religion and are consistent with a psychological perspective that is sensitive to cultural, ethnic, socio-economic and religious differences.

Greenwald and Harder (2001) identified seven interpretable factors out of which four represented various dimensions of spirituality. One indicated what is not spiritual. One reflected the positive tone of many of the items and the last represented the adventurousness. The four spiritual factors were named as loving connection to others, self-effacing altruism, blissful transcendence and religiosity/sacredness. The one factor that garnered very low ratings for
spirituality was named lonely/angry and consisted items related to anger, pointlessness, selfishness, abandonment and loneliness.

Pervez (2002) define spirituality in phenomenological perspective and identified the dimension of spirituality in Hindus and Muslims. The dimension of spirituality identified in the sample of Hindus were; belief in the sacredness, personal philosophy, transcendence, and spiritual well being. Muslim people have described spirituality in terms of five dimensions: belief in the sacredness, personal philosophy, transcendence, spiritual well-being and consequences of death.

CENTRAL FEATURES OF SPIRITUALITY

Kuhalampi (2010) lists the following central features of spirituality.

- Meaning of the ontological significance of life; making sense of situations; deriving purpose in existence.
- Value beliefs and standards that are cherished; having to do with the truth, beauty, worth of a thought, object or behavior; often discussed as ultimate values.
- Transcendence experience and appreciation of a dimension beyond the self; expanding self –boundaries.
- Connecting relationship with self, others, God and the environment.
- Becoming an unfolding of life that demands reflection and experience; including a sense of who one is and how one knows.
• Hope a prospect of confidence and trust towards the future

The present study is guided by the Spirituality model developed after the process of concept analysis, synthesis and derivation (Walker & Avant, 1988) and conceptual mapping (Waltz, Strickland & Lenz, 1984) of observable indicators of spirituality. This model takes into account four dimensions of spirituality—Unifying interconnectedness, Purpose and meaning in life, Innerness of inner resources and Transcendence.

Unifying interconnectedness is defined as the feeling of linkage or attachment to others, and a feeling of oneness with the universe and/or a universal element of Supreme Being. The definition of Unifying interconnectedness was drawn from the work of Zumeta (1993, p. 26) who state “spirituality is an awareness of the connectedness of all things” and Shafranske (1984, p. 233) who defined spirituality as the courage to look within and trust.

Purpose and meaning in life is defined as the process of searching for or discovering events or relationship that provides a sense of worth, hope and/or reason for living existence. The actual ground and the content of this meaning vary from person to person, but the common factor is that each person has filled the “existential vacuum” with an authentic sense that life has a purpose and meaning.

Innerness or Inner resources is defined as the process of striving for and/or discovering wholeness, identity and a sense of empowerment. Innerness or inner resources are manifested in the feelings of strength in times of crisis, calmness or
serenity in dealing with uncertainty in life, guidance in living, being at peace with one’s self and the world, and the feeling of ability.

Transcendence is defined as the ability to reach or exceed the limits of the usual experience, the capacity, willingness or experience of rising above or overcoming bodily or psychic conditions of the capacity for achieving wellness and / or self healing that is, the spiritual person believes in the “more” that what is seen is not all there. He or she believes in an unseen world and the harmonious contact with, and adjustment to this unseen dimension is beneficial.

The four dimensions of spirituality are inter-related and are influenced by demographic characteristics like age, gender, marital status and income and the situational factors which include the experience of crisis event and possibly state of health.
CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF SPIRITUALITY
RELIGIOSITY: CONCEPT AND DEFINITIONS

The events of the past two decades have created a universal sense of bewilderment. In 18th and 19th centuries men believed that with the progress of science and the increased control over nature, which it must bring, man's lot will steadily improve and will bring such a vision that men will cease killing and tormenting each other. The shock of the two world wars has been enough to shake this false confidence in man's future; and yet strange as it may seem, ideas of the 18th and 19th centuries persist in the solution proposed and remedies suggested for the evils of the mankind.

Human beings are influenced by their environmental and social surroundings but it is fundamentally absurd to think that they are mere creation of their social environment. Men are rational beings, free to choose the good from the evil or do the opposite and it is their own moral ideas and spiritual consciousness, which modify the social conditions in which they live. Thus if we accept moral freedom as an admitted fact and cease to regard man as a mere machine or animal, completely controlled and shaped by external influences, then it becomes a matter of highest importance to find out the true ends of life, to discover the right ideals which should govern man's conduct, and the appropriate means, through which those ends and ideals are to be attained; for if we go wrong in the choice of either ends or means, we are bound to suffer from the consequences of a wrong choice.

It is here that 'religion' comes in and states that in clear terms the meaning behind life and the goal it is seeking to achieve. Religion plays a very important
role in the behavior, thinking and attitudes of all human beings irrespective of the
cultural and traditional constructs. The social, political, economic and other values
are also governed by his religious sanctions.

Tagore (1931) emphasized the importance of religion in our society. For
him, religion is necessary for controlling and sub-ordinating the brute natures of
man. Iqbal (1944) reported that it is religion, which can prepare man to face the
crisis of modern civilization. Mukerji (1958) has observed that modern art;
literature and amusements are saturated with religious sentiments. Radhakrishnan
(1966 ed.) has regarded religion as a binding force that deepens the solidarity of
human society. The word religion is derived from the Latin word religare, which
means "to tie fast" or “to bind together". According to the American Heritage
Dictionary of the English language, one definition of religion is, “a set of beliefs,
values and practices based on the teachings of a spiritual leader.”

It is not an easy task to define religion due to two related but separable
problems- one is that of the subject matter itself, that is, " the definition of religion
is problematic, And the other one is to determine what it " means" to describe
someone as religious. The latter manifests itself particularly in questions of
measurement. Belief in God is a universal (although controversial) attitude that
has existed almost as long as man and his myriad fears and anxieties. Belief in
God is closely linked to the concept of religiosity. The word “religiosity" is a
comprehensive sociological term, which emerged from the broad concept of
"religion" and is used to refer to the numerous aspects of religious activity and beliefs.

Religiosity is defined in terms of the concrete, 'Practices carried out by those who profess faith (Doyle, 1992, p. 303); the abstract, ' the attitude peculiar to a consciousness has been altered by the experience of the numinous' (Jung, 1938, p.6) and the metaphysical, 'concerns with the ground and purpose of the world we call God' (Rahner & Vorgimiler, 1981,p.437)

It has been 15 years since the last and only chapter on the psychology of religion appeared in the annual review of psychology (Gorsuch, 1988). The psychology of religion as an identifiable sub field of psychology has grown rapidly since then. The more applied areas of psychology such as clinical, counseling and health have taken the lead in examining links between religion and psychological, physical and interpersonal functioning.

In the early days of psychology, at the time when all the psychological thinking was fresh and new, various psychologists took it as a serious part of their work to study the psychological aspects of religiousness. William James (1842-1910), founder of the field of the psychology of religion, distinguished between institutional religion and personal religion. In studying personal religious experiences, he made a distinction between healthy minded and sickle souled religiousness in The Varieties of Religious Experience. William James's hypothesis of Pragmatism stems from the efficacy of religion. If an individual believes in and performs religious activities, and those actions happen to work,
then that practice appears the proper choice for the individual. However, if the processes of religion have little efficacy, then there is no rationality for continuing the practice.

Sigmund Freud (1850-1939) spoke of religion as an illusion in “The Future of Illusion”. He maintained that religion is a fantasy structure, from which a man must be set free, if he is to grow to maturity. Freud views the idea of God as being a version of the father image, and religious belief as an act that is infantile and neurotic. Authoritarian religion is dysfunctional and alienates man from himself.

Carl Jung (1875-1961) adopted a more sympathetic posture to religion with a positive appreciation of religious symbolism. Jung considered the question of the existence of God to be unanswerable by the psychologists and adopted a kind of agnosticism.

Jung postulated, in addition to the personal unconscious, the collective unconscious, which is repository of human experience and contains "archetypes". The eruption of these basic images that are universal from the unconscious into the realm of consciousness is the basis of religious experience.

Alfred Adler (1870-1937) emphasized the role of goals and motivation in his theory. One of the Adler's famous ideas is that we try to compensate for inferiorities that we perceive in ourselves. One way that religion enters into this picture is through our belief in God, which is characteristic of our tendency to strive for perfection and superiority. Our ideas about God are important indicators of how we view the world. Adler illustrates that God (or the idea of God)
motivates people to act, and that those actions do have real consequences for us and for others.

Compared to the science or other social movements, religion is more efficient because it motivates people more effectively. According to Adler, "Only when science begins to capture the same religious fervor, and promotes the welfare of all segments of society, will the two be more equal in people's eyes".

Gordon Allport (1897-1967) in his classical book, "The Individual and His Religion" (1950) illustrates how people may use religion in different ways. He makes a distinction between "mature religion" and "immature religion". More recently, this distinction has been encapsulated in terms of “intrinsic religion" and "extrinsic religion".

Eric Erickson (1902-1994) revealed religion as an important factor which influences the personality development because they are the primary ways cultures promote the virtues associated with each stage of life. Religious rituals facilitate this development.

Erich Fromm (1900-1980) estimated that religion can foster individuals' highest potentialities, but religion in practice tends to relapse into being neurotic. Human beings are always in a need for a stable frame of reference, religion fills this need. In effect, humans carve answers to questions that no other source of knowledge has an answer to, which only religion may seem to answer. However, a sense of free will must be given in order for religion to appear healthy. An authoritarian notion of religion appears detrimental.
Tillich (1951) value religion as an exploratory behavior, driven among other things by man’s curiosity and by his perceptual attempts to maximize contact with a maximal environment, to the full deployment of his potentialities.

Fowler (1971) has proposed a stage development of faith (or spiritual development) across the life span in terms of a holistic orientation, and is concerned with individual’s relatedness in the universe. James Fowler proposed six stages of faith development as (1) Intuitive-Projective (2) Symbolic-Literal (3) Synthetic-Conventional (4) Individuating (5) Paradoxical (conjunctive) (6) Universalizing. Although there is evidence that children up to the age of 12 years do tend to be in the first two stages, there is evidence that adults over the age of 61 shows considerable variation in displays of quantities of stage 3 and beyond.

Pascal Boyer, one of the leading figures in the cognitive psychology of religion accounts for the psychological processes that underlie religious thought and practice and acquisition and transmission of ideas concerning gods. Persons acquire religious ideas and practices through social exposure. While mere exposure does not cause a particular religious outlook, nevertheless some exposure seems required.

Since long it is a topic of debate whether religiosity is determined by genes or by environment. Studies conducted on twins (Bouchard et al.1999; Kirk et al. 1999; Koenig et al. 2005) have reported that religiosity becomes more determined as we age. Environmental factors, like attending religious ceremonies with family affect our religiosity as children, but genes most likely keep us attending and
believing, as we become adults. During the transition from adolescence to adulthood, genetic factors increase from 12% to 44% while shared environmental factors decrease from 56% to 18%. An analysis of self-reported religiosity showed that monozygotic twins maintained their religious similarity over time, while dyzygotic twins become more dissimilar. These correlations suggest low genetic and high environmental influences when the twins were young but a larger genetic influence as the twins age.

Although modernity has caused a degree of rupture between religion and society, there has been a global revival of religion in the last three decades. There exists a great variation among the world religions over the issue of how religiosity is manifested or what are the core dimensions of religiosity.

**DIMENSIONS OF RELIGIOSITY**

Putley and Middelton (1961) tried to analyze the dimensions of religious ideology by focusing on four dimensions: (1) Orthodoxy; (2) Fanaticism; (imposing religion on others); (3) Importance (personal significance of religion) and (4) Ambivalence (awareness of holding contradictory attitudes towards religion).

Wearing and Brown (1964) pointed out that the question of dimensionality remained a persistent question in the analysis of religious belief, attitudes and behavior.
Mc Guire (op.cit. p.13) rightly notes "there are many facets of religiosity''. One's acceptance of and position towards a supernatural being, towards an ultimate reality and its manifestation involve a multidimensional process of comprising attitudes, beliefs, emotions, experiences, rituals, the community and feelings of belongingness.

Hill and Hood (1999) argue that any construct as complex as religiosity is multidimensional in nature because religiosity deals with peoples ultimate concerns and provides both personal and social identity within the cosmic or metaphysical background. Research on religious commitment supports the observation and indicates that religiosity is not a one-dimensional experience in individual's lives.

The most extensive elaboration of the dimensions of religiosity occurred under the leadership of Charles Glock (1988), although the beginning should probably trace to Yashio Fukuyama (1961). Glock proposed a five dimensional model of religiosity, and argues that despite the great variety of details, all the world religions share a general area in which religiosity is manifested. The five core dimensions are (1) the ritualistic dimension (including, but not only, "church" attendance), (2) the experiential dimension (or the feeling aspect of the religion), (3) the ideological dimension (or adherence to the principal beliefs of religion), (4) the intellectual dimension (involving religious knowledge and was frequently measured by such activities as reading religious publications: including, but not only sacred text), and (5) the consequential dimension which attempted to measure
the "effect" of an individual's religion in its other dimensions upon his or her "life".

   Faulker and Dejong (1966) studied the interrelationship among the five dimensions of religiosity and pointed out that the degree of relationship differs for various dimensions lending support to the view that several dimensions characterize religious involvement.

   King (1967) developed a frame work for the analysis of religious commitment and proposed ten dimensions to measure religiosity which are delineated as; (1) Creedal Assent and Personal Commitment; (2) Participation in Congregation; (3) Personal Religious Experience; (4) Personal Ties in Congregation; (5) Commitment to Intellectual Search Despite Doubt; (6) Openness to Religious Growth; (7) Dogmatism; (8) Extrinsic Orientation; (9) Financial Behavior and Financial Attitude; (10) Talking and Reading about Religion.

   Instead of using the concept of dimensions, Verbit (1970) proposed the concept of "components" in his attempt to develop a theoretical framework suitable for understanding religiosity. Verbit argues that religiosity has several components and individual's behavior vis-a-vis each one of these components has a number of "dimensions". He identifies six components of religiosity including "ritual", "doctrine", "emotion", "knowledge", "ethics", and "community". In Verbit's model these six components of religiosity are measured along the four dimensions as context, frequency, intensity and centrality.
O'Connell (1975) proposed two more dimensions in addition to five dimensions presented by Stark and Glock. O'Connell argued that the consequential scale should be divided into two main dimensions, as individual and societal consequences, to find out the relationship between the dimensions of religiosity.

Himmelfarb (1975) argued that religious involvement has at least two elements; "doctrinal belief" and "ritual observance".

Hilty and Morgan (1985) proposed seven dimensions of religiosity- Personal faith, Intolerance of Ambiguity, Orthodoxy, Social Conscience, Knowledge of Religious History, Life Purpose and Church Involvement.

Wulff (1991, 1997) has recently constructed a comprehensive framework to identify the possible approaches to religiosity. Peters, 2003a and 2003 b, Ricoeur, 1970 and 1990, Wallace, 1990). It attempts to arrange the approaches in two orthogonal bipolar dimensions. The vertical axis- Exclusion Vs Inclusion of Transcendence specifies whether the object of religious interest are granted participation in a transcendent reality, and as such this gives an indication whether or not an individual is religious/ spiritual. The horizontal axis- the Literal Vs Symbolic dimension refers to the ways of interpreting religious expression i.e. an individual can interpret things in a literal or symbolic way. As a result four quadrants can be formulated (fig1), each representing different approach to religion; Literal Affirmation, Literal Disaffirmation, Symbolic Affirmation and finally Symbolic Disaffirmation.
Based on the Wulff’s theory, Hutsebaut and his colleagues (2000) constructed the Post Critical Belief Scale as an operationalisation of his heuristic model. The four approaches to Christian religiosity of Orthodoxy, External Critique, Relativism and Second Naiveté map into the four quadrants of the Wulff’s model respectively- Literal Affirmation, Literal Disaffirmation, Symbolic Affirmation and finally Symbolic Disaffirmation.

**Wulff’s 2-Dimension Model of Religiosity (1991, 1997)**
These approaches argue for the view that religiosity is a multidimensional human experience and thus one cannot reduce the manifestations and impact of religiosity to a single variable. It is self evident that religiosity is multifaceted social reality and psychological experience. However Clayton and Glagged (1974) argued that religiosity is primarily a commitment to an ideology and the other so called dimensions are merely expressions of the strength of that core commitment. All these empirical studies suggest that religiosity is a multidimensional phenomenon, the core dimension of which involves belief, knowledge, practice
and experience. All the explanatory frameworks of religiosity are susceptible to omitting some of the dimensions and sub-dimensions of religiosity but they are a useful means for identifying the general patterns. Glock (1972) points out, however the real challenge lies in the cross-cultural study of religious commitment.

Currently, social scientists are in general agreement that religious commitment varies across religions, and that religious commitment may manifest itself in different ways within the same religious tradition. The need of the hour is to "triangulate" belief, practice, and self-perception in determining the relative effect of "religiosity" on behavioral and attitudinal measures.

In the present day world, the emphasis on virtues as a source of human strength has a profound implication within the positive psychology movement. It provides a potential bridge between personality psychology and spiritual and religious studies. In the past, quite a series of studies have been conducted in order to shed light on the personality religiosity relationship. Apart from this, a limited number of studies have addressed the relationship between personality and spirituality, especially in the Indian context. The present study is an attempt to explore the dimensions among the Big Five which have a profound influence in determining the degree of relationship between personality and spirituality and personality and religiosity. In addition, the relationship between spirituality and religiosity is also studied to see how the two constructs are different and what is common between spirituality and religiosity.
SPIRITUALITY VERSUS RELIGIOSITY

Though spirituality traditionally has been considered to be exclusively the
domain of religiosity, it is now being conceptualized in terms that have no
particular relationship to theology, and at the same time being accepted as
practical and intellectually respectable. Worthingtom et al. (1996) speak of the
three categories of people whose beliefs were classified to differentiate the
religious from the spiritual: (1) those who may be spiritual but not religious in that
they believe in and value a universal human spirit or an “élan vital” without
holding religious beliefs to be true, (2) those who are religious but not spiritual
holding to doctrines or a religious organization but not experiencing any devotion
to a higher power, and (3) those who are both spiritual and religious and believe in
valuing a higher power that is accepted to and consistent with some organized
religion. It may be said that the majority of the Indian population fall into the
second and the third categories, for most use religion to morally and usually guide
their behavior.

Religiosity is moving from a broad band construct---- one that includes
both institutional constructs that restricts and inhibits human potential. Spirituality
on the other hand, is an individual expression and speaks to the greatest of human
capabilities. It is a unified quality if mind, heart and spirit. Spirituality is a
commitment to existence.
Psychologists have been reluctant to acknowledge the importance of religious beliefs to human existence. They tend to think religious beliefs as coping mechanisms. Both religious and spiritually oriented people have a sense of community participation. Pargament (1999) prefers the spirituality as a part of religion, based on an understanding of the “sacred” as the spirituality is a wider concept than religion. Simply stated, religion is the path and spirituality is the outcome. It would be helpful to understand spirituality, if we differentiate it from religiosity. Maslow believed that the “essential core religious experience may be embedded in either as a theistic, supernatural context or a non-atheistic context” (1970, p. 28). Maslow and Dewey were strongly committed to the view that spirituality is a human phenomenon and it is a more basic than prior to, and different from traditional expressions of religiosity. The churches and temples do not have a monopoly on spirituality or on the values that compose it. These belong to humanity and are not the exclusive possession of organized religion or of traditionally religious persons. Yinger (1970) also warned against definitions that over emphasize religiosity and noted the need for assessment approaches that would tap “awareness if and interest in, the continuing, recurrent, permanent problems of human existence” (p. 33). In a study of psychology of spirituality, Shafranske and Malony (1985) found that 71% considered spirituality to be personality relevant, yet only 9% report a high level of involvement with traditional religion, and 74% indicated that organized religion was not the primary source of spirituality.
A growing number of people are developing spirituality outside traditional, organized religion. In the words of Erich Fromm (1950), they are discovering that “it is not true that we have to give up the concerns for the soul if we don’t accept the tenets of religion” (p. 9).

Kippner and Welch (1992) distinguish spirituality and religiosity, maintaining that spiritual people may or may not engage in formal religious practice and religious people may not embody spiritual values. They say that people who have internalized an institutionalized common set of beliefs and rituals (as dictated by religion) regarding spiritual concerns and issues are not always spiritual. This view is elaborated by Vrinte (1996) who says that spirituality is distinct from religion in that spirituality is more related to authentic mystical experiences whereas religiosity is associated with normative practices (laid by a prophet or a religious group). In fact Keen (1994) observes millions of people who are unmoved by established religion as well as disillusioned with a secular view of life, are yet looking for some missing value, some absent purpose, some “new meaning” and some “presence of the sacred”—all of which indicate becoming spiritual in one’s orientation.

However defined whether broadly as consciousness (Helminaike, 1995) or in relation to transcendence (Miller & Martin, 1988: Thorensen, 1998), spirituality is an attribute of individuals. Religiosity, in contrast, is an organized social entity. Thorensen (1998), drawing on recent work examining working definitions of spiritual and religious perspectives, (Larson 1997) suggested that some
characteristics are shared, such as a search for what is sacred or holy in life, coupled with some kind of transcendent (beyond the self) relationship with God or a higher power or universal energy.

Religious factors focused more on prescribed beliefs, rituals and practices as well as social institutional features. Spiritual factors, on the other hand, are concerned more with individual subjective experiences, sometimes shared with others (cf. Zinnbauer, 1997). Maslow (1976) similarly differentiated, “the subjective and naturalistic religious experiences and attitude” (spiritual) from institutional organized religions. Religion is characterized in many ways by its boundaries and spirituality by a difficulty in defining its boundaries. Religion involves an organized social institution with, among other things, beliefs about how one relates to that which is sacred or divine. Spirituality does not necessarily involve religion. Some people experience spirituality as a highly personal and private matter, focusing on intangible elements that provide vitality and meaning in their lives. In what has been described as “the new spirituality” arising from organized religion in recent decades (for example, Roof, Carrol & Roozen, 1995), spirituality may be conceptualized in ways that do not assume any reality beyond material existence. In such an individualistic perspective, each person (regardless of his religious involvement) defines his or her own spirituality, which might centre on material experiences such as mountain biking at dusk, quiet contemplation of nature, reflection on the direction of one’s life, and a feeling of intimate connection with loved one’s.
The term spirituality is currently more acceptable than in the past, both in religious and non-religious settings (Mc Donald, 2000), the meaning attached to the term still vary considerably from one context to another. Research to date has largely defined spirituality in terms of religiosity, generally as a set of public religious behaviors (Westgate, 1996) as well as the subjective experience or those behaviors. However this literature often uses the terms spirituality and religion together and at times interchangeably without any attempts to distinguish between the two effectively producing a body of literature that does not lend itself to rigorous comparison (Stanard, Sandhu & Painter, 2000).

A useful distinction between the terms has been proposed by Stanard (2000) who suggests that spirituality is a broader concept that represents an internalized subjective experience of being where as religiosity is a narrower concept that refers to public religious behaviors usually mandated by a set of established doctrines, which characterize the belief and practices of an organized church or religious institution (Fisher, 2001). The distinction is consistent with the growing view that spirituality may be expressed in a religious context; however it is not synonymous with religiosity or religiousness (Fisher, 2001; Mac Donald, 2000; Moberg, 1979).

Fisher (2005) who has been researching the nature of Australian spirituality in relation to education, distinguishes between spirituality and religiosity. He suggests that while religion tends to focus on ideology and rules of faith and belief system, spirituality on the other hand, focuses on experience and relationships.
Roa (2010) suggests that religion is external and observable and community focused whereas spirituality is more subjective and individual driven search for the sacred. There is a general consensus between the Indian and Western perspectives that the common ground between religion and spirituality is the sacred. The sacred may refer to different things such as God, divinity, ultimate reality and so on. The common denominator of all of them is transcendence. Transcendence implies going beyond what is given in one’s normal sensory experience.

From the beginning of time, religion has been considered as the panacea of all ills and mankind, despite moments of doubt has always leaned on religious faith for solace. There exists a breath taking diversity of faith in the world. Every religion has three Aspects-----values, symbols and practices----while the last two might differ, values are essentially common.

The spirit manifests itself in every religious universe where the echoes of the Divine word are still audible, but the manner in which the manifestations of the Spirit takes place differs from one religion to another.
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Formulation of research objectives is a very important step in research investigation. Research objective is a statement that provides the basis for investigation and ensures proper direction in which the study should proceed. Research objectives are significantly important in every scientific investigation because they are the working instruments of the theory, have prediction values and also they are powerful tools for the advancement of knowledge and making meaningful interpretation.

The following research objectives are formulated considering our investigation purpose to study the relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality, NEO-FFI and religiosity and spirituality and religiosity.

1. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in the whole sample.
2. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in males.
3. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in females.
4. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in Hindu males.
5. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in Hindu females.
6. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in Muslim males.
7. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in Muslim females.
8. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in the whole sample.
9. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in males.
10. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in females.
11. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in Hindu males.
12. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in Hindu females.
13. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in Muslim males.
14. To study the relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in Muslim females.
15. To study the relationship between spirituality and religiosity in the whole sample.
16. To study the relationship between spirituality and religiosity in males.
17. To study the relationship between spirituality and religiosity in females.
18. To study the relationship between spirituality and religiosity in Hindu males.
19. To study the relationship between spirituality and religiosity in Hindu females.
20. To study the relationship between spirituality and religiosity in Muslim males.

21. To study the relationship between spirituality and religiosity in Muslim females.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in the whole sample?

2. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in males?

3. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in females?

4. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in Hindu males?

5. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in Hindu females?

6. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in Muslim males?

7. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and spirituality in Muslim females?

8. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in the whole sample?

9. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in males?

10. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in females?

11. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in Hindu males?
12. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in Hindu females?
13. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in Muslim males?
14. Is there any relationship between NEO-FFI and religiosity in Muslim females?
15. Is there any relationship between spirituality and religiosity in the whole sample?
16. Is there any relationship between spirituality and religiosity in males?
17. Is there any relationship between spirituality and religiosity in females?
18. Is there any relationship between spirituality and religiosity in Hindu males?
19. Is there any relationship between spirituality and religiosity in Hindu females?
20. Is there any relationship between spirituality and religiosity in Muslim males?
21. Is there any relationship between spirituality and religiosity in Muslim females?

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Personality: McCrae and Costa (1989) define personality as enduring emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal, and motivational styles that explain
behavior in different situations. They believe that five factors best define the organization of human personality. They developed the NEO-Five Factor inventory including the following five dimensions of personality: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness.

**Spirituality:** Howden (1992) defined spirituality in terms of four dimensions: Unifying Interconnectedness, Purpose and Meaning in Life, Innerness or Inner Resources, and Transcendence.

**Religiosity:** Deka and Broota (1985) defined religiosity as an organized social entity. It focused more on prescribed beliefs, rituals and practices.