



## PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF RELIGIOSITY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

Namita<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr Zahoor Lone<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

This study examines the connections between young adults' personality qualities, religion, and aspects of psychological well-being. The study used a variety of questionnaires to examine personality traits, religiosity, and psychological well-being in 126 persons between the ages of 22 and 28. The findings show that extraversion is positively correlated with these characteristics of wellbeing, while neuroticism is adversely correlated with environmental mastery, pleasant connections with others, and self-acceptance. Positive relationships with people, environmental mastery, and self-acceptance are all directly tied to personal development, autonomy, life purpose, and self-acceptance. However, none of the personality traits or aspects of psychological well-being in this population seem to be significantly correlated with religiosity. According to the findings, some personality qualities may be bad for well-being while others may be good for it. Interventions meant to improve one element of well-being may also have a favorable effect on other dimensions. However, the correlational design of the study and use of a single sample necessitate further investigation to confirm and build upon these findings as well as investigate the causal relationships between these variables.

**Keywords:** Personality, Religiosity, Psychological well-being, Adults.

---

<sup>1\*</sup>Master in Psychology, Department of Psychology, School of Humanities, Lovely Professional University, Punjab India. Email – namitarukhaya13@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, School of Humanities, Lovely Professional University, Punjab India

**\*Corresponding author:** Namita

\*Master in Psychology, Department of Psychology, School of Humanities, Lovely Professional University, Punjab India. Email – namitarukhaya13@gmail.com

**DOI:** 10.48047/ecb/2023.12.si5a.0174

## INTRODUCTION

Since it has long been a part of human civilization, religion has been extensively studied for its role in people's daily lives. Many of the research that have looked into the connection between religiosity and psychological health have found that the two are positively correlated. However, less research has been done on the part of personality traits in this association. By examining the personality correlates of religiosity and psychological well-being among adults, this study report tries to close this gap. It has recently become very difficult for people to cope socially, economically, and psychologically, especially for the less fortunate who have lost hope in the real essence of life and everything it has to offer. Resources for individual livelihood have been drastically reduced, and technology has eliminated the majority of natural resources, forcing people to spend money on every need. Individuals' general well-being has been significantly impacted by the ambiguous and untrustworthy situation, which has increased feelings of loneliness, diminished self-esteem, and lower life satisfaction. People are exposed to unhealthy lifestyles as a result of this predicament, which leads to a general collapse in mental health and overall wellbeing. Enough people have grown more unsatisfied with life, while many others have lost their sense of self-worth and have turned to other institutions for wellbeing in an effort to lessen their unfavorable self-perceptions and uncontrollable anxieties. This is done to lessen their need on therapy. In the process of trying to improve these unpleasant and unmanageable circumstances, some people discovered life fulfillment and mental calm under the aegis of religion based on their particular convictions.

According to several studies, an individual's commitment to religious activities and beliefs depends on whether they have intrinsic or extrinsic goals and how much value they place on those goals (Strawbridge et al., 2013). Literature has shown that while some people turn to religion to lessen the upsetting effects of their daily lives, others turn to prayer as a way to overcome their fears and feel better and more secure in the knowledge that nothing bad will ever happen to them (Reinberg & Weaver, 2010). According to Strawbridge, et al. (2008), participation in public religious practices, such as church attendance, increased the chance of living longer by 43% and active religious involvement improved the chance of living longer than the average by 29%. According to certain people, there may be some degree of sadness, schizophrenia, and low self-esteem (Watters, 2005). Numerous research studies studying the connection between religiosity

and various dimensions of well-being have been conducted as a result of the increased interest and media focus on the benefits and drawbacks of religion's role in fostering health and wellbeing. According to Micklethwait and Wooldridge (2009), religion has the potential to unite isolated people and communities and bring about beneficial changes for the lonely.

Although there is evidence that suggests some positive behaviours may be influenced by religiosity, other research revealed that the link depends on how religion was measured. They discovered that religiousness was better measured by involvement in or attendance at church than by importance of religion, interest in religion, or religious mindedness (Witter et al., 2003). Numerous academic studies have repeatedly found that religious involvement leads to positive mental outcomes (Ellison & Levin, 2012; Swinton, 2011). According to studies, being religious and the majority of psychological well-being factors are generally connected with lower levels of loneliness. It was nonetheless hypothesised that the lack of link might be due to the correlation of various religious perspectives with psychological results. However, according to Hackney and Sander (2003), the association between religiosity and mental health may be due to the study's use of various metrics. Regarding the current study, George et al. (2012) proposed that the relationship between religiosity and psychological well-being is still unclear, despite the empirical support for a moderate relationship. A number of factors, including enhanced social support, more psychological resources, good health habits, or a greater sense of coherence, may contribute to the impact of religion and spirituality on mental health (Helm et al., 2010)

## Personality

Research has explored the relationship between personality traits and religiosity, finding that certain traits have positive correlations while others have negative correlations. Agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience have been positively linked to higher degrees of religiosity, as they may inspire participation in religious activities that promote community and social relationships, find appeal in religious structure and routine, and foster intellectual curiosity in spiritual and philosophical issues. In contrast, neuroticism has been negatively linked to religiosity, as it may be challenging for those experiencing negative emotions like worry and insecurity to reconcile them with the concept of a forgiving higher power. Mental health providers can benefit from understanding the relationship between personality traits and religiosity when

working with clients experiencing religious difficulties. Research into the personality correlates of religiosity is important for understanding how religion affects people's wellbeing.

### Religiosity

Religiosity refers to the level of devotion to religious ideas, practices, and values, which has been found to be closely linked to psychological well-being. Religion can positively impact mental health by providing social support, a sense of community, meaning and purpose in life, and opportunities for prayer and meditation. However, the relationship between religiosity and psychological health may vary depending on individual and cultural factors such as age, gender, and ethnicity. Additionally, some religious beliefs and practices may have negative effects on mental health, such as causing stress or promoting negative attitudes towards certain groups. Therefore, individuals should consider their personal values and beliefs when choosing behaviors that promote their mental health and overall well-being.

### Psychological well-being

Personality and psychological health are interrelated concepts that can impact each other in various ways. Personality refers to an individual's unique pattern of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors, while psychological well-being encompasses a person's overall quality of life. Personality traits

such as neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness can influence psychological well-being. Coping mechanisms also play a role in psychological outcomes, with healthy coping mechanisms leading to positive outcomes and unhealthy ones leading to negative outcomes. Furthermore, psychological health can also impact personality traits, with higher levels of psychological well-being associated with positive personality attributes such as optimism and emotional stability.

### Hypothesis

1. There will be a significant positive correlation between Personality and religiosity among young adults.
  2. There will be a significant positive correlation between religiosity and psychological well-being among young adults.
  3. There will be a significant positive correlation between Personality and psychological well-being among young adults.
1. To assess correlation among Personality, Religiosity and Psychological well-being among young adults

### Methodology

Sample size of (N=126) young adults between the age group of 22-28 years from different parts of the country has been chosen by purposive sampling from university campus.

<p><b>Inclusion criteria</b> Any young adult aging between 22-28 yrs both mentally and physically fit</p>	<p><b>Exclusion criteria</b> Every one beyond the prescribed age group of 22-28 Having history of psychiatric and medical illness</p>
---	---

### Procedure

The study adopted a cross-sectional design, utilizing both simple random and purposive sampling techniques. Scales were utilized to measure the variables under consideration, and appropriate statistical methods were applied to validate the results obtained. To collect the required data, an online survey was administered after obtaining prior informed consent from participants, who were assured of the confidentiality of their responses and the exclusive use of the data for research purposes. The survey was administered individually, and participants were given the opportunity to seek clarification on any aspect of the questionnaire through email. Data was documented, and entry was done using Excel worksheets for further analysis, employing suitable statistical techniques such as raw scores, percentiles, and category designation for each variable. The final outcomes were compared to the

suggested hypotheses and relevant literature to determine their validity.

### Psychometric Tools Used

To ensure the suitability of the tools used in this study in relation to the variables and aims, a careful selection process was implemented. As a result, the following tools were chosen:

**Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI)** – It is a psychometric test designed to give a rough and ready measure of two important personality dimensions: Neuroticism or emotionality, and Extraversion. Each of two traits are measured by means of 24 questions.

Neuroticism refers to the general emotional stability of a person, his emotional over responsiveness, and his stability to neurotic breakdown under stress.

Extraversion, as opposed to introversion refers to the outgoing, uninhibited, sociable proclivities of a

person. The M.P.I is much shorter than most other questionnaires.

The Duke University Religion Index (DUREL) – It is a psychometric test designed to assess an individual's religious beliefs and practices. It was developed in 1995 by a team of researchers at Duke University and has since become one of the most widely used measures of religious involvement in academic research. The DUREL consists of three subscales: Organizational Religiousness (OR) Non-Organizational Religiousness (NOR) Intrinsic Religiousness (IR) The OR subscale measures an individual's involvement in formal religious organizations such as churches, synagogues, and mosques. The NOR subscale assesses an individual's involvement in informal religious activities such as prayer, meditation, and personal religious study. The IR subscale evaluates an individual's personal religious beliefs and the degree to which they consider religion to be an important part of their life. The DUREL has been used in a variety of settings, including healthcare, social work, and psychology research, to assess the role of religion in individuals' lives and its impact on health outcomes, mental health, and well-being. Ryff's Scales of Psychological Well Being – It is a psychometric test designed to assess an individual's

level of well-being. The scale includes 3 items for each of 6 aspects of well-being: self-acceptance, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, positive relations with others, and personal growth.

Participants are asked to rate how each item applies to themselves using a 7-point Likert rating scale. Items that are positively worded are flipped so that higher ratings on all individual items indicate greater well-being. The total score is the mean of the ratings, with a higher score relating to greater well-being.

**ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

In order to participate in the study, potential subjects were informed about the questionnaire and their consent was obtained before inclusion. The purpose and goals of the study were clearly explained to the participants and a positive relationship was established. The confidentiality and privacy of the participants' responses were maintained throughout the process. Only those participants who voluntarily consented were included in the study. The participants were provided with the questionnaire and it took them an average of 15 minutes to complete it.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

Correlations				
		Personality	PSW	Religiosity
PSW	Pearson Correlation	-.296**	1	.136
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.129
	N	126	126	126
Religiosity	Pearson Correlation	.059	.136	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.509	.129	
	N	126	126	126

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations										
		Neuroticism	Extraversion	Religiosity	Autonomy	Environmental Mastery	Personal growth	Positive Relations with others	Purpose in life	Self Acceptance
Neuroticism	Pearson Correlation	1	-.116	-.069	-.142	-.415**	-.081	-.279**	-.192*	-.397**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.194	.443	.113	.000	.368	.002	.031	.000
	N	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126
Extraversion	Pearson Correlation	-.116	1	.220*	.016	.178*	.057	.117	-.069	.244**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.194		.013	.855	.046	.527	.192	.441	.006
	N	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126
Religiosity	Pearson Correlation	-.069	.220*	1	-.046	.163	.158	.038	.058	.172
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.443	.013		.606	.068	.077	.676	.517	.054
	N	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126
Autonomy	Pearson Correlation	-.142	.016	-.046	1	.370**	.101	.208*	.132	.375**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.113	.855	.606		.000	.260	.020	.140	.000
	N	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126
Environmental Mastery	Pearson Correlation	-.415**	.178*	.163	.370**	1	.160	.333**	.247**	.576**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.046	.068	.000		.074	.000	.005	.000
	N	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126

	N	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126
Personal growth	Pearson Correlation	-.081	.057	.158	.101	.160	1	.253**	.148	.079
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.368	.527	.077	.260	.074		.004	.098	.379
	N	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126
Positive Relations with others	Pearson Correlation	-.279**	.117	.038	.208*	.333**	.253**	1	.360**	.368**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.192	.676	.020	.000	.004		.000	.000
	N	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126
Purpose in life	Pearson Correlation	-.192*	-.069	.058	.132	.247**	.148	.360**	1	.222*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.031	.441	.517	.140	.005	.098	.000		.012
	N	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126
Self Acceptance	Pearson Correlation	-.397**	.244**	.172	.375**	.576**	.079	.368**	.222*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.006	.054	.000	.000	.379	.000	.012	
	N	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

Two correlation sets were examined. The first set investigated the associations between psychological well-being (PWB) religiosity, and personality traits. The second set reviewed the relationships between different aspects of psychological well-being.

The tables show the correlations between a number of factors, such as personality traits (neuroticism, extraversion), religiosity, and numerous well-being aspects (autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relationships with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance). The strength and direction of the association between two variables are assessed using the Pearson correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficient's value falls between -1 (perfectly negative correlation) and 1, with 0 denoting no correlation.

- PWB (psychological well-being) and religiosity do not have a statistically significant link ( $r = .136, p = .129$ ).
- Environmental mastery ( $r = -.415, p .01$ ), positive relationships with others ( $r = -.279, p .01$ ), and self-acceptance ( $r = -.397, p .01$ ) are all adversely connected with neuroticism.
- Positive relationships with others ( $r = .117, p >.05$ ), environmental mastery ( $r = .178, p .05$ ), and autonomy ( $r = .016, p >.05$ ) are all positively connected with extraversion.
- It has a negative correlation ( $r = -.244, p .01$ ) with self-acceptance.
- There is no discernible relationship between religiosity and any of the personality qualities.

Interpretation: The findings imply that environmental mastery and neuroticism are significant predictors of psychological well-being. Particularly, people with high neuroticism scores may have lower psychological well-being levels, whereas people with high environmental mastery scores may have higher psychological well-being

levels. Personal development also has a favorable impact on psychological health. The relationships between psychological well-being's various dimensions point to the possibility that some relationships are closer than others. A sense of purpose in life and self-acceptance appear to be particularly firmly associated, as do autonomy, positive relationships with others, and environmental mastery. The absence of any significant associations between religiosity and the other factors raises the possibility that religiosity in this population may not be a reliable indicator of psychological well-being.

Discussion: The results of this study have significant ramifications for our comprehension of the elements that influence psychological wellbeing. According to the findings, some personality traits, like neuroticism, may be detrimental to one's well-being, while other ones, like environmental mastery, may be beneficial. The relationships between the components of psychological well-being also imply that interventions intended at enhancing one component of well-being may benefit the other components as well. However, it should be noted that since only one sample was used, these results might not apply to other populations. These results need to be confirmed and expanded upon by additional study. The study's correlational design also makes it impossible to draw conclusions about causality. The causal links between these factors might be clarified in next research employing experimental or longitudinal approaches.

**CONCLUSION**

This study investigated the relationships between personality traits, religiosity, and several aspects of psychological well-being. The findings imply that extraversion is positively correlated with these characteristics of wellbeing, while neuroticism is adversely correlated with environmental mastery, pleasant connections with others, and self-

acceptance. Additionally, there is a strong correlation between environmental mastery, positive relationships with others, and self-acceptance as well as personal development, autonomy, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. Surprisingly, none of the personality traits or dimensions of psychological well-being show a significant association with religiosity, indicating that religiosity may not be a valid predictor of wellbeing in this population. These findings suggest that interventions aimed at improving one aspect of well-being may have important implications for understanding the factors that influence psychological well-being.

## REFERENCES

1. Abbie, E. (2016). *The Practice of Social Research* (14th ed.). Cengage Learning.
2. Abdel-Khalek, A. M. (2013). Personality dimensions and religiosity among Kuwaiti Muslim college students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54(2), 149–152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.08.004>
3. Aghababaei, N., Wasserman, J. A., & Nannini, D. R. (2014). The religious person revisited: cross-cultural evidence from the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 17(1), 24–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.737771>
4. Aguilar-Vafaie, M. E., & Moghanloo, M. (2008). Domain and facet personality correlates of religiosity among Iranian college students. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 11(5), 461–483. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674670701539114>
5. Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
6. Colledani, D. (2017). The mediating role of values between personality and religiosity. *The International Journal of Children's Spirituality*, 22(2), 120–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364436x.2017.1310089>
7. Dastjerdi, R., Farzad, V., & Kadivar, P. (2011). The Role Of Five Big Personality Factors In Predicting Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Birjand University of Medical Sciences*, 18(247), 126–133. <http://journal.bums.ac.ir/article-1-1035-en.html>
8. Hill, J. L., Hoffman, B. (2018). *Designing and Conducting Longitudinal Research*. Academic Press.
9. Jhangiani, R. S., Chiang, I. A., Price, J. (2019). *Research Methods in Psychology*. BCcampus.
10. Kokko, K., Tolvanen, A., & Pulkkinen, L. (2013). Associations between personality traits and psychological well-being across time in middle adulthood. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(6), 748–756. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.07.002>
11. Lavrič, M., & Flere, S. (2008). The Role of Culture in the Relationship Between Religiosity and Psychological Well-being. *Journal of Religion & Health*, 47(2), 164–175. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-008-9168-z>
12. Leondari, A., & Gialamas, V. (2009). Religiosity and psychological well-being. *International Journal of Psychology*, 44(4), 241–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590701700529>
13. Lewis-Beck, M. S., Bryman, A. (2021). *Longitudinal Research (Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences)* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
14. Momtaz, Y. A., Hamid, T. A., Ibrahim, R., Yahaya, N., & Chai, S. (2011). Moderating effect of religiosity on the relationship between social isolation and psychological well-being. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 14(2), 141–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2010.497963>
15. Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (7th ed.). Pearson.
16. Newsom, J. T., Jones, R. N., Hofer, S. M. (2018). *Longitudinal Data Analysis: A Practical Guide for Researchers in Aging, Health, and Social Sciences* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
17. Ruini, C., Ottolini, F., Rafanelli, C., Tossani, E., Ryff, C. D., & Fava, G. A. (2003b). The Relationship of Psychological Well-Being to Distress and Personality. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 72(5), 268–275. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000071898>
18. Suls, J., & Martin, R. (2005). The Daily Life of the Garden-Variety Neurotic: Reactivity, Stressor Exposure, Mood Spillover, and Maladaptive Coping. *Journal of Personality*, 73(6), 1485–1510. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00356.x>
19. Szczeńniak, M., Sopińska, B., & Kroplewski, Z. (2019). Big Five Personality Traits and Life Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Religiosity. *Religions*, 10(7), 437. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel10070437>

20. Trochim, W. M. K. (2006). *The Research Methods Knowledge Base* (3rd ed.). Atomic Dog Publishing.
21. Unterrainer, H., Ladenhauf, K. H., Moazedi, M., Wallner-Liebmann, S. J., & Fink, A. M. (2010). Dimensions of Religious/Spiritual Well-Being and their relation to Personality and Psychological Well-Being. *Personality and Individual Differences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.03.032>
22. Yonker, J. E., Schnabelrauch, C. A., & DeHaan, L. (2012). The relationship between spirituality and religiosity on psychological outcomes in adolescents and emerging adults: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(2), 299–314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.08.010>
23. Yoon, D. K., & Lee, E. K. (2006b). The Impact of Religiousness, Spirituality, and Social Support on Psychological Well-Being Among Older Adults in Rural Areas. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 48(3–4), 281–298. [https://doi.org/10.1300/j083v48n03\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1300/j083v48n03_01)