Introduction

According to some scholars, it is impossible to understand a human being solely by looking at the self from a non-transcendental perspective (Nelson, 2009). In order to fully understand the whole person, there are two concepts that cannot be ignored: religion and spirituality (Kirkpatrick, 1999), owing to the fact that religion (including spirituality) is of great significance to human beings in most cultures (Hood, Spilka, Hunsberger & Gorsuch, 2003). One of the most influential factors on the cognition, affect, motivation, and behaviour of people is their spiritual and/or religious goals, beliefs, and practices (Emmons, 2001). Religion has been one of the most significant areas in social scientific thinking, especially after the late 19th century (Hill, Pargament, Hood, McCullough, Swyers, Larson et al., 2000). Spirituality was incorporated into the field of psychology and was added to the list of terms in the computerized database of the American Psychological Association in 1988 (Helminiak, 2006). In the last few decades, the scientific and popular interest in the concept of spirituality has risen and continues to increase (Roof, 1993; Zinnbauer, Pargament & Scott, 1999) even despite the fact that spirituality remains, for many, a fuzzy concept (Spilka, 1993).

Religion and spirituality have a profound relationship; that they are both grounded in faith, is a common feature (Damon & Lerner, 2006). Therefore, they are related and intertwined (Streib & Hood, 2008), interrelated and interchangeable (Moberg, 2010) and thus need not be seen as in opposition to each other (Damon & Lerner, 2006). They can appear as overlapping constructs, having both shared and uncommon features (Miller & Thoresen, 2003). However, it is explicitly stated that spirituality is not synonymous with religion (Heelas & Woodhead, 2005; Hayes, 1984) and that experiences of transcendence occur in secular-nonbelieving individuals as well (Coleman, Silver & Holcombe, 2013).

Over time, spirituality has been separated from religious tradition. A few decades ago, the sacred was mainly regarded as being related to religion (Principe, 1983; Young-Eisendrath & Miller, 2005); and the concept of
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religiousness covered today's definitions of spirituality (Pargament, 2007). However, spirituality today has become known as a psychological phenomenon, and a research subject, distinct from religiosity (Saroglou & Munoz-Garcia, 2008). In recent decades, with the rise of secularism (Zinnbauer, Pargament, Cole, Rye, Butter, Belavich et al., 1997; Coleman, 2013) and the transformation of social identities by modernity (Carrette & King, 2005), 'religious individualism' has gained significance. Most Americans supported the idea of following their faith and beliefs while at the same time seeing them as independent from religious institutions, such as places of worship or churches. Furthermore, the authority derived from these institutions in the social sphere has also diminished. Religious forces (e.g. church and clerical law) that have proved socially cohesive and relevant in the past have, in many cases, given way to secular equivalents (e.g. police and secular law) (Coleman, 2014) yet still, a more individualized religiosity persists. As denominational affiliation was no longer dictated by attendance, Christians and Jews could be considered good without attending church or synagogue. In this new age of extremely privatized religion, a need for new alternative perspectives on belief in popular thinking has produced “spirituality” as distinguished from religiosity as subjective reality (Roof, 2003). Spirituality has become a contemporary alternative to religion in a society that is made up of a variety of beliefs all converging on the individual (Loewenthal, 2008). In short, over the past forty years, the conceptual meanings of both religion and spirituality have changed dramatically.

Some contemporary theorists have polarized the terms ‘religion and spirituality’. Often, religion is conceptualized as organized, institutional, dogmatic, substantive, restrictive, negative, and mundane (i.e. ‘harmful religion’) – versus a more positive characterization of spirituality as personal, subjective, functional, life enhancing, and helpful (Zinnbauer, Pargament & Scott, 1999; Pargament & Annette, 2002). In the process of searching for the sacred – which is the common aim – religiosity is a sociological phenomenon requiring affiliation and involvement with a religious tradition and participation in religious activities. It refers to group or social practices and doctrines, whereas spirituality is psychological, involving personal beliefs, values, behaviour and experiences (McCullough, Smith & Poll, 2003; Hood, Hill & Spilka, 2009). Religion is perceived as denominational, external, cognitive, behavioural, ritualistic, and public; while spirituality is seen as more universal, ecumenical, internal, affective, spontaneous, and private (Ho & Ho, 2007). To some, religion is more comprehensive than spirituality (Zinnbauer, Pargament, Cole, Rye, Butter, Belavich et al., 1997) and spirituality may be the source and heart of religion (Hayes, 1984; Salarzehi, Aramesh & Mohammadi, 2011). On the other hand, some scholars affirm that spirituality is more extensive and superior (Emblen, 1992;
Moberg, 2010); it does not need a particular organized religion (Ho & Ho, 2007; Zinnbauer, Pargament, Cole, Rye, Butter, Belavich et al., 1997), and it may or may not be triggered by religion (Shahabi, Powell, Musick, Pargament, Thoresen, Williams et al., 2002). A ritualized spirituality, in which various rituals are held in common with religion; such as, meditation, fasting, sacraments, myths and symbols from diverse traditions, occurs especially among young adults (Tacey, 2005). Such practices still provide meaning and place the devotee in harmony with the transcendent yet their experiences are not interpreted through doctrinal authority of religion. The number of people who define themselves and/or might be defined as spiritual but not religious or more spiritual than religious is increasing in the United States and Western Europe giving support to meaningful exercises within the spiritual domain (Zinnbauer, Pargament, Cole, Rye, Butter, Belavich et al., 1997; Streib & Hood, 2008).

Over the past few decades, the interest in spirituality has increased. However, the majority of the research on spirituality is conducted in the United States and in other countries that have mainly Christian populations. There is an urgent need to study spirituality in an Islamic context, using a Muslim sample (Ho & Ho, 2007). Therefore, in an attempt to address this considerable lack of research, this study focuses primarily on the perceptions of religion and spirituality in Turkey, a Muslim majority country.

In Turkish society, spirituality is mainly recognized as a religious phenomenon. When Turks converted to Islam, they not only shaped their lives in accordance with Islamic beliefs but also included some Central Asian belief systems and paganism into official Islam. Their previous superstitious beliefs, customs and habits and new Islamic forms were combined beneath the umbrella of the Turkish Islamic tradition. Religion, spirituality and culture mingled through the partial incorporation of past Hellenic cultural remnants into new Islamic norms. For example, Islamic monasteries were built next to what were once ‘Pagan’ temples. The society believed that Combatants and Dervishes who spread Islam to Anatolia were mystic people who had spiritual powers. After their deaths, their burial places became tombs and shrines. Turkish people have attributed sacredness not only to life and the dead, but also to these physical locations (Kose & Ayten, 2010). One of the common spiritual beliefs in Turkey is shrine visiting, which is practiced in connection with the sacred. It involves circling around the shrines, worshipping and practicing several rituals inside, tying tatters and putting papers with requests on them for blessings such as happiness, success in life, health and wealth etc. The individuals involved in these rituals hope that the spirits of the people buried in the shrines might help them. Even though officially, Islam does not permit ‘benefit oriented’ shrine visiting, it has become a part of the mixed traditional – even
“spiritual” – Islamic culture, which evidences that spirituality is a part of culture (Shafranske & Malony, 1996). In fact, throughout Turkish history, this embedded spiritual culture has been very influential on the perceptions of people, and remains so in Turkey today (Kose, Mehmedoglu & Ayten, 2009). The perception of spirituality in Turkey is not highly independent from religion; these two terms have a very strong association.

Current Study

The main objectives of the present research are to investigate how Turkish Muslim students define these concepts, to discover whether the spiritual but not religious trend exists among Muslims in Turkey, and to examine the relation between several demographic variables (e.g., gender, college major, parents’ educational level, and socioeconomic status) and the levels of religiosity and spirituality. The primary research questions of the present study are these: in this Turkish Muslim sample, is spirituality a term deriving from religion and do Turkish people consider there to be a meaningful relationship between religiosity and spirituality?

The following hypotheses were constructed to address the purposes of this research: It is hypothesized that women will score higher than men will in religiosity and spirituality. Psychology students will score higher than theology students in spirituality, and theology students will score higher than psychology students in religiosity. Students with a higher socioeconomic status, in contrast to individuals with a lower level of socioeconomic level, are believed to be more spiritual. The educational level of parents is hypothesized to influence their children's religiosity and spirituality. Consequently, students of parents with a high educational level are more likely to be spiritual, while students coming from families with a lower educational level are predicted to be more religious.

Method

The following data are based on a survey that was collected between May 2011 and June 2011 and was analysed in July 2011 for the purpose of the first author's MA dissertation1.

1 Altunl-Macić, M. (2011)
**Participants**

The sample consists of 220, graduate and postgraduate students of which 95 are males (43.2%) and 125 are female (56.8%), with an age range from 18 to 30 (\(M = 23\)). Participants were students in the departments of Theology (\(N = 111, 50.5\%\)) and Psychology (\(N = 109, 49.5\%\)) at Selcuk University. The number of respondents who reported their family income level as very good was 6.4% (\(N = 14\)), good was 51.4% (\(N = 113\)), average was 40.5% (\(N = 89\)), and only four respondents indicated that their family income was weak. 36.4% (\(N = 80\)), 9.5% (\(N = 21\)), 15.9% (\(N = 35\)), 30% (\(N = 66\)), and 8.2% (\(N = 18\)) of the participants indicated respectively primary school graduate, secondary school graduate, high school graduate, university graduate and postgraduate (MA or PhD) for their fathers’ educational level. Distribution of the respondents’ mothers’ educational level was respectively; 2.7% (\(N = 6\)) for postgraduate, 7.3% (\(N = 16\)) for university graduate, 13.6% (\(N = 30\)) for high school graduate, 10% (\(N = 22\)) for secondary school graduate, and 66.4% (\(N = 146\)) for primary school graduate.

**Instruments**

Quantitative methods were used in the research. In the survey document, respondents completed a background information form followed open-ended qualitative questions asking for the participants’ definitions of what ‘religiosity’ and ‘spirituality’ meant to them (i.e. “What does spirituality mean to you?”, and “What does religion mean to you?”), which was then, followed by the two scales related to each concept.

**Background Information**

On the background information form, participants answered several demographic questions on gender, the department in which they were a graduate or postgraduate student, the educational level of their parents, and their socio-economic status. Five definitions of spirituality from different scholars were given to the participants in order for them to choose the one they found most personally meaningful.

**Spirituality Scale**

In this research, spirituality is considered a dimension of character. As such, the self-transcendence (ST) subscale of the TCI (Temperament and Character Inventory), developed by Robert Cloninger, Svrakic & Przybeck (1993), is used as a measure of spirituality. The ST subscale is a 33-item measure that includes three factors: ‘self-forgetfulness’ (11 items) (i.e. “When I focus on doing something, I often do not realize how the time passes”, and “Often when I look at an ordinary thing, something wonderful happens – I get the feeling that I am
seeing it fresh for the first time.), ‘transpersonal identification’ (9 items) (i.e. “I often feel a strong unity with all objects around me”, and “I have made real personal sacrifice in order to make the world a better place – like trying to prevent war, poverty and injustice”), ‘spiritual acceptance’ (13 item) (i.e. “Religious experiences have helped me understand the essential aim of my life”, and “I have had personal experiences in which I felt in contact with a divine and wonderful spiritual power”). “Self-transcendence (ST) is associated with spirituality and it refers generally to identification with everything conceived as essential and consequential parts of a unified whole” (Cloninger, Hansenne & Delhez, 2005). Samet Kose and Kemal Sayar translated TCI into Turkish (Kose, Sayar, Ak, Aydin, Kalelioglu, Kirpınar et al, 2004) and since then it has become a well-known and commonly used measure for spirituality studies in Turkey.

In this study, the overall Cronbach alpha coefficient is acceptable for this scale, and relatively good (α = .81). However, the sub-scale alpha coefficient is only marginally acceptable at (α = .70) for ‘self-forgetfulness’, and poor for ‘transpersonal identification’ (α = .65) and for ‘spiritual acceptance’ (α = .56).

Religiosity Scale
In order to measure religiosity levels of participants the Brief Islamic Religiosity Measure (BIRM), which was developed by Ayten (2009) and consists of 10 items, was used. This scale has two sub-scales named ‘religious effect and faith’ (6 items) (i.e. “My religious beliefs are effective with regard helping needy”, and “Religion is helpful in comprehending the meaning of life and in finding answers to the questions which are faced in life”) and ‘religious knowledge and ritual’ (4 items) (i.e. “How often do you read Qur’an and its translation into Turkish?”, and “What do you think about your level of religious knowledge in order to worship properly?”).The first sub-scale (religious effect and faith) contains 6 items that assess the degree of the effect of religious beliefs on benevolence, honesty, and problem solving. The second sub-scale (religious knowledge and ritual) contains four items that assess the degree of the fulfilment of religious rituals (e.g. daily prayers, fasting during Ramadan, and reading the Qur’an), and the level of religious knowledge. The Cronbach’s alphas in the present study are all above acceptable levels for this scale (α = .83); and for the two sub-scales ‘religious effect and faith’ and ‘religious knowledge and ritual’, respectively (α = .79) and (α = .72).

Procedure
Investigators passed out the survey questionnaires to student volunteers in the break time after their courses. The participants were given brief information about the research before they began completing the questionnaires. However,
they were not informed about the aim of the research in order to prevent biased responses. It took approximately 30 minutes to complete both questionnaires. The questionnaire forms were distributed to 250 students, although data was collected from 220. Thirty participants did not return them.

Results

Self-definitions of Spirituality and Religiosity (Answers to the Open-ended Questions)

Participants were asked to answer two open-ended questions (i.e. “What does spirituality mean to you?”, and “What does religion mean to you?”). Twenty-two participants (16%) did not answer the open-ended question on religiosity. Seventy-five respondents (34%) did not answer the open-ended question on spirituality. Qualitative content analysis was administered as a research method to code the data and identify themes mentioned by the participants. Definitions of spirituality were classified into two groups; religious spirituality and nonreligious spirituality.

Our data indicates that spirituality is perceived as a religious concept by 93 respondents (41.8%). Forty-five of these define spirituality as:

– Piety to Allah
– Living a life for His sake in the direction of His commands
– Practicing Islam sincerely

Fifty-two participants (23.6%) did not mention religion or religious affiliation when defining spirituality. Their definitions were:

– Peace which could be reached during the process of seeking God
– Sincerity
– Prospering spirit with values
– Nonmaterial
– Intrinsic satisfaction
– Being simple-hearted
– Listening to heart instead of mind
– The place and situation where money has disappeared
– Intuitional aspects
– Belief and commitment
– Love
– Comprehending the meaning of life
- Viewing life optimistically
- Living life at the same time as considering death
- Believing in something
- Searching for oneself, or for sacred
- Sensibility
- Conscience
- Believing in an existence and communicating with that existence
- *Sincere commitment to people we love*

Only one participant defined spirituality as a larger concept than religion.

The most common definitions of religiosity were:

- Performing all of the commands of Allah willingly
- Thinking of God at all times and places
- Full commitment to the Creator
- Being obedient
- Practicing religion without any hesitation
- Living a life in the direction of spiritual values without being under pressure
- Being a Muslim and practicing the religion under the guidance of the Qur’ān and hadiths

Interestingly, there was only one different answer in the sample; a 29-year-old male psychology student who stated that religiosity is *a tool used by some people who are thought to be religious leaders in order to exploit people.*

In conducting research about what the term spirituality entails among professionals from the five main religious traditions such as priests, monks, temple presidents, imams and rabbis, Rose (2001) discovered that the majority of the professionals argued that religious belief was not necessary to experience spirituality. However, the majority of Muslim respondents, compared to other traditions, indicated that spirituality could not be experienced without religious belief (Rose, 2001). Consistent with the general findings of Rose from their Muslim sample, the results of our research indicate that: to a Turkish Muslim sample (41.8%), a majority of the respondents identify spirituality as a term derived from religion.

*Chosen definitions of spirituality within five given definitions from scholars*

Participants were given five definitions of spirituality by scholars and were asked to choose the most personally meaningful. The majority of the respondents ($N = 81$, 36.8%) indicated ‘a commitment to a transcendent existence’. 36.4% of the sample ($N = 80$) chose ‘a response of a human being to the call of
God who is communicating with him or her. These two were the most popular statements accepted by both Theology and Psychology students. The other percentages were respectively 10.5 for ‘the process of seeking for the sacred’ ($N = 23$), 9.5 for ‘an existential search for the sacred’ ($N = 21$), and 6.8 for ‘a special relationship between the individual and the cosmos’ ($N = 15$) (see Table 7.1).

**Table 7.1** Chosen definitions of spirituality within five given definitions from scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A response of human being to the call of God (Allah) who is communicating with him or her (Berner, 1989).</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A special relationship between the individual and the cosmos (Grof, 2007).</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An existential search for meaning (Doyle, 1992).</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of seeking for the sacred (Pargament, 2002).</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A commitment to a transcendent existence (Belzen, 2004).</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship between Demographic Variables, Religiosity, and Spirituality**
A one-way ANOVA test was conducted in order to understand group differences between women and men; whether gender made a difference in terms of religiosity and spirituality. (see Table 7.2).

**Table 7.2** Means and standard deviations for gender, religiosity and spirituality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women ($N = 125$)</th>
<th>Men ($N = 95$)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity total</td>
<td>35.7 (3.86)</td>
<td>34.6 (4.23)</td>
<td>2.005</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious effect &amp; faith</td>
<td>22.3 (2.40)</td>
<td>21.9 (2.57)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious knowledge &amp; ritual</td>
<td>13.3 (1.95)</td>
<td>12.6 (2.31)</td>
<td>2.399</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality total</td>
<td>1.1 (13.86)</td>
<td>1.1 (12.92)</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual acceptance</td>
<td>45.4 (5.61)</td>
<td>45.1 (5.37)</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self forgetfulness</td>
<td>32 (6.31)</td>
<td>31.9 (5.81)</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transpersonal identification</td>
<td>28.1 (4.18)</td>
<td>28 (4.75)</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bonferroni correction applied $\alpha = .0035$; no significant results
There were no meaningful differences observed between female and male participants in ‘religiosity total’, ‘religious effect & faith’ or ‘religious knowledge & ritual’. Thus, the hypothesis that women will score higher than men in religiosity and spirituality is not supported by the findings.

According to the scores of spirituality and religiosity scales (see Table 7.3) there is no meaningful difference between theology and psychology students. The findings do not support the hypothesis that psychology students will score higher than Theology students in spirituality, and Theology students will score higher than Psychology students in religiosity.

Table 7.3  Means and standard deviations for theology and psychology students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theology students</th>
<th>Psychology students</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 111)</td>
<td>(N = 109)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity total</td>
<td>35.4 (35.4)</td>
<td>35.1 (3.77)</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious effect &amp; faith</td>
<td>22.1 (2.76)</td>
<td>22.2 (2.15)</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious knowledge &amp; ritual</td>
<td>13.2 (2)</td>
<td>12.8 (2.25)</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality total</td>
<td>1.1 (13.79)</td>
<td>1.1 (13.13)</td>
<td>-0.284</td>
<td>0.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual acceptance</td>
<td>45.3 (5.91)</td>
<td>45.2 (5.07)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self forgetfulness</td>
<td>31.8 (6.29)</td>
<td>32.1 (5.90)</td>
<td>-0.343</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transpersonal identification</td>
<td>27.8 (4.31)</td>
<td>28.2 (4.56)</td>
<td>-0.686</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bonferroni correction applied α = 0.0035; no significant results

No meaningful correlation appears between family income level and religiosity and spirituality (See Table 7.4). The findings do not support the hypothesis that spiritual people, in contrast to religious people, are of higher socioeconomic status.

The negative correlations among fathers’ educational level, the religiosity and spirituality levels of respondents are apparent (see Table 7.4). A two-tailed t-test was used. The results for the educational level of the father had weak negative correlations with both religiosity (r = -0.137) and spirituality (r = -0.206) totals. Additionally, the correlation between mothers’ educational level and religiosity was negative and weak (r = -0.135). However, there is no significant correlation between the education level of the participants’ mothers and the
level of spirituality. The research team observed that the higher the educational level of the father, the less likely the associated family member will identify as spiritual and religious. In addition, the religiosity of participants decreases as the level of education of the mother increases. The findings do not support the hypothesis that students whose parents have a high educational level are more likely to be spiritual, while students coming from families with a lower educational level seem to be more religious.

**Spirituality and Religiosity**

Correlations between religiosity and spiritualitity scales are statistically significant (See Table 7.5). With respect to the association between religiosity and spirituality, it has been demonstrated that correlations between the two scales were statistically significant ($r = .236$). Other patterns of correlations were found between the religiosity and spirituality subscales, and also between the subscales of the two terms. For example, religiosity total score had a small positive correlation with spiritual acceptance ($r = .213$) and transpersonal identification ($r = .219$), however, a marginal correlation with self-forgetfulness ($r = .149$) (see Table 7.5). The findings support the main hypothesis that is Turkish people consider there to be a meaningful relationship between religiosity and spirituality.

### Table 7.4 Correlations among family income, education level of parents; and religiosity and spirituality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Religiosity total</th>
<th>Spirituality total</th>
<th>Family income level</th>
<th>Education level of father</th>
<th>Education level of mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.236**</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.137*</td>
<td>-0.135*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality total</td>
<td>.236**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>-0.206**</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income level</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.147*</td>
<td>1.155*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level of father</td>
<td>-0.137*</td>
<td>-0.206**</td>
<td>-0.147*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>194**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level of mother</td>
<td>-0.135*</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>.155*</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Religiosity total</th>
<th>Religious effect &amp; faith</th>
<th>Religious knowledge &amp; ritual</th>
<th>Spirituality total</th>
<th>Spiritual acceptance</th>
<th>Transpersonal identification</th>
<th>Self forgetfulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.896**</td>
<td>.857**</td>
<td>.236**</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>.149*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious effect &amp; faith</td>
<td>.896**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>.230**</td>
<td>.191**</td>
<td>.206**</td>
<td>.166*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious knowledge &amp; ritual</td>
<td>.857**</td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.180**</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>.176**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality total</td>
<td>.236**</td>
<td>.230**</td>
<td>.180**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.807**</td>
<td>.759**</td>
<td>.846**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual acceptance</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>.191**</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>.807**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>.512**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transpersonal identification</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>.206**</td>
<td>.176**</td>
<td>.759**</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.468**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self forgetfulness</td>
<td>.149*</td>
<td>.166*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.846**</td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>.468**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Discussion and Conclusion**

This paper aimed to investigate Turkish Muslim students’ perceptions of spirituality and religiosity, and to examine the relation between several demographic variables and the levels of spirituality and religiosity. This research has demonstrated that a large percentage ($N = 93$, 41%) of the Turkish Muslim sample examined in this study tends to demonstrate what we term as a ‘religious spirituality’—by identifying spirituality with religion, Islam and Allah.

There have been social changes in Turkey accompanied by secularization and modernity that may affect people’s understandings of religion and spirituality. The understanding of spirituality without religion is a relatively new issue both in Turkey and in the Islamic world. A more collectively orientated religiosity is still present and dominant in Turkey, but more recently, religious individualism has emerged, however it is not as widespread as in the US and other Western countries. A significant portion of our sample ($N = 52$, 23.6%) did not identify spirituality directly with religion. This may be related to secularization and other social changes. Consequently, it may be beneficial to measure the
spirituality of people within different groups, for example liberals and secularists, as well as people from different religious backgrounds, such as Sunni, Shi’ite, and Alawi, and of people with different educational backgrounds, such as academicians and psychiatrists to take the impact of secularity and modernity on specific groups into account. Future research efforts should be made to broaden the sample to include different age groups, ranging from children to the elderly.

Another significant conclusion that can be drawn from this project is the importance of education in the changes of the levels of religiosity and spirituality in Turkey. Even though an individual comes from a religious background, traditional scientific positivist training in universities may lead him or her to withdraw from religion and spirituality. As parents are one of the most influential factors on the development of children, their educational levels might have an indirect effect on the understandings of spirituality and religion of their children. Nevertheless it remains difficult to generalize the results. There are many studies both supporting this hypothesis (Gunay, 1979; Koktas, 1993) and contradicting this hypothesis (e.g., Yapici, 2007; Karasahin, 2007). Secular education might have a negative effect on religiosity and spirituality while religious education might help increase belief and practice levels. Therefore, we suggest studying the effects of positivist scientific training and other forms of education on spirituality.

The current study has some limitations. The sample consisted of students from a generally conservative city; Konya in Turkey, so that religiosity and spirituality levels might be higher here than in other Turkish cities. As such, it might be useful to study more cosmopolitan cities such as Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir. Another limitation of the quantitative methods used in this research was the marginal to poor subscale reliability alpha scores, particularly the spiritual acceptance subscale of the spirituality scale. Previous studies have demonstrated problems achieving acceptable alpha scores for the subscales of the Spiritual Transcendence scale (and even other subscales on the TCI) as well (e.g. Kose et al., 2004; Arkar et al., 2005); however these studies have not typically drawn attention to this limitation. Therefore, we suggest that future research should consider ways to improve the subscale reliability concerns. Moreover, it may be worth, and in taking a cue from cultural psychology of religion (Belzen, 2010), exploring the construction of a spirituality scale explicitly designed for the Turkish cultural context. As such, qualitative methods such as interviews on the concept of spirituality might be a more appropriate precursor to scale construction in order to understand, evaluate and conceptualize the perceptions of the individuals, and should provide deeper insight for the researchers. Moreover, the results of this research are
limited in relation to the measurement capacity of the scales. Furthermore, as
this study is not a longitudinal investigation and regarding the potential chang-
es in faith, belief, thoughts, and behaviours of the participants over time, these
results are limited to the time when the research was conducted.

Although we found no significant differences among the men and women
in our sample, the reporting of this ‘lack of significance’ is significant. Research-
ers reporting results that are not significant in all areas of the sciences is known
as ‘the file drawer problem’ (Rosenthal, 1979; Scargle, 2000). Scientists must be
willing to report the absence of statistically significant findings if the social
sciences, particularly psychology, are to advance. If researchers only publish
their results when they are significant or support their hypothesis, such publi-
cation bias can present a false view of the phenomena being studied as no one
can tell how many studies have been conducted, yet never reported. Therefore,
even findings that are not significant (such as the lack of detectable difference
between men and women in our sample) make an important contribution to
the literature on religion and spirituality in Turkey.

In conclusion, comprehensive research including broader sample groups
and more detailed measurements of spirituality and religiosity need to be con-
ducted in Islamic regions and countries. Further research in this field regard-
ing the role of spirituality and its relationship with religion would be
extremely valuable in understanding the psychology of Muslims. Particularly,
such work could examine any benefit derived from spirituality when facing
challenging struggles and finding solutions to their problems in the hope of
producing an extensive definition of spirituality that could be accepted by all
Muslims.
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