Is Spirituality Detrimental to Generativity?

MICHELE DILLON
PAUL WINK
KRISTEN FAY

This article examines the relations between religiousness, spirituality, and generativity (concern for the welfare of future generations) in late adulthood using longitudinal life-course data. Religiousness and spirituality were operationalized as distinct but overlapping dimensions of individual difference measuring involvement in traditional and nontraditional religious practices, respectively. In late adulthood, both religiousness and spirituality correlated positively with overall scores on self-report and observer-based measures of generativity. However, whereas religiousness was significantly related to the communal facets of generativity, spirituality was significantly related to its self-expanding aspects. These differences were more pronounced after gender, cohort, social class, and the overlap between religiousness and spirituality were controlled. The respective relations among religiousness, spirituality, and generativity in late adulthood were also observed using religiousness scored in early, and spirituality scored in late-middle, adulthood.

Church involvement has provided many generations of Americans with the motivating scripts and opportunities for giving practical realization to ethics of care and social responsibility. In recent years, however, the trend toward a personalized and individuated spirituality coupled with evidence of a decline in social and community participation has raised concern that emergent forms of spirituality threaten to undermine the long-established link between religion and doing good for others. This article uses data from a 60-year-old longitudinal study to test the relations between spirituality, religiousness, and generativity in a representative sample of American men and women who were born in the 1920s.

RELIGION AND THE CULTURAL SHIFT OF THE 1960s

The post-1960s cultural transformation has produced a noticeable change in American religion (e.g., Marty 1993; Roof 1999; Wuthnow 1998) with communal and tradition-centered religious beliefs and practices being displaced to some extent by a relatively privatized, seeker-oriented spiritual individualism that is largely independent of institutionalized religious authority. The significant increase in the proportion of Americans reporting no religious preference or church affiliation (Hout and Fischer 2002) and the concomitant increase in the proportion of Americans who report a "personal religion" (Smith 2002) is part of a broader pattern of decline in American social involvement in the latter part of the 20th century (Putnam 2000). Because of the long-standing positive association between traditional forms of religious involvement and social and community participation, some sociologists have responded to the emergence of a privatized and individuated spirituality with considerable concern (e.g., Bellah et al. 1985). They see a socially responsible individualism being displaced by a self-centered, narcissistic, and therapeutic individualism, the triumph of "psychological man," for whom personal fulfillment is an end in itself rather than the result of engagement in socially meaningful activities (Rieff 1966). On this view, a spiritual individualism that is autonomous of institutionalized religion threatens to undercut

Michele Dillon is an Associate Professor of Sociology, University of New Hampshire, 20 College Road, Durham, NH 03824. E-mail: michele.dillon@unh.edu
Paul Wink is a Professor of Psychology, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181. E-mail: Pwink@wellesley.edu
Kristen Fay is Research Coordinator in the Department of Psychology, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181.

Americans' social and communal commitments (e.g., Bellah et al. 1985; Wuthnow 1998), and their concern for the welfare of future generations, or what Erikson (1963) called *generativity*.

Others, however, offer a more positive assessment of the social implications of the recent turn toward spirituality. Roof's (1999) research among middle-aged "baby boomers" suggests that those who have had spiritual experiences are more likely to value self-giving than those who have not. Openness to self-growth, Roof argues, translates into a predisposition toward more generative personal and social relations on the part of individuals who are spiritually engaged. On this view, because spirituality usually means that the individual has developed an awareness of a sense of connectedness between self and others and the world at large (Underwood 1999), spiritual individualism does not necessarily threaten communal involvement (Roof 1999:163, 269). It should, in fact, be conducive to achieving the broader societal perspective that leads to generativity, even though as argued by Bellah et al. (1985:81) the "romantic and psychological pantheism" reflected in belief in the unity of all living things offers only the "vaguest prescriptions about how to live in an actual society."

The expectation that spirituality should lead to an increase in generative interests fits well with diverse psychological theories that link spiritual growth to higher levels of cognitive development and/or self-actualization. Both psychodynamic (Erikson 1963; Jung 1964) and postformal (e.g., Sinnott 1994) theories of development see spirituality as intertwined with the maturational processes and experiences (McFadden 1996; Stokes 1990) associated with the second half of adulthood. According to these theorists, the development of spirituality requires the kind of personal autonomy and awareness of contextual relativism that typically develops only around midlife once the individual has established a niche in society and begins to experience physical signs of aging (Jung 1964). Adult development theories thus emphasize the relation between spirituality and a sense of human connectedness, integration of the self, and openness to new experiences (Erikson 1963; McFadden 1996; Sinnott 1994). At the same time, of course, maturational processes are not independent of specific sociocultural contexts. Therefore, it might be expected that individuals who came of age in post-1960s American society with its diversity of publicly accessible spiritual vocabularies and resources would show evidence of spiritual growth from earlier in the life cycle than that postulated by adult development theorists.

The current debate over whether spirituality undermines or nurtures generativity is limited by (1) the absence of empirical studies investigating the relation between spirituality, religiousness, and generativity, (2) lack of clarity about the distinction between religiousness and spirituality, and (3) failure to consider different types of socially beneficent behavior.

RELIGIOUSNESS AND SPIRITUALITY

The conceptual ambiguity surrounding the relationship between religiousness and spirituality derives primarily from the multiplicity of meanings associated with the term spirituality (e.g., Farina 1989; Marler and Hadaway 2002; Wulff 1997; Zinnbauer et al. 1997). It can be applied equally aptly to a pious individual who expresses devotion within the context of a traditional religious institution (Pargament 1999), a New Age seeker (Roof 1999), a person who has mystical experiences (Atchley 1997), and a nonreligious individual who seeks answers to life's existential dilemmas (Stifoss-Hanssen 1999). Depending on the definition used, spirituality has been conceived as being narrower (Pargament 1999), broader (Stifoss-Hanssen 1999; Zinnbauer et al. 1997), or largely independent (Roof 1999) in meaning from religiousness.

In this study, we operationalize religiousness and spirituality as two dimensions of individual difference using Wuthnow's (1998) distinction between dwelling and seeking. According to Wuthnow, "religious dwellers" tend to accept traditional forms of religious authority; they inhabit a space created for them by established religious institutions and relate to the sacred through prayer and public communal worship. By contrast, for "spiritual seekers" individual autonomy takes precedence over external authority and the hold of tradition-centered religious doctrines.

They are explorers who create their own space by typically borrowing elements from various religious and mythical traditions and they frequently blend participation in institutionalized Western religion with Eastern practices. Wuthnow's model captures a salient aspect of the distinction between religiousness and spirituality as used in public culture, and in a way that makes both concepts operationalizable and amenable to research. As argued by Moberg (2002), however, because of the complexity in the relation between religiousness and spirituality, it is impossible for any one definition to capture all the nuances of both constructs.

Two Faces of Generativity

Scholarly debate concerning the differential social implications of spirituality and religiousness has tended to be framed in terms of their beneficial or detrimental impact on social and communal participation without an attempt to define the nature and sources of such altruistic or pro-social behavior (e.g., Bellah et al. 1985). In this article we reframe the question in terms of generativity because this sharpens the scope of inquiry by introducing the possibility that there may be more than one way of expressing commitment to community and society. According to Erik Erikson's (1963) formulation of the construct, generativity reflects a selfless concern for the welfare of future generations and for the world at large that may be expressed in diverse ways, including teaching and mentoring, communal, political, and environmental activism, or through more privatized creative activities.

Generativity produces mutuality in that it strengthens both the doer and the recipient (Erikson 1963). As other scholars have argued, it fuses both other-oriented and self-expanding concerns, or what might be referred to as communal and agential interests (e.g., Bakan 1966; Kotre 1996; MacDermid, Franz, and De Reus 1998; McAdams and de St. Aubin 1992). Undoubtedly, many generative acts are a manifestation of a deeply felt need for interpersonal givingness and caring, and the desire to attain fusion with others, characteristics that are the hallmark of communion (Bakan 1966; Bellah et al. 1991). However, generative behavior can also be the manifestation of more self-expansive or agential impulses, such as the desire to outlive the self and attain immortality (Kotre 1996), the need for power and impact on others (McAdams 1995), and creativity (Erikson 1963). Importantly, the investment of the self in purposeful activities, irrespective of whether such activities are communal or self-expansive, is seen as demonstrating a sense of basic trust in the world and in other human beings. This activity, in turn, injects a sense of social trust, reciprocity, and optimism among the younger generations who witness it (Bellah et al. 1991; Erikson 1964; Putnam 2000). In this study we construe generativity in terms of both its communal and self-expanding dimensions. By doing so we are able to assess the overall relations between religiousness, spirituality, and generativity and to identify the specific patterns of association among religiousness, spirituality, and the communal and self-expansive aspects of generativity.

Hypotheses

We propose to test two models of the relation between spirituality, religiousness, and generativity. The first, undifferentiated, model hypothesizes that because of the well-established theoretical and empirical links between religiousness and concern for others (e.g., Erikson 1963; Putnam 2000; Rossi 2001), religiousness will be positively related to generativity. Following Bellah and co-authors' (1985) assumption that privatized spiritual seeking cuts individuals off from the practices of social commitment associated with tradition-centered religious involvement, this model assumes that spirituality will be either negatively or not related to generativity. The second, differentiated, model hypothesizes that both religiousness and spirituality will be positively related to generativity but in the case of religiousness this association will primarily reflect communal interests, whereas in the case of spirituality it will be the product of self-expanding concerns. Specifically, this model hypothesizes that individuals who score high on religiousness

should show altruistic concerns and be seen as giving and protective of others. In contrast, because of the self-orientation associated with spiritual seeking, individuals who score high on spirituality should be engaged in generative activities that have a creative dimension, are aimed at personally impacting others, or leaving a legacy that outlives the self (Kotre 1996). They should also be seen as embracing a broad social perspective that reflects the sense of cosmic interconnectedness associated with spirituality (Underwood 1999). Because of a moderately positive relation between religiousness and spirituality, these hypothesized differences between the two constructs should be particularly evident once the overlap between them is statistically controlled.

Our third set of hypotheses involves the long-term stability of the expected relations between religiousness, spirituality, and generativity. Empirical studies show that religiousness is relatively stable throughout adulthood with the patterns established in early adulthood setting the norm for later stages (e.g., Hout and Greeley 1987; Rossi 2001). These trends support a "religious capital" perspective whereby the more individuals invest in religious activities in early adulthood, the more likely they will participate subsequently (e.g., Iannaccone 1990). Drawing on a "religious capital" model, we hypothesize that the relations between religiousness and generativity in late adulthood will also be observed for religiousness scored from early and late middle adulthood.

The theoretical expectation (e.g., Jung 1964; Sinnott 1994) and the available empirical evidence, including previously reported findings using this study's sample (Wink and Dillon 2002), suggest that, unlike religiousness, spirituality tends to develop from midlife onward. Consequently, we hypothesize that any of the relations we discover between spirituality and generativity in late adulthood will also be found for spirituality scored in late-middle but not early adulthood (when spiritual concerns are relatively marginal).

DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Because women tend to be more religious than men and also show higher rates of social and community participation (Putnam 2000; Rossi 2001), we test whether controlling for gender, religiousness and spirituality continue to be positively related to generativity. Because of the association between high social status and engagement in philanthropic and community service activities (Ostrower 1995), we also control for social class in our analyses. Finally, because our study's sample combines two different age cohorts (one-third born in the early 1920s and two-thirds born in the late 1920s), and because studies suggest that older-age Americans are more altruistic than successive age-cohorts (Putnam 2000), we include cohort as an independent variable.

ANALYTIC STRATEGY

First, we use zero-order correlations to test hypotheses regarding the differential relations between religiousness, spirituality, and generativity in late adulthood without statistically controlling for the overlapping variance in the two constructs. This allows us to compare the relation between religiousness and spirituality as it is likely to occur in the "real world" where we expect a moderate positive correlation between the two constructs. We then repeat the analyses regressing the different generativity measures on religiousness, spirituality, social class, gender, and cohort in order to investigate the independent relations of religiousness and spirituality to the generativity measures once the overlap with each other and the background variables is statistically controlled. This isolates the unique relations between generativity in late adulthood and religiousness and spirituality, respectively. Finally, we repeat the regression analyses to test hypotheses regarding the long-term relations of religiousness scored in early and late-middle adulthood, and spirituality scored in late-middle adulthood, to generativity in late adulthood.

<center>**METHODS**</center>

Sample

The data come from the Intergenerational Studies established by the Institute of Human Development (IHD) at the University of California, Berkeley in the 1920s. The original sample was a representative sample of newborn babies in Berkeley (California) in 1928/1929 (the Berkeley Guidance Study), and of preadolescents (ages 10–12) selected from elementary schools in Oakland (California) in 1931 and who were born in 1920/1921 (the Oakland Growth Study). Both samples were combined into a single study in the 1960s (Eichorn, Hunt, and Honzik 1981). The participants were studied intensively in childhood and adolescence and interviewed in-depth four times in adulthood: in *early adulthood* (age 30s; interview conducted in 1958/1959), *middle adulthood* (age 40s; 1970), *late-middle adulthood* (age 50s/early 60s; 1982), and *late adulthood*, when the participants were in their late 60s or mid-to-late 70s (1997–2000). At each interview phase, the participants also completed self-administered questionnaires. This article uses data collected in early, late-middle, and late adulthood only.

Three-hundred individuals took part in at least one of the three assessments conducted between early and late-middle adulthood. By late adulthood, 26 percent of these individuals had died. Of the remainder, 1 percent had become seriously cognitively impaired, 7 percent were noncontactable, and 5 percent declined to participate. Because the late-adulthood assessment involved an intensive interview, individuals with serious cognitive impairment were excluded. Of the available participants (neither dead, noncontactable, or severely cognitively impaired), 91 percent ($N = 183$) were interviewed in late adulthood. Prior analyses indicated very little bias due to sample attrition other than a slight tendency for lower participation rates among individuals with lower levels of education (Clausen 1993; Wink and Dillon 2002).

Characteristics of the Sample

In the current sample ($N = 183$), 53 percent are women and 47 percent are men; 36 percent were born in the early 1920s and 64 percent were born in the late 1920s. In late-middle adulthood, 59 percent of the participants (or their spouses) were upper-middle-class professionals or executives, 19 percent were lower-middle class, and 22 percent were working class. All but six of the participants are white. The majority of the sample (73 percent) grew up in Protestant families, 16 percent grew up Catholic, 5 percent grew up in mixed religious (Protestant/Jewish) households, and 6 percent came from nonreligious families. In late adulthood, 58 percent of the study participants were Protestant (and of these, 78 percent were members of mainline denominations, primarily Presbyterian, Episcopalian, and Methodist), 16 percent were Catholic, 2 percent were Jewish, and 24 percent were not church members. Forty-eight percent said that religion was important or very important currently in their lives, 83 percent were still living in California, 71 percent were living with their spouse or partner, 89 percent reported their general health as good, and the median household income was $55,000. Forty-eight percent identified as Republican, 31 percent as Democrats, and 21 percent did not have a party affiliation or were independent.

Measures of Religiousness and Spirituality

Religiousness and spirituality were coded on five-point scales independently by two raters using discrete segments on religion from transcripts of interviews conducted with the participants at three times in adulthood. Before being rated, the interview segments were photocopied and assigned a discrete, randomly generated number. The same raters, who were blind to the study's hypotheses, coded the interview segments from all three assessments after the late-adulthood data were collected. The interview segments included answers to open-ended questions on the

individual's beliefs about God and the afterlife, their religious practices, and the importance of religion in everyday life. In answering these questions, the participants had no, or very little, opportunity to comment on matters relating to this study's dependent variables. Questions pertinent to these constructs were asked in earlier and separate segments of the interview. The data on religiousness and spirituality, therefore, are unlikely to have been confounded by the interview material on other matters.

Religiousness was defined in terms of the importance of institutionalized or tradition-centered religious beliefs and practices in the life of the individual (Wuthnow 1998; Roof 1999). A high score indicated that institutionalized religion or tradition-centered religious beliefs and practices played a *central* role in the respondent's life indicated by belief in God, heaven, and prayer, and/or frequent (once a week or more) attendance at a traditional place of worship (see Wink and Dillon 2001 for a more detailed description of the rating scale). The Kappa index of reliability for the two sets of ratings of religiousness ranged from a low of 0.65 for late-middle adulthood to a high of 0.70 in late adulthood, $p < 0.001$. The average rank-order stability (correlation) between the ratings of religiousness (combined across the two raters) for the three time points in adulthood was 0.71.

Spirituality was defined in terms of the importance of noninstitutionalized religion or nontradition-centered beliefs and practices in the life of the individual (Wuthnow 1998; Roof 1999). A high score indicated that noninstitutionalized religion or nontradition-centered religious beliefs and practices played a *central* role in the individual's life. The person typically reported an awareness of a sense of connectedness with a sacred Other (e.g., God, higher power, nature, other individuals) and systematically engaged in intentional spiritual practices on a regular basis (e.g., participation in a theosophical discussion group, involvement in Eastern meditation practices, undertaking a shamanistic journey, engagement in centering or contemplative prayer) (see Wink and Dillon 2002 for a more detailed description of the rating scale). The Kappa index of reliability for the two sets of ratings of spirituality ranged from a low of 0.60 for late-middle and late adulthood to 0.74 for early adulthood, $p < 0.001$. The average rank-order stability between the ratings of spirituality (combined across the two raters) for the three time points in adulthood was 0.42.

There was a significant moderate relation between religiousness and spirituality at each adult interview: 0.26 in early adulthood, 0.28 in late-middle adulthood, and 0.30 in late adulthood, $p < 0.01$.

Generativity

The *Loyola Generativity Scale* (LGS) is a 20-item self-report scale that uses a four-point Likert scale to gauge an individual's concern with the goal of providing for the next generation (McAdams and de St. Aubin 1992). Because the LGS assesses various aspects of generativity and, important from the perspective of this study, mixes themes of communion and agency, we developed four subscales that reflect the LGS's major themes: altruism, having impact on others, doing things that will be remembered by others, and being creative (see McAdams and de St. Aubin 1992). The subscales were developed using a mixed rational and internal consistency method of scale construction. First, two raters sorted the 20 items of the LGS into the four thematic categories (disagreement among the raters regarding the placement of one of the items was resolved through discussion). Next, the items were grouped into four provisional scales and alpha coefficients were computed to establish the homogeneity of each scale. At this stage, one item from one scale was shifted to a different scale and two additional items (both phrased negatively) were dropped from the analyses because inspection of the correlational matrix indicated that respondents were confused about their meaning.

The *Altruism* subscale consists of five items assessing generative concerns that reflect feelings of responsibility for one's neighborhood, commitment to different groups and organizations, a

desire to work as a teacher, and to adopt children. The *Impact on Others* subscale consists of eight items reflecting a belief that the person has had a positive (unique) effect on others, is needed by others, and has worthwhile skills and knowledge to pass onto others. The *Outliving the Self* subscale consists of three items reflecting the belief that the individual's contribution will exist and be remembered by others after death. The *Creative Endeavor* subscale consists of two items indicating a desire to be creative and the belief that the person's creative endeavor has made an impact on others. The alpha coefficient of reliability for the four scales ranged from a low of 0.64 for the Altruism and Creative Endeavor subscales to a high of 0.75 for the Impact on Others subscale. The correlation between the LGS and its four subscales ranged from a high of 0.91 for the Impact on Others subscale to a low of 0.69 for the Outliving the Self and Creative Endeavor subscales. Among the subscales, the correlations ranged from a high of 0.61 between the Altruism and Impact on Others subscales to a low of 0.34 between the Altruism and Outliving the Self subscales (see Table 1). (Scale items are available from the authors upon request.)

The California Adult Q-set (CAQ; Block 1978) Generativity Scale (the CAQ-GS) consists of 13 items and provides an observer-based measure of the realization of an individual's generative potential (Peterson and Klohnen 1995) (alpha = 0.89). Following Peterson and Klohnen (1995), we divided the 13 items of the CAQ-GS into three subscales measuring themes of *Givingness* (five items, e.g., "behaves in a giving way toward others" and "is protective of those close to him/her") (alpha = 0.91); *Prosocial Competence and Productivity* (three items, e.g., "is productive" and "behaves in an ethically consistent way") (alpha = 0.65),[1] and *Social Perspective* (four items, e.g., "is incisive and socially perceptive," "able to see to the heart of important problems," and "is philosophically minded") (alpha = 0.70). In late adulthood, the correlations between the CAQ-GS and its three subscales ranged from a high of 0.89 for the Givingness subscale to a low of 0.71 for the Prosocial Competence and Productivity subscale. Among the three subscales, the correlations ranged from a high of 0.53 between the Givingness and Social Perspective subscales and a low of 0.48 between the Prosocial Competence and Productivity and Social Perspective subscales (see Table 1). The CAQ-GS scale was available for the IHD participants for each of the three assessments in adulthood (average intercorrelation = 0.43).

The correlation between the LGS and the CAQ-GS was only 0.32 (see Table 1). This is due, in part, to the effect of method variance when comparing self-report and observer-based measures and, in part, because the LGS places more emphasis on the agentic or self-expanding aspects of generativity whereas the CAQ-GS primarily taps its social and communal aspects.

Demographic Background Variables

Gender was measured with a 1/0 dummy variable (1 = female; 0 = male). *Cohort* was measured with a 1/0 dummy variable (1 = belonging to the older age group, born 1920/1921; 0 = belonging to the younger age group, born 1928/1929). *Social class* was measured with the five-point Hollingshead Social Class Index (Hollingshead and Redlich 1958) for the participants at early, late-middle, and late adulthood.

RESULTS

Concurrent Correlations Between Religiousness, Spirituality, Generativity, and Background Variables in Late Adulthood

Table 1 displays the bivariate correlations between all the measures used in this study.[2] As already indicated, religiousness and spirituality were moderately intercorrelated. As hypothesized in our differentiated model, both religiousness and spirituality correlated positively with scores on the overall Loyola Generativity scale (LGS) and the overall CAQ Generativity scale (CAQ-GS). As also expected, religiousness correlated positively with the Altruism subscale of the LGS

TABLE 1
INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG THE MEASURES OF THE STUDY

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Religiousness	—													
2. Spirituality	0.31***	—												
3. LGS	0.20*	0.30***	—											
4. Altruism subscale	0.26**	0.24**	0.79***	—										
5. Impact on Others subscale	0.14	0.20*	0.91***	0.62***	—									
6. Outliving the Self subscale	0.14	0.20*	0.69***	0.34***	0.58***	—								
7. Creative Endeavor subscale	−0.03	0.24*	0.69***	0.46***	0.57***	0.44***	—							
8. CAQ-GS	0.30***	0.21**	0.32***	0.39***	0.23**	0.20**	0.12	—						
9. Givingness subscale	0.26**	0.07	0.19*	0.22**	0.10	0.17*	0.05	0.89***	—					
10. Prosocial Competence and Productivity subscale	0.20**	0.01	0.28***	0.37***	0.26**	0.12	0.09	0.76***	0.55***	—				
11. Social Perspective subscale	0.27**	0.44***	0.37***	0.44***	0.27**	0.19*	0.17*	0.78***	0.48***	0.47***	—			
12. Social class	0.05	0.07	0.20*	0.18*	0.23**	0.12	0.13	0.00	−0.12	0.02	0.18*	—		
13. Gender	0.28***	0.27***	0.03	0.01	−0.07	0.09	−0.03	0.14	0.16	−0.05	0.16	0.03	—	
14. Cohort	−0.01	−0.08	−0.03	−0.04	0.04	0.08	−0.12	−0.03	0.05	−0.12	−0.09	−0.06		—

Note: LGS = Loyola Generativity Scale; CAQ-GS = California Adult Q-set Generativity Scale. $N = 157$.

$*p < 0.05$; $**p < 0.01$; $***p < 0.001$; two-tailed.

and the Givingness subscale of the CAQ-GS. Religiousness did not correlate with any of the three remaining subscales of the LGS but it was related positively to the CAQ-GS's Prosocial Competency and Productivity and Social Perspective subscales. As expected, spirituality correlated positively with the self-expanding Impact on Others, Outliving the Self, and Creative Endeavor subscales of the LGS and with the Social Perspective subscale of the CAQ-GS. Unexpectedly, spirituality was also positively related to the LGS's Altruism subscale.

Among the background variables, social class was positively associated with the overall LGS and its Altruism and Impact on Others subscales, and the Social Perspective subscale of the CAQ-GS. Gender (being female) was positively related to religiousness and spirituality. Cohort (being born in early vs. late 1920s) was unrelated to any of the study's variables.

Concurrent Relations of Religiousness and Spirituality to Generativity in Late Adulthood Controlling for Overlapping Variance

Regression equations were used to test hypotheses regarding the relations among religiousness, spirituality, and generativity while statistically controlling for the overlap in variance between religiousness and spirituality and the three background variables. As shown in Table 2, once the overlapping variance between religiousness and spirituality, gender, cohort, and social class was controlled, religiousness continued to be significantly related to the Altruism subscale of the LGS, the overall CAQ-GS and its Givingness and Prosocial Competence and Productivity subscales, but it was no longer associated with the overall LGS or the Social Perspective subscale of the CAQ-GS. Spirituality continued to be significantly related to scores on the overall LGS and all four of its subscales (including Altruism) and the Social Perspective subscale of the CAQ-GS, but it was no longer associated with the overall CAQ-GS. Of the background variables, social class continued to be positively related to scores on the overall LGS and its Altruism and Impact on Others subscales, and the Social Perspective subscale of the CAQ-GS. Gender (being female) was negatively related to scores on the Impact on Others subscale.

We next recomputed the regressions adding to each of the equations an interaction term assessing the joint effect of religiousness and spirituality on each of the generativity scales and their respective subscales in late adulthood. In computing the interaction term, we first centered and then multiplied the scores on religiousness and spirituality. In the nine regression analyses conducted, we found only one significant interaction. Concern with Outliving the Self was highest among individuals who were high on spirituality and low on religiousness and was lowest among persons who were low on both religiousness and spirituality.

Longitudinal Stability of the Relations Between Religiousness, Spirituality, and Generativity in Late Adulthood

To test the hypotheses regarding the longitudinal relations among religiousness, spirituality, and generativity, we regressed the LGS and the CAQ-GS and their subscales scored in late adulthood (70s) on religiousness, spirituality, and background variables scored from interview data in early (age 30s) and late-middle (mid 50s/early 60s) adulthood.

LGS

As hypothesized, religiousness in early and late-middle adulthood was positively related to the overall LGS and its Altruism subscale in late adulthood (see Table 3). Unexpectedly, religiousness in early adulthood was also a predictor of scores on the Impact on Others and Creative Endeavor subscales in late adulthood. As hypothesized, spirituality in late-middle, but not early adulthood, was positively related to the overall LGS and its Impact on Others and Creative Endeavor subscales. Spirituality in late-middle adulthood was also related to the Altruism subscale in late adulthood.

TABLE 2
STANDARDIZED BETA COEFFICIENTS FOR REGRESSING SELF-REPORT AND OBSERVER-BASED MEASURES OF
GENERATIVITY ON RELIGIOUSNESS, SPIRITUALITY, AND BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Independent Variables	LGS	LGS Subscales				CAQ-GS	CAQ-GS Subscales		
		Altruism	Impact on Others	Outliving the Self	Creative Endeavor		Givingness	Prosocial Competence and Productivity	Social Perspective
Religiousness	0.14	0.23**	0.12	0.08	-0.10	0.25***	0.24*	0.24**	0.13
Spirituality	0.27**	0.18*	0.20*	0.17*	0.29**	0.13	-0.01	-0.05	0.37***
Social class	0.17*	0.15*	0.20*	0.10	0.12	0.01	-0.13	0.02	0.16*
Gender	-0.08	-0.10	-0.16*	0.03	-0.10	0.02	0.08	-0.09	0.04
Cohort	-0.03	-0.04	0.03	0.10	-0.12	-0.03	0.04	-0.11	-0.04
R^2	0.14***	0.13**	0.12**	0.07	0.11**	0.11**	0.09**	0.06	0.24***
df	(5,149)	(5,149)	(5,149)	(5,149)	(5,149)	(5,148)	(5,148)	(5,148)	(5,148)

Note: LGS = Loyola Generativity Scale; CAQ-GS = California Adult Q-set Generativity Scale.
*$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; two-tailed.

TABLE 3
STANDARDIZED BETA COEFFICIENTS FOR REGRESSING THE LOYOLA GENERATIVITY SCALE IN LATE ADULTHOOD AND ITS SUBSCALES ON RELIGIOUSNESS, SPIRITUALITY, AND BACKGROUND VARIABLES IN EARLY AND LATE-MIDDLE ADULTHOOD

Independent Variables	LGS	LGS Subscales			
		Altruism	Impact on Others	Outliving the Self	Creative Endeavor
			Early Adulthood		
Religiousness	0.35**	0.38***	0.27**	0.14	0.25*
Spirituality	−0.01	−0.06	0.02	−0.11	0.04
Social class	0.03	0.11	0.06	−0.08	0.06
Gender	−0.04	−0.11	−0.11	0.10	−0.11
Cohort	−0.12	−0.11	−0.06	0.10	−0.22*
R^2	0.11*	0.14**	0.07	0.05	0.09*
df	(5,124)	(5,124)	(5,124)	(5,124)	(5,124)
			Late-Middle Adulthood		
Religiousness	0.18*	0.27**	0.16	0.06	−0.01
Spirituality	0.27**	0.21**	0.21*	0.10	0.24**
Social class	0.20**	0.17*	0.23**	0.13	0.15*
Gender	−0.04	−0.11	−0.13	0.09	−0.05
Cohort	0.01	−0.02	0.05	0.11	−0.09
R^2	0.17***	0.18***	0.15***	0.06	0.10*
Df	(5,145)	(5,145)	(5,145)	(5,145)	(5,145)

Note: LGS = Loyola Generativity Scale.
$^*p < 0.05$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{***}p < 0.001$; two-tailed.

Of the background variables, cohort (being older) in early adulthood was related negatively to the Creative Endeavor subscale.

Because the unexpected relation between religiousness in early adulthood and Impact on Others and Creative Endeavor in late adulthood was inconsistent with the results of regressions using religiousness in late adulthood (as shown in Table 2), we repeated those analyses restricting the sample only to those individuals who participated in the assessments in both early and late adulthood ($N = 122$). In this restricted sample, religiousness in early, but not late, adulthood continued to be significantly related to Impact on Others and Creative Endeavor in late adulthood.

CAQ-GS

As shown in Table 4, religiousness, as hypothesized, was related to the overall CAQ-GS and its Givingness subscale from early adulthood onward. Religiousness in early adulthood was also related to Prosocial Productivity and Social Perspective in late adulthood. As hypothesized, spirituality in late-middle adulthood was related significantly to the Social Perspective subscale of the CAQ-GS. In addition, spirituality in early adulthood was negatively related to the CAQ's Givingness subscale. Social class in late-middle adulthood was positively related to the Social Perspective subscale in late adulthood but social class in early adulthood was negatively related to Givingness.

TABLE 4
STANDARDIZED BETA COEFFICIENTS FOR REGRESSING THE CAQ
GENERATIVITY SCALE IN LATE ADULTHOOD AND ITS SUBSCALES ON
RELIGIOUSNESS, SPIRITUALITY, AND BACKGROUND VARIABLES IN EARLY
AND LATE-MIDDLE ADULTHOOD

Independent Variables	CAQ-GS	CAQ-GS Subscales		
		Givingness	Prosocial Competence and Productivity	Social Perspective
		Early Adulthood		
Religiousness	0.36***	0.38***	0.20*	0.26**
Spirituality	−0.07	−0.17*	−0.12	0.16
Social class	−0.04	−0.17*	0.06	0.09
Gender	0.05	0.06	−0.03	−0.07
Cohort	−0.07	0.01	−0.10	−0.13
R^2	0.13**	0.17***	0.06	0.15**
df	(5,124)	(5,124)	(5,124)	(5,124)
		Late-Middle Adulthood		
Religiousness	0.31***	0.30**	0.26**	0.20*
Spirituality	0.01	−0.09	−0.13	0.24**
Social class	0.03	−0.11	0.02	0.22**
Gender	0.06	0.08	−0.09	0.11
Cohort	−0.02	0.04	−0.11	−0.02
R^2	0.12**	0.12**	0.07*	0.21***
df	(5,144)	(5,144)	(5,144)	(5,144)

Note: CAQ-GS = California Adult Q-set Generativity Scale.
*$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; two-tailed.

DISCUSSION

In this study we sought answers to the question concerning the relation between spirituality and socially beneficent behavior. In doing so we used data from a 60-year-old longitudinal study to compare the relations of religiousness and spirituality to generativity. The study yielded four sets of findings. First, in our sample of older-age American men and women, religiousness and spirituality were positively correlated with overall scores on both a self-report and an observer-based measure of generativity. This means that high scorers on either religiousness or spirituality tended to describe themselves as caring and concerned for the welfare of others and they were also described that way by observers who rated their personality based on transcripts of in-depth interviews. These findings, therefore, do not support the general claim that an individuated spirituality is antithetical to communal commitment, and they challenge any simple model that postulates an inevitable dichotomy between an institutionally autonomous spirituality and concern for others. (For illustrative case study examples of the links among religiousness, spirituality, and generativity in individual lives, see Dillon and Wink in press.)

Second, although both religiousness and spirituality correlated significantly with scores on the overall LGS and CAQ-GS, they tended to correlate with different subscales of the two measures. Whereas religiousness was positively related to the Altruism subscale of the LGS and the Givingness and Prosocial Competence and Productivity subscales of the CAQ-GS, spirituality was significantly related to subscales measuring the more self-expansive dimensions of generativity (the Impact on Others, Outliving the Self, and Creative Endeavor subscales of the LGS, and

the Social Perspective subscale of the CAQ-GS). The only exception to this pattern was a positive relation between spirituality and scores on the self-report (LGS) measure of altruism.

These differences in the emphasis given to discrete aspects of generativity befit the different orientations of religious dwellers and spiritual seekers (Wuthnow 1998; Wink and Dillon in press). Highly religious individuals are expected to attend church, be active members of the congregation, and follow the Golden Rule with its injunction to "love thy neighbor" or, in Kantian terms, to see people as ends rather than means. By the same token, we would expect highly spiritual individuals who have developed relatively novel and nontraditional ways of embracing the sacred to be similarly creative and self-expansive in other domains of their lives. Our findings thus demonstrate the value of conceptualizing social responsibility in terms of Erikson's construct of generativity because it allows for a more differentiated mapping of the association between religiousness and spirituality that takes into account the different types of interests and motives that may lead to communally beneficent behavior.

Because the generativity associated with spirituality has a more self-expansive component compared to religiousness, it raises the question as to whether this kind of behavior is truly indicative of a commitment to others and the common good. Favoring an action approach to the analysis of social behavior, we would like to suggest that both the communally-oriented and the self-expansive forms of generativity, irrespective of their motivation, should be seen as prosocial because both types of action can promote the enrichment of others and contribute to enhancing the confidence and social trust of younger generations. Indeed, as Bellah et al. (1991:275) have noted, self-expanding activities can signal a purposefulness and an engagement in the present that is characterized not by a self-satisfied or exploitative self-absorption but by an attentiveness whose results can enrich the lives of all. Nonetheless, further research is needed to understand more fully the implications of the different types of generativity associated with religiousness and spirituality, and to also explore how different social contexts may influence the links between spirituality and generativity.

Third, in the regression analyses where the overlap between religiousness, spirituality, and background variables was statistically controlled, only religiousness was significantly associated with the observer-based measure of generativity (the CAQ-GS) and only spirituality was positively related to the self-report-based LGS. This means that once the moderately positive relation between religiousness and spirituality was controlled, only high scorers on religiousness tended to be described by raters as generative and only high scorers on spirituality tended to describe themselves as generative. This finding is likely to reflect the greater emphasis given by the LGS to the agential aspects of generativity (three of its four subscales measure self-expanding dimensions) and, conversely, the greater emphasis of the CAQ-GS on the communal dimensions of generativity (tapped by two of its three subscales). We cannot, however, rule out the possibility that the respective differences in generativity associated with religiousness and spirituality may, at least in part, be an artifact of the method of assessment (self-report vs. observer based). The fact that religiousness and spirituality were positively related to both the self-report and observer-based measures of generativity in analyses where their overlap was not controlled suggests, perhaps, that the strongest and most balanced expression of generativity in everyday life is characteristic of individuals who fuse elements of religiousness and spirituality.

Finally, our results showed that the association between religiousness and generativity in late adulthood remained stable over a period of 40 years and could be predicted using religiousness scored in early adulthood. This finding supports the "religious capital" model by demonstrating that investment in religious practices yields a long-term benefit toward the cultivation and enactment of generativity. We also found that religiousness in early adulthood was significantly related to scores on the Impact on Others and Creative Endeavor subscales of the LGS and the Social Perspective subscale of the CAQ, although in late adulthood these aspects of generativity were associated with spirituality rather than religiousness. Although we were not able to test this

hypothesis directly, it may be that religious individuals who as young adults have self-expanding generative concerns turn toward spirituality in later life.

As expected, spirituality in late-middle, but not early, adulthood was significantly related to the self-report LGS and three of its four subscales and the CAQ-GS's Social Perspective subscale. However, we found a negative relation between spirituality in early adulthood and the Givingness subscale of the CAQ, suggesting, perhaps, that different types of individuals are attracted to spirituality in early versus late adulthood.

The positive connection between spirituality and generativity that, unlike the relation between religiousness and generativity, became apparent only in the second half of the adult life cycle reflects the fact that in this sample spirituality was not salient until after mid-life (Wink and Dillon 2002). Although this may indicate a life-cycle effect, there may also be a sociocultural explanation. Given that most of the sample continued to live in California, the greater public accessibility of new spiritual resources in that region in the late 1960s and subsequently may have enhanced the motivation and opportunity for some individuals in the study—who were, after all, negotiating mid-life identity in the 1970s at the apex of the emergence of alternative spiritualities—to experiment with different ways of connecting to the sacred. Most likely, the post-mid-life nature of the relation between spirituality and generativity results from a combination of maturational, cultural, and geographic factors.

Although in this study we used social class primarily as a control variable, it is interesting to note that social class was positively related to the overall LGS and its Altruism and Impact on Others subscales and to the CAQ's Social Perspective subscale from late-middle adulthood onward. These findings thus support other studies that have documented a positive relation between social status and engagement in community service activities (e.g., Rossi 2001).

Finally, we would like to point out that the generalizability of our findings is limited because our sample, although representative of the community from which it was originally drawn, comprises mostly white, predominantly Protestant men and women who were born in California in the 1920s. It would be interesting to investigate whether similar results would emerge in studies using more ethnically, religiously, and geographically diverse samples. It is also important to examine whether different cohorts would show a similarly differentiated pattern, or whether the relations between religiousness, spirituality, and generativity that we observed might be modified by some of the generation and age-specific sociocultural experiences of different birth cohorts. Young people today, for example, who have grown up accustomed to the cultural legitimacy of diverse forms of spirituality may show trajectories of generativity and express generative concerns in ways that are somewhat different from those of older Americans. As indicated, we measured religiousness and spirituality using ratings based on Wuthnow's (1998) distinction between religious dwelling (institutionalized religion) and spiritual seeking (noninstitutionalized forms of religion). Although we have found this distinction to be useful in mapping the similarities and differences between religiousness and spirituality, it would be interesting to know whether the positive relation between spirituality and generativity found in this study also applies to spirituality when it is conceptualized in other ways.

In conclusion, the significance of our study lies in showing that spirituality, when operationalized in terms of intentional and systematic practices, is positively related to generativity. Thus, if spirituality has gained in prominence in late-20th-century America (Roof 1999; Wuthnow 1998), and especially if it is practice-oriented, our findings augur well for the aging boomers' and younger cohorts' potential to engage in generative behavior. Although the conceptual complexity of spirituality means that no one definition can capture all of its nuances (e.g., Moberg 2002), it is important to point out that it is the undisciplined, ad hoc, and idiosyncratic forms of spirituality—and not a practice-oriented spirituality—that tend to inform much of the scholarly discussion about the negative social implications of spiritual seeking (cf. Bellah et al. 1985). In view of current debates over declining social capital in America and the prevalent assumption that an institutionally autonomous spirituality exacerbates the increased cultural tendency toward

social withdrawal, our findings should help dispel concern that spirituality necessarily implies indifference toward the welfare of others.

NOTES

1. In computing the Prosocial Competence and Productivity subscale we omitted the item "tends to proffer advice" because of its low correlation with the other three items in the subscale. We reran all the subsequent analyses reported in this article using both the three- and four-item versions of the Prosocial Competence and Productivity subscale and found no differences in any of the results.
2. The drop in the number of participants in the correlational and all subsequent analyses from 183 to 157 is because not everyone who was interviewed completed a self-report questionnaire. A t-test comparison of the participants who completed the questionnaire and those who did not revealed no differences among the two groups in either religiousness or spirituality, $t(22,157) = -1.18$ and -1.87, respectively.

REFERENCES

Atchley, R. 1997. Everyday mysticism: Spiritual development in later adulthood. *Journal of Adult Development* 4:123–34.

Bakan, D. 1966. *The duality of human existence*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Bellah, R., R. Madsen, W. Sullivan, A. Swidler, and S. Tipton. 1985. *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

————. 1991. *The good society*. New York: Knopf.

Block, J. 1978. *Lives through time*, 2nd ed. Berkeley, CA: Bancroft.

Clausen, J. 1993. *American lives*. New York: Free Press.

Dillon, M. and P. Wink. In press. American religion, generativity, and the therapeutic culture. In *The generative society*, edited by E. de St. Aubin and D. P. McAdams. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Eichorn, D., J. Hunt, and M. Honzik. 1981. Experience, personality, and IQ: Adolescence to middle age. In *Present and past in middle life*, edited by D. Eichorn, J. Clausen, N. Haan, M. Honzik, and P. Mussen, pp. 89–116. New York: Academic Press.

Erikson, E. 1963. *Childhood and society*, 2nd ed. New York: Norton.

————. 1964. *Insight and responsibility*. New York: Norton.

Farina. J. 1989. The study of spirituality: Some problems and opportunities. *U.S. Catholic Historian* Spring:15–31.

Hollingshead, A. B. and F. Redlich. 1958. *Social class and mental illness*. New York: Wiley.

Hout, M. and C. Fischer. 2002. Explaining the rise of Americans with no religious preference: Politic and generations. *American Sociological Review* 67:165–90.

Hout, M. and A. Greeley. 1987. The center doesn't hold: Church attendance in the United States, 1940–1984. *American Sociological Review* 52:325–45.

Iannaccone, L. 1990. Religious capital: A human capital approach. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 29:297–314.

Jung, C. editor. 1964. *Man and his symbols*. New York: Laurel.

Kotre, J. 1996. *Outliving the self*, 2nd ed. New York: Norton.

MacDermid, S., C. Franz, and L. A. De Reus. 1998. Adult character: Agency, communion, insight, and the expression of generativity in mid-life adults. In *Competence and character through life*, edited by A. Colby, J. James, and D. Hart, pp. 205–29. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Marler, P. and C. K. Hadaway. 2002. "Being religious" or "being spiritual" in America: A zero-sum proposition? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 2:289–300.

Marty, M. 1993. Where the energies go. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 553:11–26.

McAdams, D. 1995. *Power, intimacy, and the life story*. New York: Guilford.

McAdams, D. and E. de St. Aubin. 1992. A theory of generativity and its assessment through self-report, behavioral acts, and narrative themes in autobiography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 62:1003–15.

McFadden, S. 1996. Religion, spirituality, and aging. In *Handbook of the psychology of aging*, edited by J. Birren and W. Schaie, pp. 41–52. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Moberg, D. 2002. Assessing and measuring spirituality: Confronting dilemmas of universal and particular evaluative criteria. *Journal of Adult Development* 9:47–60.

Ostrower, F. 1995. *Why the wealthy give*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pargament, K. 1999. The psychology of religion and spirituality? Yes and no. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 9:3–16.

Peterson, W. and E. Klohnen. 1995. Realization of generativity in two samples of women at midlife. *Psychology and Aging* 10:20–29.

Putnam, R. 2000. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Rieff, P. 1966. *The triumph of the therapeutic: Uses of faith after Freud*. New York: Harper & Row.

Roof, W. C. 1999. *Spiritual marketplace: Baby boomers and the remaking of American religion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rossi, A. 2001. *Caring and doing for others*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sinnott, J. 1994. Development and yearning: Cognitive aspects of spiritual development. *Journal of Adult Development* 1:91–99.

Smith, T. 2002. Religious diversity in America. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 4:577–85.

Stifoss-Hanssen, H. 1999. Religion and spirituality: What a European ear hears. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 9:25–33.

Stokes, K. 1990. Faith development in the adult life cycle. *Journal of Religious Gerontology* 7:167–84.

Underwood, L. 1999. Daily spiritual experiences. In *Multidimensional measurement of religiousness/spirituality for use in health research: A report of the Fetzer Institute/National Institute on Aging working group*, pp. 11–17. Kalamazoo, MI: John E. Fetzer Institute.

Wink, P. and M. Dillon. 2001. Religious involvement and health outcomes in late adulthood. In *Faith and health: Psychological perspectives*, edited by T. G. Plante and A. C. Sherman, pp. 75–106. New York: Guilford.

———. 2002. Spiritual development across the adult life course: Findings from a longitudinal study. *Journal of Adult Development* 9:79–94.

———. In press. Religiousness, spirituality, and psychosocial functioning in late adulthood. *Psychology and Aging*.

Wulff, D. 1997. *Psychology of religion: Classic and contemporary*. New York: Wiley.

Wuthnow, R. 1998. *After heaven: Spirituality in America since the 1950s*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Zinnbauer, B., K. Pargament, B. Cole, M. Rye, E. Butter, T. Belavich, K. Hipp, A. Scott, and J. Kadar. 1997. Religion and spirituality: Unfuzzying the fuzzy. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 36:549–64.