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Abstract

In his analysis of the construct ‘implicit religion’ Edward Bailey speaks of those individuals ‘who believe in Christianity’ but who do not display the behaviours of explicit religion, like church attendance. A recent research tradition has tried to operationalise this understanding of implicit religion by studying those who believe that they can be a Christian without going to church. A longer established research tradition has demonstrated the association between explicit religiosity and an enhanced sense of purpose in life. The aim of the present study is to test the hypothesis that implicit religiosity (in the sense of believing that you can be a Christian without going to church) is also associated with an enhanced sense of purpose in life. Data provided by a sample of 25,825 13- to 15-year-old adolescents support this hypothesis. In turn these findings support the notion that implicit religion (in the sense operationalised by this study) fulfils some functions similar to those fulfilled by explicit religion.
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Introduction

Explicit religion and purpose in life

Purpose in life is a construct of considerable interest within the broad field of individual differences. Following the pioneering work of Frankl (1978), purpose in life is understood to be central to the meaning-making process which confers meaningfulness. As such, purpose in life is a central component of psychological well-being. It is purpose in life which makes living worthwhile and which helps to prevent despair from leading to suicide.

Purpose in life is a construct of considerable interest not only to psychologists, but to theologians as well. Following the pioneering work of Tillich (1952), purpose in life is understood to be central to the very essence of religion. Substantive analyses of religion point to the beliefs, teaching and rituals which explicitly address the fundamental questions concerning the meaning and purpose of life. Functional analyses of religion point to the meaning-making process as central to the raison d’être of religious and para-religious systems. There are clear grounds, therefore, for hypothesising a positive relationship between religiosity and purpose in life.

A number of studies conducted since the mid-1970s have examined the relationship between scores recorded in the Purpose in Life Test (Crumbaugh, 1968; Crumbaugh & Maholick, 1969) and a range of different conceptualisations and operationalisations of explicit religiosity. The most consistently reported association concerns the positive relationship between purpose in life and intrinsic religiosity, as measured by various instruments. The association was reported by Crandall and Rasmussen (1975) among 71 students, by Bolt (1975) among 52 students, by Soderstrom and Wright (1977) among 427 students, by Paloutzian, Jackson, and Crandall (1978) among 84 students and 177 adults, by Chamberlain and Zika (1988) among 188 women having at least one child under the age of five and no paid employment, by Weinstein and Cleanthous (1996) among 11 protestan

Philipchalk, Lester, & Brown, 1995) among 274 students in Slovakia and 249 students in Hungary.

Using a somewhat different approach, Stones and Philbrick (1980) found a significant increase in purpose in life scores four months after 100 English-speaking South African students became members of religiously orientated groups. Further support to this finding was provided by Stones (1981) who compared the purpose in life scores of 72 of these members of religiously oriented groups with a control group of non-members, matched for age, sex, home-languages, educational level and occupation of father. Taking group membership as an indicator of religiosity, in a study of 91 students Paloutzian (1981) found higher purpose in life scores among those who recently experienced a religious conversion following an evangelistic mission. In a study of 232 students, Dufton and Perlman (1986) found higher purpose in life scores among conservative believers than among non-conservative believers and non-believers.

Not all studies using the Purpose in Life Test, however, reported a positive association with religiosity. While Pearson and Sheffield (1975) reported a positive correlation between purpose in life and the religion-puritanism subscale of the Wilson and Patterson Conservatism Scale among 84 male psychiatric patients, they failed to find any significant relationship among these same variables among 97 female patients. While French and Joseph (1999) reported a positive correlation between purpose in life and the Francis Scale of Attitude toward Christianity among 101 students, Lewis, Lanigan, Joseph, and de Fockert (1997) failed to find any significant relationship between the same two variables among 154 students. Taking group membership as an indicator of religiosity, in a study among 118 elderly persons from three senior citizen centres, Gerwood, LeBlanc, and Piazza (1998) found no significant relationship between purpose in life scores and religious affiliation as Catholic or Protestant. In a study among 31 gay men with AIDS Bechtel (1994)
found a significant negative association between purpose in life and active membership of a religious organisation.

The more recently developed Purpose in Life Scale (first reported by Robbins and Francis, 2000) has been used in two studies to assess the connection between purpose in life and explicit religion. In the first study, Robbins and Francis (2000) found a positive correlation between church attendance and scores on the Purpose in Life Scale among 517 first-year undergraduate students in Wales. In the second study, Francis, Jewell, and Robbins (2010) found a positive correlation between intrinsic religiosity and scores on the Purpose in Life Scale among 407 older Methodists in England.

A somewhat different strand of research has assessed the relationship between purpose in life and religiosity, by using a single-item measure of purpose in life. For example, Francis and Burton (1994) found a positive correlation between personal prayer and perceived purpose in life among a sample of 674 12- to 16-year-olds attending a Catholic school and who identified themselves as members of the Catholic Church, even after controlling for individual differences in frequency of church attendance. Francis and Evans (1996) found a significant positive relationship between frequency of personal prayer and perceived purpose in life among two samples of pupils: 669 pupils who attended church most weeks, and 1,640 pupils who never attended church. Francis (2005) replicated and extended the study by Francis and Evans (1996), drawing on two samples of 13- to 15-year olds. The first sample comprised 7,083 males and 5,634 females who never attend church. The second sample comprised 1,738 males and 2,006 females who attend church nearly every week. The data demonstrated a significant positive relationship between frequency of personal prayer and perceived purpose in life among both the churchgoers and the non-churchgoers. Robbins and Francis (2005) extended the study by Francis and Evans (1996) in a different way by drawing a sample of adolescents from Northern Ireland where religion has a much higher
saliency than in the rest of the United Kingdom and where the community is strongly divided on denominational grounds. These data, provided by 1,206 13- to 15-year-olds in Catholic schools and by 1,464 in Protestant schools, once again demonstrated a clear relationship between frequency of prayer and perceived purpose in life, after controlling for the effects of sex, age, personality, and church attendance, in both denominational communities. Building on this study, Francis and Robbins (2006, 2009) take their analyses one stage further to examine the wider association between prayer, purpose in life and prosocial attitudes, including attitude toward school, attitude toward law and order, and attitude toward substances.

Other studies have also employed this single item measure of purpose in life alongside indices of explicit religiosity. For example, Francis (2000) found a significant positive correlation between bible reading and purpose in life among a sample of 25,888 13- to 15-year-old pupils. Francis and Kaldor (2001) found significant positive correlations between purpose in life and three measures of explicit religiosity (personal prayer, belief in God and church attendance) among 1,021 adults participating in an Australian population survey.

**Operationalising implicit religion**

One of the strengths of Bailey’s notion of implicit religion concerns the ways in which it functions as a multi-faceted construct. One of these ways is illustrated by Bailey’s perceptive analysis of the implicit religion of a British suburb. Here Bailey (1998, p.67) spoke in terms of those whose religious commitment was most adequately expressed in the confession ‘Well, you see, I believe in Christianity’. ‘Christianity’ in this context, argues Bailey, seems to have three sides: belief in God, in Christ, and in the church. This belief in Christianity is more likely to be reflected in the quest for infant baptism than in the commitment to frequent church attendance. Those who express this implicit religiosity
through belief in Christianity are likely to take the view that ‘You don’t have to go to church to be a Christian.’

Within their study examining the motivations of individuals who leave church, Francis and Richter (2007) located the notion that you don’t have to go to church to be a Christian within the wider context of the move from churchgoing to the attraction of a ‘de-institutionalised faith’. Developing their questionnaire survey from the rich resources of previous surveys and their interview data, Francis and Richter selected four statements that epitomised for them the position of those individuals who became church leavers in their quest to express a ‘de-institutionalised faith’. These statements were: ‘I believed that you do not need to go to church to be a Christian’; ‘People have God within them, so churches aren’t really necessary’; ‘I wanted to follow my own private spiritual quest, without religious institutions’; and ‘I distrusted most institutions, including the church’. It is statements like these that may capture the essence of the implicit religion of people who, in Bailey’s words, believe in Christianity but who do not attend church. Drawing further on their interview data, Francis and Richter illustrate this position by citing Peter Kendall, a television producer in his forties who had left a Methodist church and who associated his church-leaving with a more general distrust of institutions.

I tend not to like institutions that much. I don’t mean that I don’t like them in any sort of glib way, I just think that institutions tend to always have alternative agendas ....

Certainly the Methodist church was the first time that I began to formulate my opposition to institutions, and my first move away from the church was not to reject Christianity, but to reject what I call Churchianity. (Francis & Richter, 2007, p. 229),

Drawing on their statistical data from over 800 church-leavers, Francis & Richter (2007) reported that 75% of church-leavers had taken the view that they did not need to go to church to be a Christian. Moreover, this proportion did not vary significantly when the data
were examined for sex differences, generational differences, cohort differences, or age of leaving. There were, however, significant differences according to the main denomination with which the church-leavers identified. The Anglicans were significantly more likely to believe that you don’t have to go to church to be a Christian. This view was endorsed by 78% of Anglicans, compared with 70% of Roman Catholics and by 67% of Free Church members.

Building on this framework, Walker, Francis, and Robbins (2010) included the item ‘You don’t have to go to church to be a good Christian’ within their survey of 1226 individuals attending harvest festival services in Anglican churches in rural Worcestershire. The data demonstrated that around two out of every three attenders (63%) endorsed this view of Christianity. The levels were highest among those who attended church less than six times a year (84%), and among those who never prayed (81%). Such high levels of endorsement among those who attend church for harvest festival services led Walker, Francis and Robbins (2010) to conclude that de-institutionalised implicit religion may be superseding commitment to conventional explicit religious attendance.

**Influence of personality**

Research concerning the relationship between religiosity and purpose in life needs to be aware of the potential contaminating influence of personality. A number of recent studies have demonstrated, for example, that Eysenck’s three dimensional model of personality (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991) is able to predict individual differences in religiosity, including studies among school pupils (Francis & Wilcox, 1994, 1996; Smith, 1996; Fearn, Lewis & Francis, 2003; Williams, Robbins, & Francis, 2005, 2006; Francis, Williams, & Robbins, 2009, 2010; Robbins, Francis, & Williams, 2010), students (Maltby, 1995; Lewis & Maltby, 1996; Francis, 1997, 2010), school teachers (Francis & Johnson, 1999), senior citizens (Francis & Bolger, 1997), and the general adult population (Kaldor, Francis, & Fisher, 2002). Another set of studies have demonstrated that Eysenck’s three dimensional model of
personality is able to predict individual differences over a range of areas concerned with subjective well-being in general (Francis, Brown, Lester, & Philipchalk, 1998; Francis, 1999; Hills & Argyle, 2001; Steward, Ebmeier, & Deavy, 2005; Robbins, Francis, & Edwards, 2010) and with purpose in life in particular (Pearson & Sheffield, 1974, 1989; Addad, 1987; Moomal, 1999; Francis, 2000; Robbins & Francis, 2000; Francis & Kaldor, 2001; Francis, Jewell, & Robbins, 2010; Francis & Robbins, 2009).

The present study addresses this problem by drawing on a database which includes a reliable measure of the Eysenckian dimensional model of personality. This model argues that individual differences can be most economically and adequately expressed in terms of three higher order orthogonal dimensions characterised as extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism. Eysenck’s instruments designed to operationalise this model also routinely include a lie scale (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991). Eysenck’s extraversion scales measure sociability and impulsivity. The opposite of extraversion is introversion. The high scorers on the extraversion scale are characterised by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) in the test manual as sociable individuals, who like parties, have many friends, need to have people to talk to and prefer meeting people to reading or studying alone. Typical extraverts crave excitement, take chances, act on the spur of the moment, are carefree and easy-going. Eysenck’s neuroticism scales measure emotional lability and over-reactivity, and identify the underlying personality traits which at one extreme define neurotic mental disorders. The opposite of neuroticism is emotional stability. The high scorers on the neuroticism scale are characterised by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) in the test manual as anxious, worrying individuals, who are moody and frequently depressed, likely to sleep badly, and to suffer from various psychosomatic disorders. Eysenck’s psychoticism scales identify the underlying personality traits which at one extreme define psychotic mental disorder. The opposite of psychoticism is normal personality. The high scorers on the psychoticism scale are characterised by Eysenck and
Eysenck (1976), in their study of psychoticism as a dimension of personality, as being cold, impersonal, hostile, lacking in sympathy, unfriendly, untrustful, odd, unemotional, unhelpful, lacking in insight, strange, with paranoid ideas that people were against them.

The lie scales were originally introduced into personality measures to detect the tendency of some respondents to ‘fake good’ and so to distort the resultant personality scores (O’Donovan, 1969). The notion of the lie scales has not, however, remained as simple as that and the continued use of lie scales has resulted in them being interpreted as a personality measure in their own right (McCrae & Costa, 1983; Furnham, 1986). According to one prominent account, the lie scale measures social acquiescence or social conformity (Finlayson, 1972; Massey, 1980).

**Research question**

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to examine the relative impact of explicit religiosity (defined as church attendance) and implicit religiosity (defined as believing that you can be a Christian without going to church) on self-reported sense of purpose in life. In a simple sense, this research question can be tested by comparing the strength of the correlation between explicit religiosity and purpose in life and the correlation between implicit religiosity and purpose in life. In a more sophisticated and complex sense, the associations will also be compared within a regression model that allows other (potentially contaminating) factors to be taken into account. Before examining the predictive power of explicit religiosity and implicit religiosity on purpose in life, the regression model will take three categories of variables into account. The first category comprises the personal demographic factors of sex and age. The second category comprises the personality dimensions of extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism (as well as the lie scale). The third category comprises the two religious factors that may underpin the selected operational forms of both explicit religiosity and implicit religiosity employed in the study, namely self-
identified religious affiliation (none or Christian) and belief in God (theist, agnostic, and atheist).

**Method**

**Sample**

The Religion and Values Today Survey, described in detail by Francis (2001), was completed by a total of 33,982 pupils attending year-nine and year-ten classes throughout England and Wales. This database was constructed to be thoroughly representative of young people in this age group (13- to 15-year-olds) being educated within both the state-maintained sector and the independent sector of schools. Data were provided from 163 schools, stretching from Pembrokeshire in the west to Norfolk in the east, and from Cornwall in the south to Northumberland in the north. A proper mix of rural and urban schools was included, as was a proper mix of independent and state-maintained schools. Within the state-maintained sector proper attention was given to the balance between Roman Catholic voluntary schools, Anglican voluntary schools, and non-denominational schools. Of the total respondents, 51% were male and 49% were female; 53% were in year nine and 47% were in year ten. Of those educated within the state-maintained sector, 86% were in non-denominational schools, 9% in Roman Catholic schools, and 5% in Anglican schools. Of the total sample of pupils, 10% were being educated outside the state-maintained sector.

**Procedure**

Participating schools were asked to follow a standard procedure. The questionnaires were administered in normal class groups to all year-nine and year-ten pupils throughout the school. Pupils were asked not to write their name on the booklet and to complete the inventory under examination-like conditions. Although pupils were given the choice not to participate, very few decided not to take part in the survey. They were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. They were informed that their responses would not be read by
anyone in the school, and that the questionnaires would be despatched to the University of Wales for analysis.

**Measures**

In addition to basic information about sex and school year, the present analysis draws on the following measures included in the questionnaires.

*Explicit religiosity* was operationalised by the item, ‘Do you go to church or other place of worship?’ rated on a five-point scale, ranging from ‘never’, through ‘once or twice a year’, ‘sometimes’, and ‘at least once a month’, to ‘nearly every week’.

*Implicit religiosity* was operationalised by the item, ‘I believe that I can be a Christian without going to church’ rated on a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from ‘agree strongly’, through ‘agree’, ‘not certain’, and ‘disagree’ to ‘disagree strongly’.

*Religious affiliation* was measured by the item, ‘Do you belong to a church or other religious group?’ followed by a check list of Christian denominations and other faith groups. The first category in the list was ‘none’ and the last category was ‘other (please specify)’.

*Belief in God* was measured by the item, ‘I believe in God’ rated on a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from ‘agree strongly’, through ‘agree’, ‘not certain’, and ‘disagree’ to ‘disagree strongly’.

*Purpose in life* was measured by the item, ‘I feel my life has a sense of purpose’ rated on a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from ‘agree strongly’, through ‘agree’, ‘not certain’, and ‘disagree’ to ‘disagree strongly’.

*Personality* was assessed by the short-form Junior Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Francis & Pearson, 1988). This instrument proposes four six-item indices of extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism, and a lie scale. Each item is rated on a two-point scale: ‘yes’ and ‘no’.

**Analysis**
The present analysis was conducted on a subset of the total database defined by two key parameters. First, the item in the survey concerned with religious affiliation was employed to exclude from analysis all pupils who identified with a non-Christian world faith, and all the Christian denominations were combined to form the single category ‘Christian’. The analysis therefore was capable of comparing the two categories of no religious affiliation and Christian affiliation. Second, since not all versions of the survey included the personality measure, the participants for whom these data were missing were also excluded. The analysis was, consequently, conducted on the subset of 25,825 pupils. This subset included 13,210 males and 12,615 females, 13,632 year-nine pupils and 12,193 year-ten pupils. The data were analysed by the SPSS statistical package.

**Results**

Table 1 presents the scale properties of the four indices proposed by the short-form Junior Eysenck Personality Questionnaire in terms of the alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951) and the means and standard deviations. These data are in line with the performance of these measures as reported by Francis and Pearson (1988).

- Insert tables 1 and 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the correlation matrix for all the variables included in the study. Four features of these data merit comment. First, the usual small positive correlations were found between sex and the conventional indicators of religiosity (affiliation, belief in God and church attendance). The indicator of implicit religion functioned in relation with sex in the same way as the indicator of explicit religion. In all cases females recorded higher religiosity scores than males. Second, the usual correlations were reported between sex and the four Eysenckian measures, with females recording higher scores than males on the extraversion scale, the neuroticism scale and the lie scale, and with males recording higher scores than females on the psychoticism scale. Third, the personality variables demonstrated a range of
statistically significant correlations with the religious variables and with the index of purpose in life, confirming the need to take personality variables into account when examining the association between religiosity and purpose in life. Fourth, all four indicators of religiosity demonstrated a significant positive correlation with purpose in life, including both the indicator of explicit religiosity and the indicator of implicit religiosity.

Table 3 presents the two regression models in which purpose in life is the dependent variable and in which the predictor variables have been entered in the fixed order of personal characteristics (sex and age), personality (extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism, and lie scale) and religiosity. In both models Christian affiliation has been entered first, followed by belief in God. Then in model one, the indicator of explicit religiosity (church attendance) has been entered as the final predictor variable; in model two the indicator of implicit religiosity (being a Christian without going to church) has been entered as the final predictor variable. In both models the final predictor variable explained small (but statistically significant) additional variance in the dependent variable. Moreover, the proportion of variance explained by the indicator of implicit religion is close to that explained by the indicator of explicit religion.

Conclusion

Bailey’s notion of implicit religion is a multi-faceted construct. One aspect of this construct values and respects popular reformulations of Christian identity outside the confines of strict doctrinal orthodox belief and conventional observance of practice. Bailey does not dismiss those whose religious commitment was most adequately expressed in the confession ‘Well, you see, I believe in Christianity’ as secular or merely cultural Christians. He understands such formulation as a sincere expression of implicit religion.
The contention of the present study has been that for such an unconventional formulation of Christian identity to count as ‘religious’ believing there has to be evidence of some functional equivalence of implicit religion in the lives of such believers to match the functions of explicit religion in the lives of conventional Christian believers. In the present study this contention has been tested empirically by operationalising implicit religion through the belief position, ‘I believe that I can be a Christian without going to church’, and by operationalising explicit religion through church attendance. Recognising that other dimensions of religion may underpin these operationalised forms of both implicit religion and explicit religion, self-assigned religious affiliation as Christian and self-reported belief in God were taken into account before comparing the functional equivalence of the selected indicators of implicit religion and explicit religion on a predetermined outcome variable.

The outcome variable selected to test the working hypothesis of this study was the construct ‘purpose in life’ as assessed by a single-item measure used in previous research concerned with mapping the association between religiosity and the broad area of human flourishing. The data support the thesis that (within the operationalisations employed) implicit religion and explicit religion serve similar functions in association with an enhanced sense of purpose in life.

The notion of operationalising one aspect of Bailey’s multi-faceted construct of implicit religion through the belief that ‘I can be a Christian without going to church’ was first employed in a study of individuals attending harvest festival services in Anglican churches in rural Worcestershire, reported by Walker, Francis, and Robbins (2010). The present study is the first to have employed this operationalisation of implicit religion to test whether implicit religion serves similar functions in the lives of believers to the functions served by explicit religion. A positive answer has been given to this question in terms of one empirical test: purpose in life.
There are two clear weaknesses with the present study that can be addressed by further research. The first weakness concerns the problematic nature of employing single-item measures as the dependent variable. The present study needs to be replicated with a recognised psychometric measure of purpose in life, for example the Purpose in Life Scale (Francs & Robbins, 2000). The second weakness concerns the highly specific nature of the dependent variable, focusing specifically and exclusively on the notion of purpose in life. The present study needs to be extended with a wider range of dependent variables. For example, the focus of the present study on positive affect (purpose in life) could be properly complemented by a focus on negative affect (say suicidal ideation). The extension of research in this direction would test incrementally the functional similarities (and dissimilarities) between implicit religion and explicit religion within the lives of the adherents to these different forms of religiosity.
Table 1

*Personality scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extraversion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neuroticism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychoticism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lie scale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Correlation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>purpose</th>
<th>implicit</th>
<th>explicit</th>
<th>belief</th>
<th>affil</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08***</td>
<td>.08***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.08***</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.04***</td>
<td>-.04***</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.10***</td>
<td>.04***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extraversion</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>.03***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neuroticism</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td>.06***</td>
<td>.06***</td>
<td>.06***</td>
<td>.06***</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychoticism</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
<td>-.09***</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.09***</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lie scale</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.06***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affiliation</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belief</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explicit</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, *, p < .05; **, p < .01; *** p < .001
Table 3

Regression models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Explicit religiosity</th>
<th></th>
<th>Implicit religiosity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p &lt;</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extraversion</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neuroticism</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-31.2</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychoticism</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-9.4</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lie scale</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian affiliation</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belief in God</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explicit religiosity</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit religiosity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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