

**Original citation:**

Francis, Leslie J. and Penny, Gemma. (2016) Implicit religion and psychological wellbeing : a study among adolescents without formal religious affiliation or practice. *Implicit Religion*, 19 (1). pp. 61-78.

**Permanent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/81710>

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**A note on versions:**

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP URL' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk)

Implicit religion and psychological wellbeing: A study among adolescents without formal  
religious affiliation or practice

Leslie J Francis\*

University of Warwick

Gemma Penny

University of Warwick

Author note:

\*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Centre for Education Studies

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: [leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk)

**Abstract**

This study examines Bailey's notion of the persistence of implicit religion among a sample of 8,619 adolescents between the ages of 13 and 15 years in England and Wales who have no formal religious affiliation or practice. Implicit religion is operationalised as attachment to traditional Christian rites of passage. Young people who remain attached to these aspects of implicit religion display higher levels of psychological wellbeing, suggesting that implicit religion serves similar psychological functions to explicit religion.

*Keywords:* implicit religion, psychology of religion, wellbeing, adolescents

### **Introduction**

Bailey's rich notion of implicit religion can be employed in a number of distinct and discrete ways (see Bailey, 1997, 1998, 2002; Lord, 2006; Schnell, Francis, & Lewis, 2011). The specific reference taken up and developed in the present study concerns the notion of implicit religion as identifying and describing ways in which the Christian religious tradition continues to claim a hold over people's lives in the UK, long after they have ceased to have active participation in the ongoing life of the local church. This aspect of implicit religion was 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.' Bailey's analysis of 'Christianity' in this context entails broad belief in God, broad belief in Jesus, and broad belief in the Church, but 'Christianity' in this context does not entail active church attendance. Belief in Christianity in this sense is more likely to be reflected in the quest for infant baptism than in the understanding that baptism entails going to church. Belief in Christianity in this sense is more likely to be reflected in going to the Christmas carol service than in going to the usual Sunday eucharist. Those who express their religious commitment through this particular form of religion are likely to take the view that 'You don't have to go to church to be a Christian'.

In their analysis of the motivations and beliefs of church-leavers Richter and Francis (1998) and Francis and Richter (2007) took a particular interest in the significant group of people who had left the church behind but who did not feel that they had also left their Christian faith behind. Francis and Richter (2007) spoke of such church-leavers as individuals who left the church in a quest to express a 'de-institutionalised faith'. These were the kind of people who, in Bailey's words, believe in Christianity but who do not attend church. Drawing on their statistical data from over 800 church-leavers, Francis and 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.

One of the clear strengths of this practical and concrete definition of implicit religion is that it offers the basis for operationalising the notion of implicit religion within empirical research. Five recent studies have done precisely that. In the first of these studies Walker, Francis, and Robbins (2010) proposed the item 'You don't have to go to church to be a good Christian' to serve as a single-item marker of implicit religion. This item was included in a survey completed by 1,226 attendees at rural Harvest Festival services in Worcestershire. Harvest festival services were chosen as they provide an interesting meeting point between frequent churchgoers and occasional churchgoers. In particular the study was designed to test the connection between adopting the view 'You don't have to go to church to be a good Christian' and four key factors: sex, age, frequency of church attendance (public religiosity) and frequency of private prayer (private religiosity). Some 63% of respondents agreed with the statement.

This study found no difference between men and women, but a significant relationship with age: 58% of those over sixty took the view that you don't have to go to church; the figure rose to 81% for those under the age of thirty. Unsurprisingly there was also a clear link between responses to the statement and individual practice: 84% of those who attend less than six times a year agreed with the statement compared with 53% of those attending church most weeks. There was also a clear association with frequency of personal

prayer: 54% of those who pray most days agreed with the statement, a figure that rose to 81% among those who never pray. 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.

In a second study, Walker (2013) included the item ‘You don’t have to go to church to be a good Christian’ within his survey of 1,081 individuals attending Christmas Carol Services within two English cathedrals. In this context 69% of the total participants endorsed the view that you don’t have to go to church to be a good Christian. The view was endorsed by a higher proportion of women (74%) than men (65%). The view was endorsed by more younger people than older people. While 55% of those aged seventy or over endorsed the view, the proportions rose to 66% among those in their fifties or sixties, to 77% among those in their thirties or forties, and 78% of those under the age of thirty. The view was endorsed by fewer churchgoers than non-churchgoers. While 87% of those who attended at least once a year endorsed the view, the proportions fell to 78% among those who attended at least six times a year, 74% among those who attended at least once a month and to 46% among those who attended weekly. Those who were connected with the church through baptism were more likely to endorse the view than those who were both baptised and confirmed (80% compared with 63%). These data demonstrate the power of this single-item measure to detect significantly different levels of implicit religion among well-defined categories of adults who continue to connect with the church through attendance at cathedral carol services.

Building on the studies by Walker, Francis, and Robbins (2010) and by Walker (2013) that documented prevalence of implicit religion as reflected in the belief that you do not need to go to church to be a Christian, Francis (2013a) set out to test the extent to which this form of implicit religion served the same psychological functions in people’s lives as explicit

religion. Francis took as a test case the established empirical finding that explicit religiosity is routinely associated with an enhanced sense of purpose in life (see Francis & Robbins, 2009), and argued that, if implicit religiosity serves the same function as explicit religiosity, implicit religiosity should also be associated with an enhanced sense of purpose in life.

Against this background, Francis (2013a) set out to test the hypotheses that there is a positive association between frequency of church attendance (as an indicator of explicit religiosity) and purpose in life and that there is also a positive association between believing that you do not need to go to church to be a Christian (as an indicator of implicit religiosity) and purpose in life. In a simple sense these hypotheses could 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. However, Francis (in press) argued that the hypotheses could be tested in a more sophisticated and a more adequate sense 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, Francis's regression model took three categories of variables into account. The first category comprised the personal factors of sex and age. The second category comprised the personality dimensions of extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism. The third category comprised two religious factors that may underpin the related operational forms of both explicit religiosity and implicit religiosity employed in the study, namely self-assigned religious affiliation and belief in God. Using these control variables two separate regression models were established. In the first model, church attendance was entered as the final term and in the second model, the belief that you do not need to attend church to be a Christian was entered as the final term. In both models the final term emerged as a significant predictor of an enhanced sense of purpose in life confirming that implicit religiosity served a similar function to that served by explicit religiosity in respect of purpose of life.

In a subsequent study, Francis (2013b) repeated the analytic model established by Francis (2013b) with a different dependent variable. While the first study had focused on an area of positive psychology (purpose in life), the second study focused on suicidal ideation. Like purpose in life, suicidal ideation has been securely linked with individual differences in explicit religiosity. However, the psychological mechanisms linking these two constructs with explicit religiosity work in very different ways. While explicit religiosity promotes the sense of meaning and purpose in life, explicit religiosity serves to inhibit suicidal ideation. This link between suicide and explicit religiosity has been well discussed in both the psychology of religion and the sociology of religion since the pioneering work of Durkheim (1897) and supported by a series of empirical studies, including Lester and Francis (1993), Schweitzer, Klayich, and MacLean (1995), Zhang and Jin (1996), Hovey (1999), Marion and Range (2003), and Hills and Francis (2005).

The findings from the two studies reported by Francis (2013a) and Francis (2013b) were not identical. In the study of purpose in life both explicit religiosity and implicit religiosity predicted a significantly higher level of purpose in life; in the second study explicit religiosity predicted a significantly lower level of suicidal ideation, but implicit religiosity was not significantly related to suicidal ideation. The incompatibility of the findings from the two studies suggest that there are some ways in which the form of implicit religion captured by the sentiment that you do not have to go to church to be a Christian serves the same function as explicit religion captured by church attendance, but that there are other ways in which this is not the case. Drawing on the evidence from the two studies so far available to examine the issue, it is reasonable to propose that implicit religion may work in the lives of individuals in the same way as explicit religion to generate positive psychological outcomes like positive affect and the sense of meaning and purpose, but that implicit religion may not work in the lives of individuals in the same way as explicit religion to offer protection from

negative psychological outcomes like negative affect and the sense of despair and meaninglessness.

Building on the two studies reported by Francis (2013a) and Francis (2013b), Penny and Francis (2015) tried to access and operationalise Bailey's notion of implicit religion by a different measure, this time focusing on attachment to traditional Christian rites of passage in terms of baptism, marriage and death. They found that among their sample of 12, 252 13- to 15-year old students the following three items generated an alpha coefficient of .72: I want to get married in church; I want my children to be baptised, christened, or dedicated in church; I want a church funeral after my death. Then they employed the same analytic strategy as employed in the earlier two studies, developing two parallel regression models with church attendance (explicit religiosity) entered as the final predictor variable in one model and with the scale of attachment to traditional Christian rites of passage (implicit religiosity) entered on the final predictor variable in the other model.

In this new study, Penny and Francis (2015) selected as their dependent variable a nine-item scale of attitude toward substances. They chose this dependent variable because empirical studies exploring the relationship between explicit religiosity and substance use tend to demonstrate that higher levels of church attendance are associated with lower levels of alcohol consumption, drunkenness and alcohol-related problems among young people and adults (Cosper, Okraku, & Neumann, 1987; Lubben, Chi, & Kitano, 1988; Clarke, Beeghley, & Cochran, 1990; Cochran, Beeghley & Bock, 1992; Toussaint, 2009; Brechting, Brown, Salsman, Sauer, & Holeman, 2010; Rasic, Kisely, & Langille, 2011; Fawcett, Francis, Linkletter, & Robbins, 2012), as well as lower levels of drug use (including cannabis, tranquilizers, LSD, cocaine and heroin) among young people and adults (Sloane & Potvin, 1986; Francis & Mullen, 1993; Mullen & Francis, 1995; Cook, Goddard, & Westall, 1997; Regnerus & Elder, 2003; Chu, 2007; Steinman, Ferketich, & Sahr, 2008; Mellor & Freeborn,

2011). Data from this study support the working hypothesis proposed by Francis that (within the operationalisations employed) implicit religion and explicit religion serve similar functions, where both religious variables make a significant contribution to the development of proscriptive attitudes toward substances among young people. This would tend to suggest that implicit religion (operationalised as attachment to Christian rites of passage) may work in the lives of individuals in the same way as explicit religion to generate moral awareness and a sense of prohibition toward experiences that have the potential to hinder human flourishing.

The series of studies reported by Francis (2013a), Francis (2013b) and Penny and Francis (2015) have all taken into account the potentially contaminating effect of individual differences in personality, drawing on the three dimensional model proposed by Hans Eysenck and his associates and operationalised in a series of self-completion instruments for application both among adults, including the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975) and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised (Eysenck, Eysenck, & Barrett, 1985), and among young people, including the Junior Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975) and the Junior Eysenck Questionnaire Revised (Corulla, 1990).

Eysenck's dimensional model of personality proposes that individual differences in personality can be most economically and adequately summarised in terms of three orthogonal higher order factors. The first factor is expressed on the continuum from introversion, through ambiversion, to extraversion. Those who score high on the extraversion scale can be characterised as sociable, lively, active, carefree, dominant and assertive. The second factor is expressed on the continuum from emotional stability, through emotional lability, to neurotic disorder. Those who score high on the neuroticism scale can be characterised as anxious, depressed, tense, emotional, irrational and often have low self-

esteem. The third factor is expressed on the continuum from tendermindedness, through toughmindedness, to psychotic disorder. Those who score high on the psychoticism scale can be characterised as cold, aggressive, toughminded, antisocial and impersonal. In order to guard against dissimulation, the Eysenckian family of personality measures also generally includes what has been defined (somewhat unfortunately) as a 'lie scale'. Those who score high on this scale can often be characterised as displaying high levels of social conformity, rather than intentional or unintentional dissimulation.

### **Research question**

Building on the studies reported by Francis (2013a), Francis (2013b) and Penny and Francis (2015) the present study intends to sharpen the research question concerning the correlates of implicit religiosity among young people by studying a group of young people who claim no formal religious affiliation and no public engagement with the churches. Such a group can be defined within the Teenage Religion and Values Survey by selecting out those participants who check the religious affiliation category 'none' and the religious attendance category 'never'. Here are young people who for all intents and purposes are living and growing up wholly outside the sphere of explicit religion. The research question then re-applies the three-item measure developed by Penny and Francis (2015) concerning attachment to Christian rites of passage in order to test how well this measure works among a group of young people living and growing up wholly outside the sphere of explicit religion.

Taking this measure of attachment to Christian rites of passage as an index of implicit religion the research question then tests the strength of the index to predict individual differences in two dependent measures: one scale of negative affect and one scale of positive affect, employing the same analytical model as utilised in the earlier studies by Francis (2013a), Francis (2013b) and Penny and Francis (2015). The scale of positive affect was

designed to amplify the interest of Francis (2013a) in purpose in life, while the scale of negative affect was designed to amplify the interest of Francis (2013b) in suicidal ideation.

## **Method**

### **Procedure**

Schools participating in the Teenage Religion and Values Survey (a replication of the Religion and Values Today Survey described by Francis, 2001) were asked to follow a standard procedure. The questionnaires were administered in normal class groups to all year-nine and year-ten students throughout the school. Students were asked not to write their name on the booklet and to complete the inventory under examination-like conditions. Although students 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 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.

*Religious attendance* 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 a three-item scale comprising the items, ‘I want a church funeral after my death’, ‘I want my children to be baptised, christened, or dedicated in church’, and ‘I want to get married in a 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)’.

*Personality* was assessed by the abbreviated form of the Revised Junior Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (JEPQR-A: Francis, 1996). This is a 24-item instrument which proposes four six-item measures of extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism, and a lie scale. Each item is assessed on a dichotomous scale: yes or no.

*Positive affect* was operationalised by a four-item scale comparing the items: ‘I feel my life has a sense of purpose’, ‘I find life really worth living’, ‘I am happy in my school’, and ‘I like the people I go to school with’, rated on a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from ‘agree strongly’, through ‘agree’, ‘not certain’, and ‘disagree’ to ‘disagree strongly’.

*Negative affect* was operationalised by a four-item scale comprising the items: ‘I feel I am not worth much as a person’, ‘I often feel depressed’, ‘I have sometimes considered taking my own life’, and ‘I have sometimes considered deliberately hurting myself’, rated on a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from ‘agree strongly’, through ‘agree’, ‘not certain’, and ‘disagree’ to ‘disagree strongly’.

## **Analysis**

The present analysis was conducted on a subset of the total available database of 19,561 students shaped by responses to the items in the survey concerned with religious affiliation and with religious attendance. These items were employed to select only those students who responded to the religious affiliation question by checking the category ‘none’ and to the religious attendance question by checking the category ‘never’. This process selected 8,619 students for the analysis. The data were analysed by SPSS statistical package using the frequency, reliability, correlation, and multiple-regression functions. Step-wise multiple-regression was employed to create two independent models, both of which

controlled for individual differences in sex, age, personality, and religious affiliation before testing for the influence of implicit religiosity on positive affect (model 1) and on negative affect (model 2).

### **Participants**

Of the 8,619 students participating in the project, 51% were male and 49% female; 53% were attending year nine classes and 47% year ten classes; 70% were attending schools without a religious foundation and 30% schools with a religious character.

### **Results**

- insert table 1 about here -

The first step in data analysis concerned examining the scale properties of the seven measures to be employed in the analyses in terms of the alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951) and the means and standard deviations. The data presented in table 1 demonstrate that the measures of positive affect, negative affect, implicit religion, extraversion and neuroticism function with satisfactory internal consistency reliability reaching alpha coefficients above the .65 threshold recommended by DeVellis (2003). While the psychoticism scale displays an alpha coefficient of .60, this is high, given the historic difficulties typically encountered by the psychoticism scales in general (Francis, Philipchalk, & Brown, 1991). The lie scale displays the lowest alpha coefficient of .54, which also is in line with previous research findings (Francis, 1996).

- insert table 2 about here -

Since the three measures of intrinsic religiosity, positive affect and negative affect are all novel measures, further information about these instruments is displayed in table 2. The correlations between the individual items and the sum of the other items within the respective scales confirms that each item is playing a full and useful role with a homogeneous scale. The item endorsements generate further insight into the group of young people living and growing

up outside the influence of explicit religion. The endorsement of the three items concerned with attachment to traditional Christian rites of passage demonstrate that two out of every five of these unaffiliated non-attenders want to get married in church (43%) or want a church funeral after their death (42%). One in five want their children to be baptised, christened or dedicated in church (21%). In terms of positive affect, around two thirds of these young people feel their life has a sense of purpose (63%), are happy in their school (67%) or find life really worth living (70%). The proportion rises to 82% who say that they like the people they go to school with. In terms of negative affect, one in five of these young people feel that they are not worth much as a person (19%), have sometimes considered taking their own life (19%), or have sometimes considered deliberately hurting themselves (23%). The proportion rises to 31% who say that they often feel depressed.

- insert table 3 about here -

Table 3 presents the correlation matrix for all the variables included in the study. Four functions of these data merit comment. First, 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. Sex was also a strong predictor of individual differences in implicit religiosity and in negative affect with females recording significantly higher scores on both measures. At the same time, males recorded slightly (but significantly) lower scores on positive affect. Second, school year demonstrated that year ten students compared with year nine students recorded significantly lower scores on implicit religiosity and on positive affect, but significantly higher scores on negative affect. Third, the personality variables demonstrated a range of statistically significant correlations with the measure of implicit religiosity and with the measures of positive affect and negative affect, confirming the need to take personality variables into account when examining the

association between implicit religiosity and positive and negative affect. Fourth, implicit religiosity correlated quite strongly and positively with positive affect ( $r = .19, p < .001$ ) and weakly and negatively with negative affect ( $r = -.03, p < .01$ ).

- insert table 4 about here -

Table 4 presents the two regression models in which the predictor variables have been entered in the fixed order: sex, school year, personality (extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism, and lie scale), and implicit religiosity. In the first model positive affect stands as the dependent variable and in the second model negative affect stands as the dependent variable. In both cases the variance accounted for by the model was significantly increased by adding implicit religiosity, but the variance explained was greater in respect of positive affect ( $r^2$  change = .027,  $F = 279.2, p < .001$ ) than in respect of negative affect ( $r^2$  change = .003,  $F = 37.5, p < .001$ ). Within the total system the beta weights also confirm the stronger influence of implicit religiosity on strengthening positive affect ( $B = .17$ ) than on reducing negative affect ( $B = -.06$ ).

### Conclusion

This study builds on the recent empirical research tradition initiated by Walker, Francis, and Robbins (2010) and Walker (2013) and developed by Francis (2013a, 2013b) and Penny and Francis (2015) which has employed and operationalised Bailey's (1997, 1998) notion of implicit religion to explore ways in which Christian believing in the UK may be persisting alongside declining levels of church attendance. Building on and extending this research tradition the present study had two specific aims.

The first aim was to identify a group of young people who could be said to be living and growing up outside the immediate environment of explicit religion. This was achieved by drawing from the 19,561 13- to 15-year-old participants currently available within the Teenage Religion and Values Survey database those 8,619 students who had responded to the

religious affiliation question by checking the category 'none' and to the religious attendance question by checking the category 'never'.

The second aim was to test among this group of unaffiliated non-practising students the three-item measure developed by Penny and Francis (2015) concerning attachment to traditional Christian rites of passage (birth, marriage, and death). The data demonstrated that this measure functioned with a good level of internal consistency reliability among this population and identified considerable attachment to these rites of passage among unaffiliated and non-practising students. Two fifths of them remained attached to traditional Christian rites of passage at marriage and at death and one fifth remained attached to traditional Christian rites of passage at birth.

The third aim was to test the extent to which individual differences in implicit religiosity (assessed in terms of attachment to traditional Christian rites of passage) generates among this population of unaffiliated and non-practising students similar psychological correlates to those generated by individual differences in explicit religiosity among affiliated and practising students. In two earlier studies, Francis (2013a) demonstrated that both implicit religiosity and explicit religiosity were associated with higher levels of purpose in life, while Francis (2013b) demonstrated that explicit religiosity was associated with lower levels of suicidal ideation but implicit religiosity was not then associated. The difference between these two findings led to the hypothesis that implicit religiosity may work in the lives of individuals in the same way as explicit religiosity to generate positive psychological outcomes such as positive affect and the sense of meaning and purpose in life, but that implicit religiosity may not work in the lives of individuals in the same way as explicit religiosity to offer protection from negative psychological outcomes such as negative affect and the sense of despair and meaninglessness. Such a distinction between the correlates of negative affect and the correlates of positive affect is consistent with the classic distinctions

offered by the notions of balanced affect (Bradburn, 1969) and the recognition that the psychological phenomena of positive affect and negative affect behave in different and distinct ways. The present study further tested this hypothesis among unaffiliated and non-practising students using four-item measures of positive affect and negative affect. The hypothesis was basically confirmed with a strong positive beta weight from implicit religiosity to positive affect and a negligible negative beta weight from implicit religiosity to negative affect.

The present study and the three earlier studies on which it builds (Francis, 2013a, 2013b; Penny & Francis, 2015) have contributed to knowledge in three ways. First, the data have supported Edward Bailey's contention that implicit religion remains alive and well in the UK in spite of the apparent demise of explicit religion in the sense of church attendance and even in the sense of self-assigned religious affiliation. The advantage of Bailey's construct of implicit religion is that it values and respects popular reformulations of Christian identity outside the confines of orthodox doctrinal beliefs and conventional observance of practices. Bailey does not dismiss those whose religious commitment is most adequately expressed by the statement 'Well, you see, I believe in Christianity' as secular or merely cultural Christians: he understands such a formulation as an expression of their implicit religion. Here, Bailey's concept of implicit religion is capable of taking seriously the implicit religion of the young people included within the present study. This expression of implicit religion is characterised by the desire to pursue rites of passage central to the Christian faith, even in presence of low levels of frequent church attendance.

Second, the data have confirmed that Bailey's notion of implicit religion is sufficiently robust to be effectively operationalised within empirical investigations. Both the single-item assessment drawing on the notion that 'You don't have to go to church to be a good Christian' and the three-item scale drawing on attachment to traditional Christian rites

of passage at the time of birth, marriage and death have provided effective operationalisations of this construct.

Third, the data have begun to clarify how and to what extent implicit religiosity may serve as a functional equivalent to explicit religiosity in terms of the psychological correlates of individual differences in religiosity. While implicit religiosity is capable of generating the same positive correlates as explicit religiosity (in the sense of supporting positive affect) implicit religiosity does not seem so capable of mitigating negative affect.

The generalisability of the findings from the present set of studies is limited culturally and geographically to England and Wales, and is limited to the narrow age range studied, adolescents between the ages of 13 and 15 years. There would be real value now in replicating these studies in different cultural and geographical contexts and among different age groups.

### References

- Bailey, E. I. (1997). *Implicit religion in contemporary society*. Kampen: Netherlands, Kok Pharos.
- Bailey, E. I. (1998). *Implicit religion: An introduction*. London: Middlesex University Press.
- Bailey, E. I. (Ed.) (2002). *The secular quest for meaning in life: Denton papers in implicit religion*. New York: The Edwin Mellon Press Ltd.
- Bradburn, N. M. (1969). *The structure of psychological well-being*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Brechting, E. H., Brown, T. L., Salsman, J. M., Sauer, S. E., & Holeman, V. T. (2010). The role of religious beliefs in predicting underage alcohol use. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Substance Abuse*, 19, 324-34.
- Chu, D. C. (2007). Religiosity and desistance from drug use. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 661-679.
- Clarke, L., Beeghley, L., & Cochran, J. C. (1990). Religiosity, social class, and alcohol use: An application of reference group theory. *Sociological Perspectives*, 33, 201-18.
- Cochran, J. K., Beeghley, L., & Bock, E. W. (1992). The influence of religious stability and homogamy on the relationship between religiosity and alcohol use among Protestants. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 31, 441-456.
- Cook, C. C. H., Goddard, D., & Westall, R. (1997). Knowledge and experience of drug use amongst church affiliated young people. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 46, 9-17.
- Corulla, W. J. (1990). A revised version of the psychoticism scale for children. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11, 65-76.
- Cosper, R. L., Okraku, I. O., & Neumann, B. (1987). Tavern going in Canada: A national survey of regulars at public drinking establishments. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 48, 252-59.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*,

16, 297-334.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage.

Durkheim, E. (1897). *Le suicide*. Paris: Felix Alcan.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (adult and junior)*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Eysenck, S. B. G., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 21-29.

Fawcett, B., Francis, L. J., Linkletter, J., & Robbins, M. (2012). Religiosity and alcohol avoidance: A study among Canadian Baptist youth. *The Journal of Youth Ministry*, 11, 45-62.

Francis, L. J. (1996). The development of an abbreviated form of the Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (JEPQR-A) among 13-15 year olds. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 21, 835-844.

Francis, L. J. (2001). *The values debate: A voice from the pupils*. London: Woburn Press.

Francis, L. J. (2013a). Implicit religion, explicit religion and purpose in life: An empirical enquiry among 13- to 15-year-old adolescents. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 16, 909-921.

Francis, L. J. (2013b). The association between suicidal ideation, explicit religion and implicit religion: An empirical enquiry among 13- to 15-year-old adolescents. *Implicit Religion*, 16, 93-109.

Francis, L. J., & Mullen, K. (1993). Religiosity and attitudes towards drug use among 13-15 year olds in England. *Addiction*, 88, 665-672.

Francis, L. J., Philipchalk, R., & Brown, L. B. (1991). The comparability of the short form EPQ-R with the EPQ among students in England, the USA, Canada and Australia. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 1129-1132.

- Francis, L. J. & Richter, P. (2007). *Gone for Good? Church-leaving and returning in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Peterborough: Epworth.
- Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2009). Prayer, purpose in life, and attitude toward substances: A study among 13- to 15-year-olds in England and Wales. *Counselling and Spirituality*, 28(2), 83-104.
- Hills, P., & Francis, L.J. (2005). The relationship of religiosity and personality with suicidal ideation. *Mortality*, 10. 286-93.
- Hovey, J.D. (1999). Religion and suicidal ideation in a sample of Latin American immigrants. *Psychological Reports*, 85, 171-77.
- Lester, D. & Francis, L. J. (1993). Is religiosity related to suicidal ideation after personality and mood are taken into account? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 15, 591-592.
- Lord, K. (2006). Implicit religion: Definition and application. *Implicit Religion*, 9, 205-219.
- Lubben, J. E., Chi, I., & Kitano, H. H. L. (1988). Exploring Filipino American drinking behaviour. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 49, 26-9.
- Marion, M.S. & L.M. Range. (2003). African American college women's suicide buffers. *Suicide and Life Threatening Behaviour*. 33, 33-43.
- Mellor, J. M., & Freeborn, B. A. (2011). Religious participation and risky health behaviors among adolescents. *Health Economics*, 20, 1226-1240.
- Mullen, K., & Francis, L. J. (1995). Religiosity and drug use among Dutch school-children. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 41, 16-25.
- Penny, G., & Francis, L. J. (2015). Implicit religion, explicit religion and attitude toward substances: An empirical enquiry among 13- to 15-year-old adolescents. *Implicit Religion*.
- Rasic, D., Kisely, S., & Langille, D. B. (2011). Protective associations of importance of

- religion and frequency of service attendance with depression risk, suicidal behaviours and substance use in adolescents in Nova Scotia, Canada. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 132, 389-395.
- Regnerus, M. D., & Elder, G. H. (2003). Religion and vulnerability among low-risk adolescents. *Social Science Research*, 32, 633-658.
- Richter, P., & Francis, L. J. (1998). *Gone but not forgotten: church leaving and returning*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Schnell, T., Francis, L. J., Lewis, C. A. (2011). Psychological perspectives on implicit religion. *Implicit Religion*, 4, 385-386.
- Schweitzer, R., Klayich, M., & MacLean, J. (1995). Suicidal ideation and behaviours among university students in Australia. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 29, 473-9.
- Sloane, D. M., & Potvin, R. H. (1986). Religion and delinquency: Cutting through the maze. *Social Forces*, 65, 87-105.
- Steinman, K. J., Ferketich, A. K., & Sahr, T. (2008). The dose-response relationship of adolescent religious activity and substance use: Variation across demographic groups. *Health Education and Behavior*, 35, 22-43.
- Toussaint, L. (2009). Associations of religiousness with 12-month prevalence of drug use and drug-related sex. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 7, 311-323.
- Walker, D. (2013). You don't have to go to church to be a good Christian: The implicit religion of the Cathedral Carol Service congregation. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*.
- Walker, D., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2010). You don't have to go to church to be a good Christian: The implicit religion of rural Anglican churchgoers celebrating harvest. *Implicit Religion*, 13, 319-325.

Zhang, J. & Jin, S. (1996). Determinants of suicide ideation: A comparison of Chinese and American college students. *Adolescence*, 31, 451-67.

Table 1

*Scale properties in terms of alpha coefficients, means and standard deviations*

	N items	alpha	Mean	SD
Intrinsic religiosity	3	.72	9.08	2.91
Negative affect	4	.82	9.50	4.10
Positive affect	4	.66	15.40	2.85
Extraversion	6	.71	4.89	1.48
Neuroticism	6	.71	2.73	1.86
Psychoticism	6	.56	1.10	1.27
Lie scale	6	.55	2.21	2.09

Table 2

*Scale items: Item rest of scale correlations and item endorsement*

	<i>r</i>	Yes %	? %	No %
<i>Intrinsic religiosity</i>				
I want to get married in church	.58	43	37	20
I want a church funeral after my death	.55	42	35	23
I want my children to be baptised, christened, or dedicated in church	.49	21	35	44
<i>Negative affect</i>				
I feel I am not worth much as a person	.57	19	25	57
I often feel depressed	.65	31	22	47
I have sometimes considered taking my own life	.68	19	13	68
I have sometimes considered deliberately hurting myself	.65	23	14	63
<i>Positive affect</i>				
I feel my life has a sense of purpose	.41	63	28	10
I find life really worth living	.51	70	20	10
I am happy in my school	.46	67	19	14
I like the people I go to school with	.37	82	12	6

Table 3

*Correlation matrix*

	Sex	SY	IR	NA	PA	L	P	N
Extraversion (E)	.10***	-.03**	.17***	-.17**	.25***	-.15***	.14***	-.17***
Neuroticism (N)	.30***	.01	.08***	.58***	-.32***	.02*	-.07**	
Psychoticism (P)	-.24***	.03**	-.08***	.11***	-.12***	-.36***		
Lie scale	.08***	-.05***	.06***	-.07***	.08***			
Positive affect (PA)	-.03**	-.07***	.19***	-.56***				
Negative affect (NA)	.16***	.03**	-.03**					
Implicit religiosity (IR)	.16***	-.04***						
School year (SY)	-.01							

Note: \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

Table 4

*Regression models*

	Positive affect			Negative affect		
	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> <	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> <
Sex	-.02	-2.0	.05	.06	5.8	.001
School year	-.05	-5.2	.001	.02	1.8	NS
Neuroticism	-.31	-28.7	.001	.56	58.8	.001
Extraversion	.19	18.3	.001	-.09	-9.5	.001
Psychoticism	-.14	-12.6	.001	.15	15.5	.001
Lie scale	.06	5.2	.001	-.04	-3.9	.001
Implicit religiosity	.17	16.7	.001	-.06	-6.1	.001
R <sup>2</sup>	.20			.37		