

Naser Aghababaei*
 Agata Blachnio**
 Mona Arji*
 Masoud Chiniforoushan*
 Somayeh Mohammadtabar*

The relations among well-being outcomes, religiosity, and personality

Abstract: A major focus of attention in psychology has been on the consequences and determinants of well-being. Religiosity and personality have both been shown to predict mental health and well-being, but the two predictors have not often been investigated together. In 4 studies involving 7 surveys (total $N = 1,530$) in various social and religious contexts, the relations among well-being, religious orientation, and personality factors were studied. Results showed that Extraversion was the single strongest correlate of higher levels of subjective and psychological well-being. Religiosity had null or weak positive relationships with well-being, and managed to explain variance in some aspects of positive functioning beyond personality factors. The null or weak relationship of religiosity with well-being beyond personality was consistent across the HEXACO and the Big Five models of personality structure. It has been suggested that religion is relatively more important for eudaimonic than for hedonic way of living.

Key words: Well-being; Happiness; Religion; Personality

Introduction

People from around the world strongly desire happiness, and happy people are successful across multiple life domains, including relationships, income, job and academic performance, and health (Argyle, 1997; Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005). Personality has long been recognized as a strong predictor of well-being. Two personality factors that have been strongly and consistently connected with well-being are Neuroticism and Extroversion. Neuroticism (reversed Emotional Stability) influences people's negative affects, whereas Extraversion influences people's positive affects (Steel, Schmidt, & Shultz, 2008). There is some evidence of a genetic link between well-being and personality (Weiss, Bates, & Luciano, 2008). Furthermore, a growing body of research has found positive links between well-being and various aspects of religiosity (Aghababaei, 2014; Aghababaei & Tabik, 2013; Dezutter, Soenens, & Hutsebaut, 2006; Francis, Jewell, & Robbins, 2010; Francis & Lester, 1997; Francis, Ziebertz, & Lewis, 2003; Ghorbani, Watson, Aghababaei, & Chen, 2014; Ghorbani, Watson, Zarehi, & Shamohammadi, 2010; Robbins, Francis, & Edwards, 2008).

“To be of ultimate value for science, numinous constructs need to show that they represent something new about individuals” (Piedmont, Ciarrochi, Dy-Liacco, & Williams, 2009, p 165). Piedmont et al. (2009) considered the Five Factor/Big Five paradigm as a base of prediction against which the contribution of religiosity can be compared. The Big Five model measures Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Emotional Stability (Goldberg, 1999). More recently, however, using data from different languages and cultures, Lee and Ashton (2004, 2008; Ashton & Lee, 2009; Ashton, Lee, & de Vries, 2014) found six distinct personality factors collectively called the HEXACO (Honesty–Humility, Emotionality, eXtraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness). Although these factors appear somewhat similar to the Big Five, they capture additional variance. Aghababaei (2012), for example, found that in his study of Iranian students' religiosity, the HEXACO inventory explained additional variance when added to a Big Five model, but the reverse was not the case. Aghababaei and Arji (2014) found similar results in relation to psychological well-being. Personality and religion have both been shown to

* Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran

** The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Lublin, Poland

predict well-being, but the two predictors have not often been investigated together. The positive links between religiosity and subjective well-being (SWB), among college students in the United States (Francis & Lester, 1997) and Iran (Aghababaei, 2014) have been found to be independent of individual differences in personality. In other studies (Francis et al., 2003; Robbins et al., 2008), however, religiosity failed to predict SWB after controlling for personality. Additionally, in Aghababaei and Tabik's (2013) study trait gratitude out-predicted gratitude towards God in relation with SWB and mental health, showing that religious gratitude compared to dispositional gratitude has less effect on mental health and well-being.

The relations among religiosity, personality and well-being may vary by population and by the manner in which these constructs are operationalized. For instance, there is some evidence suggesting that, in predicting well-being, differences in religious involvement are less important than differences in religious orientation which are indicative of people's general functioning than the relatively surface aspects of their religious involvement (Dezutter et al., 2006). According to Allport's theory and model, the intrinsically motivated people live their religion, whereas the extrinsically motivated use their religion as a means of convenience for self-serving ends (Allport & Ross, 1967). Since a host of studies has shown that intrinsic religious orientation more than extrinsic religious orientation associates with psychosocial adjustment, including happiness (e.g., Aghababaei, 2014; Flere & Lavric, 2008; Francis et al., 2010; Ghorbani et al., 2010), we expect to find the same pattern of results among our samples. Additionally, we want to see whether the links between religiosity and well-being remain significant even after controlling for personality which is a salient variable for well-being. Since religious orientations represent deep rooted predispositions which are less contaminated with contextual factors (Dezutter et al., 2006) cross-cultural generalizability of findings would be expected.

Study 1

Method

Data for this study came from two samples. Sample 1 consisted of 200 Iranian university students (74.5% female; 98% Muslim; M age = 23.77). Sample 2 consisted of 190 Iranian adults (58.9% female; 100% Muslim; M age = 31.61). The studies reported here were announced orally or through advertisements on campus. We administered the Persian versions of these measures which have been used previously and have proven to be valid. A five point Likert-type scale was applied for all items used in this and the following studies, unless indicated otherwise.

The Religious Orientation Scale

The 14-item Religious Orientation Scale-Revised (Hill, 1999), which is an adaptation of Allport and Ross's (1967) scale, was used to measure intrinsic ("My whole approach to life is based on my religion"), extrinsic-

personal ("What religion offers me most is comfort in times of trouble and sorrow), and extrinsic-social ("I go to the mosque or religious community mainly because I enjoy seeing people I know there") religious orientation. This scale has been shown to have internal consistency reliability and criterion and construct validity (Aghababaei, 2013). Cronbach's alphas for these three scales were .79, .83, and .80, respectively.

The HEXACO Personality Inventory

The HEXACO factors were measured using the 60-item HEXACO Personality Inventory-Revised (HEXACO-60; Ashton & Lee, 2009). The HEXACO-60 has been shown to have internal consistency reliability and convergent validity. Coefficient alpha of the six factors ranged from .60 to .75.

The Subjective Happiness Scale

The Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS) which is a widely used, 4-item global assessment of happiness (Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999) was used to measure happiness. Each item was assessed on a 7 point Likert scale. Sample item is "In general I consider myself: 1 = Not a very happy person to 7 = A very happy person". The SHS has shown to have test-retest reliability, discriminant and convergent validity, and internal consistency (Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999). Cronbach's alpha for the SHS was .71.

Results

Table 1 provides bivariate correlations of the study variables. Happiness in Sample 1, but not in Sample 2, was related to higher religiosity. In both samples, however, Extraversion was the strongest correlate of happiness. A series of hierarchical regressions was used to see the unique contribution of religiosity in happiness by controlling for personality factors. In doing so, religiosity was entered (in step 2), after entering personality factors (in step 1). With the effects of HEXACO controlled ($F = 20.95$; $R^2 = .39$; $p < .01$), in Sample 1, extrinsic social religiosity managed to predict 1% of variance in happiness (F change = 6.14; $R^2 = .41$, R^2 change = .019; $p < .05$). The same method was used for the two other religiosity measures; but both intrinsic and extrinsic personal religiosity failed to significantly predict happiness. In the interest of space constraints, in this and following studies, we do not report those correlations that were not significant.

Study 2

Method

Study 2 is a replication of Study 1, but with more variables. Study 1 was limited by studying only one aspect of SWB, in a Muslim population. Data for this study came from two separate samples. Participants in Samples 3 and 4 were 222 Iranian (66.2 % female; 95.9 % Muslim; M age = 22.44) and 221 Polish (77.4% female; 99.1% Christian; M age = 21.89) university students, respectively. Participants completed the questionnaire booklets which

Table 1. Intercorrelations among the study variables in Sample 1 (below diagonal) and Sample 2 (above diagonal)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Openness	1	.23**	.12	.37**	.01	.02	.07	.05	.05	-.02
2. Extraversion	.31**	1	.16*	.42**	-.14*	.05	.45**	.01	.03	-.10
3. Agreeableness	.17*	.22**	1	.31**	.09	.41**	.20**	.32**	.25**	.02
4. Conscientiousness	.22**	.37**	.22**	1	.04	.24**	.13	.23**	.23**	-.14*
5. Emotionality	-.16*	-.29**	-.22**	-.16*	1	.11	-.11	.25**	.17*	-.02
6. Honesty–Humility	.10	.09	.35**	.23**	-.21	1	-.11	.34**	.19**	-.16*
7. Happiness	.21**	.57**	.26**	.11	-.30**	.01	1	.02	.09	-.01
<i>Religious Orientation</i>										
8. Intrinsic	.07	.31**	.23**	.25**	-.05	.36**	.15*	1	.75**	.13
9. Extrinsic Personal	.03	.28**	.16*	.10	.13	.13	.19**	.63**	1	.28**
10. Extrinsic Social	-.03	.04	-.01	-.02	.09	.02	.14*	.36**	.35**	1

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

consisted of Persian or Polish versions of the HEXACO-60, Subjective Happiness Scale, and Religious Orientation Scale-Revised, all of which have been used in Study 1. Additionally, this study includes the following measures.

The Satisfaction with Life Scale

The widely used 5-item Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) was applied to measure the cognitive aspect of SWB. This scale is a brief, yet highly reliable and well-validated measure of positive emotions. A sample item is: “In most ways my life is close to my ideal”. Cronbach’s alphas for this scale ranged from .65 to .80.

Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale

Rosenberg’s (1965) Self-Esteem Scale is a standard, widely accepted index of global self-esteem, a construct distinguishable from, yet closely related to SWB. We included self-esteem because it has been considered by some authors “as an important component of well-being in terms of relationships between well-being and spirituality” (Kashdan & Nezlek, 2012, p. 1524). Sample items include “I feel I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis of others” and “I feel that I have a number of good qualities.” Cronbach’s alphas for this scale ranged from .60 to .86.

Results

Table 2 provides bivariate correlations of the study variables. Higher levels of SWB and self-esteem were associated, in both Iranian and Polish samples, with higher intrinsic and extrinsic personal religiosity, but not with extrinsic social religiosity. Here again, the HEXACO Extraversion was the single strongest correlate of SWB.

Two series of hierarchical regressions were applied to see the unique contribution of religiosity in positive functioning by controlling for personality. In the Iranian

sample, after controlling for personality ($F = 14.74$; $R^2 = .29$; $p < .01$), extrinsic social religiosity managed to predict 1% of variance in happiness (F change = 4.32; $R^2 = .31$, R^2 change = .014; $p < .05$). After the HEXACO dimensions controlled ($F = 13.80$; $R^2 = .27$; $p < .01$) extrinsic social religiosity significantly predicted 1% of variance in life satisfaction (F change = 4.37; $R^2 = .29$, R^2 change = .014; $p < .05$). Intrinsic religiosity predicted 1% of variance in life satisfaction (F change = 3.99; $R^2 = .29$, R^2 change = .013; $p < .05$) beyond personality factors ($R^2 = .27$, $F = 13.80$; $p < .01$).

In the Polish sample, after controlling for the HEXACO dimensions ($F = 5.78$; $R^2 = .14$, $p < .01$), intrinsic religiosity predicted 3% of variance in life satisfaction (F change = 9.53; $R^2 = .17$, R^2 change = .037; $p < .01$). After the HEXACO factors controlled ($F = 11.37$; $R^2 = .24$, $p < .01$) intrinsic religiosity significantly predicted 3% variance in happiness (F change = 9.39; $R^2 = .27$, R^2 change = .032; $p < .01$). Extrinsic personal religiosity predicted 2% of variance in life satisfaction (F change = 5.83; $R^2 = .16$; R^2 change = .023; $p < .05$) beyond HEXACO factors ($F = 5.78$; $R^2 = .14$; $p < .01$).

Study 3

Method

Data for this study came from two separate samples. Participants in Sample 5 and 6, were 251 Iranian (68.1% female; 100% Muslim; M age = 21.82) and 226 Polish (91.2% female; 93.8% Christian; M age = 19.71) university students, respectively. Participants completed the questionnaire booklets which consisted of Persian or Polish versions of the HEXACO-60, Subjective Happiness Scale, Satisfaction with Life Scale, and Religious Orientation Scale-Revised. This study includes a measure of psychological well-being too.

Table 2. Correlations among the study variables among Iranian students in Sample 3 (below diagonal) and Polish students in Sample 4 (above diagonal)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	11	12	13
1. Openness	1	.11	.17*	.17**	-.04	.09	.13*	.10	.17**	.21**	.12	-.12
2. Extraversion	.37**	1	-.01	.22**	-.04	-.08	.46**	.34**	.47**	-.01	.03	.01
3. Agreeableness	-.02	.13*	1	.16*	-.09	.29**	.09	.03	-.01	.18**	.04	.01
4. Conscientiousness	.24**	.33**	.14*	1	.15*	.16*	.18**	.19**	.22**	.17**	.16*	-.21**
5. Emotionality	-.12	-.20**	-.16*	-.11	1	.03	-.06	.01	-.10	.12	.21**	-.01
6. Honesty–Humility	-.04	.01	.29**	.19**	-.01	1	.03	.04	-.11	.34**	.06	-.02
7. Happiness	.20**	.52**	.11	.20**	-.25**	-.05	1	.65**	.48**	.20**	.10	-.06
8. Life satisfaction	.15*	.49**	.23**	.23**	-.13*	.09	.58**	1	.44**	.21**	.18**	.05
9. Self-esteem	.22**	.68**	.21**	.35**	-.20**	.06	.62**	.63**	1	.05	.11	-.10
<i>Religious Orientation</i>												
11. Intrinsic	.06	.15*	.13*	.24**	-.01	.30**	.12	.21**	.18**	1	.53**	.13
12. Extrinsic Personal	-.03	.11	.15*	.21**	.14*	.26**	-.01	.18**	.07	.54**	1	.17*
13. Extrinsic Social	-.10	-.02	.08	-.09	-.03	.03	.11	.12	.05	.34**	.18**	1

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

Ryff's Scales of Psychological Well-being

The theory-driven six-factor model of psychological well-being proposed by Ryff (1989) was measured using a 42-item version of Ryff's Scales of Psychological Well-being which is the most frequently used measure of eudaimonic well-being. Items assess autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relationships with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance (Ryff, 1989). This measure has shown factorial validity, high internal consistency and high criterion-related validity (Ryff & Singer, 2006). Cronbach's alphas for the Persian and Polish versions of this measure, in the current study, were .89 and .90, respectively.

Results

Table 3 provides intercorrelations between the study variables. Here again, religiosity was associated with both psychological and subjective well-being, whereas Extraversion was the strongest correlate of well-being.

In the Iranian sample, intrinsic religiosity, after controlling for personality ($F = 18.06$; $R^2 = .32$; $p < .01$), predict 1% of variance in purpose in life (F change = 3.33; $R^2 = .33$; R^2 change = .01; $p = .052$). Extrinsic personal religiosity also predicted 1% of variance in purpose in life (F change = 3.67; $R^2 = .33$; R^2 change = 01; $p = .056$), beyond personality factors ($F = 18.10$; $R^2 = .32$; $p < .01$).

In the Polish sample, after controlling for the HEXACO factors ($F = 22.70$; $R^2 = .38$; $p < .01$) intrinsic religiosity predicted 1% of variance in personal growth (F change = 4.67; $R^2 = .39$; R^2 change = .013; $p < .05$). Intrinsic religiosity also significantly predicted 1% variance in self-acceptance (F change = 5.30; $R^2 = .43$; R^2 change = .014; $p < .05$) beyond personality factors ($F = 26.72$; $R^2 = .42$; $p < .01$). Extrinsic personal religiosity, after controlling for personality ($F = 16.17$; $R^2 = .30$; $p < .01$), predicted 1% of variance in life satisfaction (F change = 6.22; $R^2 = .32$; R^2 change = .019; $p < .05$). And extrinsic social religiosity predicted 1% of variance in purpose in life (F change = 5.34; $R^2 = .35$; R^2 change = .016; $p < .05$), beyond HEXACO factors ($F = 18.65$; $R^2 = .34$; $p < .01$). The extrinsic social also significantly predicted 2% of variance in positive relations with others (F change = 9.23; $R^2 = .43$; R^2 change = .024; $p < .01$), beyond HEXACO dimensions ($F = 25.10$; $R^2 = .41$; $p < .01$). The extrinsic social predicted 2% of variance in personal growth (F change = 8.72; $R^2 = .40$; R^2 change = .024; $p < .01$), after controlling for the HEXACO factors ($F = 22.47$; $R^2 = .38$; $p < .01$). Finally, extrinsic social predicted 2% of variance in autonomy (F change = 7.04; $R^2 = .35$; R^2 change = .021; $p < .01$) beyond HEXACO factors ($F = 18.38$; $R^2 = .33$; $p < .01$). Thus, this study extends the previous findings on SWB to psychological well-being.

Table 3. Correlations among the study variables among Iranian students in Sample 5 (below diagonal) and Polish students in Sample 6 (above diagonal)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Openness	1	.08	.10	.05	-.13*	.15*	.15*	.20**	.15*	.15*	.07	.03	.14*	.27**	.19**	.01	-.11
2. Extraversion	.20**	1	.15*	.13	-.15*	.10	.65**	.49**	.41**	.61**	.50**	.60**	.41**	.47**	.14*	.03	.05
3. Agreeableness	.12	.19**	1	.21**	-.05	.32**	.29**	.20**	-.09	.22**	.32**	.26**	.18**	.15*	.18**	.08	.03
4. Conscientiousness	.29**	.21**	.13*	1	.06	.25**	.15*	.22**	.13*	.13*	.21**	.31**	.42**	.30**	.18**	.19**	-.07
5. Emotionality	-.06	-.18**	-.14*	-.06	1	.01	-.18**	-.08	-.27**	-.19**	.16*	-.18**	-.01	-.01	.04	.18**	-.08
6. Honesty-Humility	.27**	.11	.21**	.22**	-.14*	1	.20**	.16*	.26**	.18**	.26**	.26**	.26**	.33**	.38**	.07	-.11
7. Happiness	.02	.57**	.18**	-.04	-.19**	.04	1	.67**	.26**	.72**	.48**	.62**	.35**	.48**	.23**	.09	-.03
8. Life Satisfaction	.01	.38**	.11	.23**	-.08	.15*	.28**	1	.32**	.68**	.42**	.50**	.34**	.45**	.20**	.18**	-.05
9. Autonomy	.30**	.38**	.10	.25**	-.33**	.19**	.16*	.13*	1	.37**	.22**	.35**	.30**	.41**	.12	-.10	-.15*
10. Self-Acceptance	.14*	.63**	.31**	.27**	-.26**	.21**	.48**	.58**	.31**	1	.50**	.59**	.42**	.49**	.25**	.06	-.06
11. Positive Relations with Others	.19**	.56**	.32**	.10	-.07	.16**	.46**	.22**	.15*	.44**	1	.50**	.44**	.44**	.23**	.04	-.16*
12. Environmental Mastery	.20**	.50**	.28**	.30**	-.18**	.21**	.39**	.42**	.29**	.58**	.47**	1	.45**	.45**	.22**	.09	-.02
13. Purpose in Life	.19**	.35**	.18**	.47**	-.01	.23**	.14*	.28**	.29**	.47**	.26**	.35**	1	.55**	.25**	.08	-.15*
14. Personal Growth	.24**	.39**	.17**	.32**	-.12*	.25**	.28**	.43**	.32**	.55**	.39**	.47**	.47**	1	.32**	.14*	-.19**
<i>Religious Orientation</i>																	
15. Intrinsic	.21**	.16*	.11	.32**	.01	.32**	.06	.13*	.05	.20**	.20**	.16**	.30**	.22**	1	.46**	.10
16. Extrinsic personal	.08	.14*	.13*	.26**	.06	.27**	.02	.08	.02	.13*	.19**	.09	.28**	.16*	.67**	1	.33**
17. Extrinsic social	.01	-.02	.07	-.01	-.07	.03	-.01	.01	-.07	-.08	-.05	-.07	-.05	-.08	.36**	.31**	1

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

Study 4

Method

Participants in Sample 7 were 220 (61.8% female; 98.2% Muslim; M age = 22.65) Iranian university students. Participants completed the questionnaire booklets which consisted of the Persian versions of the HEXACO-60, Satisfaction with Life Scale, the 42-item Ryff's Psychological Well-being Scales, all of which have been used in previous studies. Studies 1–3 were limited by applying only the HEXACO model of personality. Sample 7 also answered to an alternative measure of personality; the 50-item International Personality Item Pool-Big Five (Goldberg, 1999) was used to assess the Big Five factors of personality.

Spirituality Self-Rating Scale

This 6-item index of intrinsic orientation to religiosity/spirituality was applied to measure religiosity. Sample items include "I try hard to live my life according to my religious beliefs" and "I enjoy reading about my spirituality and/or my religion." (Galanter, Dermatis, Bunt, Williams, Trujillo, & Steinke, 2007). Level of internal consistency reliability of this scale was, for example, as high in Iran as it was in the United States (Aghababaei, Wasserman, & Nannini, 2014).

International Personality Item Pool-Big Five

The Big Five were measured using the 50-item, self-report International Personality Item Pool-Big Five. This well-validated measure of personality has shown to have internal consistency reliability and criterion and construct validity in both English (Goldberg, 1999) and Persian (Erdle & Aghababaei, 2012). Coefficient alpha of the five factors ranged from .70 to .79.

Results

Table 4 provides bivariate correlations of the study variables. Here too, religiosity was associated with well-being. With the effects of HEXACO controlled ($F = 11.57$; $R^2 = .24$; $p < .01$), religiosity managed to predict 1% of variance in purpose in life (F change = 3.68; $R^2 = .25$; R^2 change = .013; $p = .056$) but failed to significantly predict other aspects of well-being. Also, with effects of the Big Five controlled ($F = 9.20$; $R^2 = .17$; $p < .01$), religiosity again managed to predict 1% of variance in purpose in life (F change = 4.52; $R^2 = .19$; R^2 change = .017; $p < .05$) but failed to significantly predict other well-being constructs. These findings suggest that the null or weak relationship of religiosity with well-being beyond personality is not limited to the HEXACO model of personality structure.

Discussion

Understanding the correlates and psychological consequences of being numinous is an important question for psychology of religion and spirituality, as well as for personality psychology (also known as differential psychology). We looked into the relations among

religiosity, personality, and well-being. The results in this paper came from a total of seven surveys, conducted on various social and religious populations. In line with past research, Extraversion consistently was the strongest correlate of happiness and other aspects of positive functioning. That the positive links between Extraversion and positive affect is one of the most robust findings in the field (Lucas, Le, & Dyrenforth, 2008), enhances the validity of our findings. As with previous research (e.g. Saroglou, 2002) we found some weak yet significantly positive associations between this factor and religiosity. Some weak positive links between religiosity and various aspects of well-being were also found in this set of studies.

Interest in the distinction between hedonic and eudaimonic conceptualization of well-being is growing rapidly within the field of psychology. While hedonia is focused on happiness, pleasure, enjoyment, and absence of discomfort, the principal focus in eudaimonic way of living is on activities that reflect virtue, excellence, the best within individuals, and the full development of their potentials (see Huta & Waterman, 2014). SWB measurements are based on a hedonic conceptualization of well-being, whereas psychological well-being scales are based on a eudaimonic conceptualization (Nave, Sherman, & Funder, 2008). Religiosity, in the current research, was associated with both variants of well-being, suggesting that religious people tend to live the "full life" (being high in both eudaimonia and hedonia; Peterson, Park, & Seligman, 2005). However, the relations of religiosity to psychological well-being were stronger than its relations to SWB, showing that religious people's path to living a "good life" tends to be through leading a eudaimonic way of life, rather than a hedonic way of living. This is consistent with the findings that religiosity was associated with higher levels of Honesty–Humility, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness, factors considered as moral character traits, constituting an important part of the personality of heroes, saints, and good citizens (Markowitz, Goldberg, Ashton, & Lee, 2012; Saroglou, 2010). The direction of relationships of religiousness to personality and well-being scales was somewhat similar across different samples from Iran and Poland, and the strength of these relationships was not substantially different. Although different countries may not be convergent on some related cultural factors, these studies provide some indication of cultural similarities, as would be suggested by previous, replicated cross-cultural studies summarized by Saroglou (2010).

Based on the well-established literature on the links between well-being and personality factors (more particularly Extraversion and Neuroticism), and between religiousness and personality, individual differences in personality factors should be taken into account in studies on the religion-well-being nexus (Francis et al., 2003). Using hierarchical regressions analyses, we examined the degree to which religiousness was able to predict uniquely a variety of well-being measures after controlling for personality factors. Once the effects of personality removed, some of the positive relations remain, while many of them disappeared. On the basis of this research, we

Table 4. Correlations among the study variables in Sample 7

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
<i>HEXACO scales</i>																		
1. Openness	1																	
2. Extraversion	.28**	1																
3. Agreeableness	.11	.28**	1															
4. Conscientiousness	.23**	.29**	.19**	1														
5. Emotionality	-.20**	-.23**	-.03	-.17*	1													
6. Honesty-Humility	.12	.11	.15*	.22**	-.06	1												
<i>Big Five scales</i>																		
7. Openness	.47**	.36**	.01	.32**	-.19**	.12	1											
8. Extraversion	.12	.54**	.02	.05	-.02	-.02	.32**	1										
9. Agreeableness	.22**	.31**	.35**	.24**	.07	.26**	.36**	.34**	1									
10. Conscientiousness	.09	.22**	.18**	.58**	-.05	.25**	.17**	.03	.39**	1								
11. Emotional Stability	.21**	.37**	.28**	.30**	-.43**	.23**	.10	.08	.19**	.19**	1							
<i>Well-being scales</i>																		
12. Life Satisfaction	.13	.41**	.16*	.26**	-.20*	.04	.09	.11	.13*	.22**	.39**	1						
13. Autonomy	.32**	.45**	.05	.28**	-.35**	.23**	.30**	.22**	.15*	.11	.38**	.39**	1					
14. Self-acceptance	.34**	.62**	.28**	.41**	-.35*	.15*	.35**	.26**	.25**	.30**	.49**	.56**	.49**	1				
15. Positive Relations with Others	.23**	.54**	.24**	.21**	-.11	.09	.29**	.33**	.35**	.15*	.30**	.26**	.35**	.46**	1			
16. Environmental Mastery	.19**	.49**	.24**	.49**	-.22**	.28**	.29**	.19**	.29**	.44**	.38**	.37**	.41**	.59**	.52**	1		
17. Purpose in Life	.18**	.39**	.15*	.38**	-.02	.14*	.30**	.15*	.19**	.30**	.19**	.28**	.23**	.47**	.36**	.45**	1	
19. Personal Growth	.39**	.45**	.19**	.41**	-.19**	.20**	.46**	.19**	.28**	.26**	.33**	.37**	.42**	.59**	.36**	.51**	.57**	1
19. Religiousness	.15*	.18**	.10	.28**	.10	.36**	.22**	.07*	.39**	.40**	.11	.12	.15*	.18**	.18**	.27**	.27**	.22**

Note: * p < .05; ** p < .01.

conclude that religion-happiness link exists, but is minimal and limited in extent, since it is somewhat due to individual differences in personality. Our results also suggest that the weak links between religion and well-being beyond personality may be consistent across personality measures and models.

Another findings of this research was that the relations of well-being to intrinsic religiosity were stronger than their relations to extrinsic religiosity measures. These findings suggest that people who live their religion and internalize religion's values of humanity, compassion and love of the neighbor (Allport & Ross, 1967) may live better than those who use their religions to gain some psychological or social ends. In the current study, however, extrinsic personal orientation inclined towards the intrinsic rather than the extrinsic social orientation, which is in line with some more recent findings with non-Protestant samples (Aghababaei, 2013, 2014; Flere & Lavric, 2008). Social extrinsic religiosity deals with attainment of social benefits, whereas personal extrinsic religiosity deals with overcoming and controlling psychological distress and troubles. Turning to God and religion to attain psychological comfort, especially in the face of stressful life events, is not much of an unadjusted form of religiosity. What buttresses these findings is that numerous studies have previously shown extrinsic personal, rather than social, religiosity as a clear correlate of psychosocial adjustment (Aghababaei, 2013, 2014; Ghorbani et al., 2010).

The main objective of this study was to extend the current understanding of the relations among well-being, religiosity, and personality. Previous research in the area failed to analyze these variables simultaneously, which could have a significant effect on study findings. The strength of the present research was the inclusion of participants drawn from various social and religious groups in the study sample. Nevertheless, further research is necessary, in particular, research that can identify causal relationships. Our survey into the literature revealed several variables as mediators in this relationship. To our knowledge, the casual route from religion to its positive outcomes such as happiness, health and well-being has been confirmed so far through purpose or meaning in life (Aghababaei & Blachnio, 2014) social support, optimism (Salsman, Brown, Brechting, & Carlson, 2005), compassion (Steffen & Masters, 2005), and death anxiety (Cohen, Pierce Jr., Chambers, Meade, Gorvine, & Koenig, 2005). However, a comprehensive model that includes all of these mediators is lacking. Additionally, it has been suggested that a major function of religion is to help people cope with the problem of death, through which it exerts its positive influences on peoples' lives (Vail III, Rothschild, Weise, Solomon, Pyszczynski, & Greenberg, 2010). Future research should compare the effectiveness of worldviews that promise literal immortality to those that promise only symbolic immortality. Furthermore, it has been suggested that the adaptive effect of religion may not be specific to supernatural beliefs that lies within religion; this effect may be instead a more general function of belief, including belief in science (Farias, Newheiser, Kahane, & Toledo,

2013). Future research would benefit from investigating the relationship between science and religion, and from comparing religious faith and scientific faith in their associations with happiness and positive functioning.

Limitations of this research were the use of self-reports, the use of cross-sectional data, and applying non-random sampling methods. It would be useful in future research to use multiple methods of measurement, obtain observer reports, examine greater diversity among individuals, and study unexamined religious groups. Such research will further test the notion that religious persons tend to live well.

References

- Aghababaei, N. (2013). Between you and God, where is the general factor of personality? Exploring personality-religion relationships in a Muslim context. *Personality and Individual Differences, 55*(2), 196–198.
- Aghababaei, N. (2014). God, the good life, and HEXACO: The relations among religion, subjective well-being and personality. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 17*(3), 284–290.
- Aghababaei, N., & Blachnio, A. (2014). Purpose in life mediates the relationship between religiosity and happiness: Evidence from Poland. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 17*(8), 827–831.
- Aghababaei, N., & Tabik, M.T. (2013). Gratitude and mental health: Differences between religious and general gratitude in a Muslim context. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 16*(8), 761–766.
- Aghababaei, N., Wasserman, J.A., & Nannini, D. (2014). The religious person revisited: Cross-cultural evidence from the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 17*(1), 24–29.
- Allport, G.W., & Ross, M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*(4), 432–443.
- Argyle, M. (1997). Is happiness a cause of health? *Psychology & Health, 12*, 769–781.
- Ashton, M.C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO–60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*(4), 340–345.
- Ashton, M.C., Lee, K., & de Vries, R.E. (2014). The HEXACO Honesty–Humility, Agreeableness, and Emotionality factors: A review of research and theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 18*(2), 139–152.
- Cohen, A.B., Pierce Jr., J.D., Chambers, J., Meade, R., Gorvine, B.J., & Koenig, H.G. (2005). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity, belief in the afterlife, death anxiety, and life satisfaction in young Catholics and Protestants. *Journal of Research in Personality, 39*, 307–324.
- Dezutter, J., Soenens, B., & Hutsebaut, D. (2006). Religiosity and mental health: A further exploration of the relative importance of religious behaviors vs. religious attitudes. *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*, 807–818.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*(1), 71–75.
- Erdle, S., & Aghababaei, N. (2012). Evidence for the general factor of personality (GFP) in the Big Five from 600 Iranians. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53* (3), 359–361.
- Farias, M., Newheiser, A., Kahane, G., & de Toledo, Z. (2013). Scientific faith: Belief in science increases in the face of stress and existential anxiety. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 49*, 1210–1213.
- Flere, S., & Lavric, M. (2008). Is intrinsic religious orientation a culturally specific American Protestant concept? The fusion of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation among non-Protestants. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*, 521–530.
- Francis, L.J., & Lester, D. (1997). Religion, personality and happiness. *Journal of Contemporary Religion, 12*(1), 81–86.
- Francis, L.J., Jewell, A., & Robbins, M. (2010). The relationship between religious orientation, personality, and purpose in life among an

- older Methodist sample. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 13, 777–791.
- Francis, L.J., Ziebertz, H., & Lewis, C.A. (2003). The relationship between religion and happiness among German students. *Pastoral Psychology*, 51(4), 273–281.
- Galanter, M., Dermatis, H., Bunt, G., Williams, C., Trujillo, M., & Steinke, P. (2007). Assessment of spirituality and its relevance to addiction treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 33, 257–264.
- Ghorbani, N., Watson, P.J., Aghababaei, N., & Chen, Z. (2014). Transliminality and mystical experience: Common thread hypothesis, religious commitment, and psychological adjustment in Iran. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 6(4), 268–275.
- Ghorbani, N., Watson, P.J., Zarehi, J., & Shamohammadi, K. (2010). Muslim extrinsic cultural religious orientation and identity: Relationships with social and personal adjustment in Iran. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 31(1), 15–28.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several Five-Factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe* (Vol. 7, pp. 7–28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Hill, P.C. (1999). Religious Orientation Scale-Revised (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989). In P.C. Hill, & R.W. Hood, jr. (Eds.), *Measures of religiosity*. Birmingham: Religious Education Press.
- Huta, V., & Waterman, A.S. (2014). Eudaimonia and its distinction from hedonia: developing a classification and terminology for understanding conceptual and operational definitions. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(6), 1425–1456.
- Kashdan, T.B., & Nezlek, J.B. (2012). Whether, when, and how is spirituality related to well-being? Moving beyond single occasion questionnaires to understanding daily process. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(11), 1523–1535.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M.C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39, 329–358.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M.C. (2008). The HEXACO personality factors in the indigenous personality lexicons of English and 11 other languages. *Journal of Personality*, 76, 1001–1053.
- Lucas, R.E., Le, K., & Dyrenforth, P.S. (2008). Explaining the Extraversion/positive affect relation: Sociability cannot account for Extraverts' greater happiness. *Journal of Personality*, 76(3), 385–414.
- Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(6), 803–855.
- Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H.S. (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research*, 46(2), 137–156.
- Markowitz, E.M., Goldberg, L.R., Ashton, M.C., & Lee, K. (2012). Profiling the “pro-environmental individual”: A personality perspective. *Journal of Personality* 80(1), 81–111.
- Nave, C.S., Sherman, R.A., & Funder, D.C. (2008). Beyond self-report in the study of hedonic and eudaimonic well-being: Correlations with acquaintance reports, clinician judgments and directly observed social behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 643–659.
- Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M.E.P. (2005). Orientations to happiness and life satisfaction: The full life versus the empty life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 6(1), 25–41.
- Robbins, M., Francis, L.J., & Edwards, B. (2008). Prayer, personality and happiness: A study among undergraduate students in Wales. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 11(1), 93–99.
- Rosenberg, M., (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Ryff, C.D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081.
- Ryff, C.D. & Singer, B.H. (2006). Best news yet on the six-factor model of well-being. *Social Science Research*, 35, 1103–1119.
- Salsman, J.M., Brown, T.L., Brechting, E.H., & Carlson, C.R. (2005). The link between religion and spirituality and psychological adjustment: The mediating role of optimism and social support. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(40), 522–535.
- Saroglou, V. (2002). Religion and the five factors of personality: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 15–25.
- Saroglou, V. (2010). Religiousness as a cultural adaptation of basic traits: A Five-Factor model perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14(1), 108–125.
- Steel, P., Schmidt, J., & Shultz, J. (2008). Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(1), 138–161.
- Steffen, P.R., & Masters, K.S. (2005). Does compassion mediate the intrinsic religion–health relationship? *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 30(3), 217–224.
- Vail III, K.E., Rothschild, Z.K., Weise, D.R., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Greenberg, J. (2010). A terror management analysis of the psychological functions of religion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14(1) 84–94.
- Weiss, A., Bates, T.C., & Luciano, M. (2008). Happiness is a personal(ity) thing: The genetics of personality and well-being in a representative sample. *Psychological Science*, 19(3), 205–210.