On Being Religious: A Study of Christian and Muslim Piety in Australia[1]

Riaz Hassan

Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia

Using the analytical framework developed by the Berkeley research program in religion and society, this paper investigates Christian and Muslim piety in Australia. The findings reveal significant differences in the level of religiosity between samples of practicing Australian Christians and Muslims in all dimensions of religiosity. Muslims are more orthodox in their religious beliefs, ritually more engaged and devoted. One of the most notable ways in which the two groups differ is their experience of the Divine. Sociological insights of Emile Durkheim and Mary Douglas's sociology of religion are used to explain these differences and their implications.

Introduction

There is considerable debate among scholars of religion about the nature as well as the content of religious commitment in modern society. One of the key claims in this debate is that religion must be conceived in multi-dimensional rather than in uni-dimensional terms (von Hugel, 1908; Pratt, 1920; Glock, 1962; Stark and Glock, 1968; Durkheim, 1915; Faulkner and DeJong, 1966; Gibbs and Crader 1970; also see Wulff, 1997: Chapter 6). This conceptualisation has been a hallmark of the seminal studies carried out by the Berkeley Research Program in Religion and Society- one of the most innovative and influential projects in the sociology of religion. At the conceptual and methodological levels the Berkeley program has been devoted largely to delineating, identifying and measuring religiousness or piety (Glock, 1962; Glock and Stark, 1965). A number of studies arising from this program have demonstrated the usefulness of this approach in the study of religion in modern societies (Stark and Glock, 1968; Bellah et al.1985; King and Hunt 1990).

In these studies, the core of religiosity is religious commitment. Stark and Glock, two researchers involved in the Berkeley program, have taken up the task of defining and operationalizing it and have undertaken a linguistic analysis in order to determine the different things that can be meant by the term and the different ways in which an individual can be religious. They then tried to analyse whether religiousness manifested in one of these ways has anything to do with its being expressed in other ways (Stark

and Glock 1968). In short, the multi-dimensional conceptualisation takes into account distinctions in the way religion may be expressed as well as the degree of intensity with which it may be practiced.

It is a well acknowledged sociological fact that expressions of religion vary greatly among world religions. Different religions expect quite different things from their followers. For example, regular participation in Holy Communion is obligatory for many Christians, but it is alien to Muslims. Similarly, the Islamic duty of performing Hajj (pilgrimage to Mecca) during one's life is alien to Christians. The expectations of other religions are again different from those of Islam and Christianity.

However, according to Stark and Glock (1968), although there is great variation in the religious expressions, there also exists a considerable consensus among the world's religions as to how religiosity ought to be manifested. Building on the earlier works of von Hugel (1908) and Pratt (1920), Stark and Glock identify five core dimensions of religiosity within which all of the many and diverse manifestations of religiosity prescribed by the different religions of the world can be ordered (see table 1). They label these dimensions the ideological, the ritualistic, the experiential, the intellectual and the consequential (Stark and Glock, 1968).

The ideological dimension is constituted by the fundamental beliefs, to which a religious person is expected, and often required, to adhere. The ritualistic dimension encompasses the specific acts of worship and devotion that people perform to express their religious commitment. Often it comprises public or communal, as well as private or personal, acts of worship. All religions have certain expectations, however imprecisely they may be stated, that a religious person will at some time or other achieve direct knowledge of the ultimate reality or will experience a religious emotion. This includes all those feelings, perceptions and sensations, whether felt by an individual, a person or a religious group, that involve some type of communication with God or a transcendental Being. They label this the experiential dimension.

The intellectual dimension refers to the expectation that religious persons will possess some knowledge of the basic tenets of their faith and its sacred scriptures. The intellectual dimension is clearly related to the ideological dimension, since knowledge of a belief is a necessary condition for its acceptance. However, belief need not follow from knowledge, nor does all religious knowledge bear on belief. The consequential dimension encompasses the secular effects of religious belief, practice, experience and knowledge on the individual. It includes all those religious prescriptions that specify what people ought to do and the attitudes they ought to hold as a consequence of their religion.

Validation and verification of the multidimensionality of religion have been achieved primarily through studies of inter-correlations of scales that seek to represent different dimensions. Most of these studies have found generally robust scale inter-correlations (Cardwell 1969; Clayton 1971; Gibbs and Crader 1970; Rohrbaugh and Jessor 1975). This has led to criticism about the independence of different dimensions. Such criticism is given further support by factor-analytic studies which report only

one factor, ideological commitment, which is not only clearly defined but also explains most of the variance (Clayton and Gladden 1974). On the basis of such findings, some researchers have argued that 'religiosity is essentially a single-dimensional phenomenon composed primarily of ideological commitment whose strength is reflected in experience and practice' (Clayton and Gladden 1974, p141).

Other studies, however, provide strong support for the multi-dimensionality of religiosity. The most sustained support has been offered by studies conducted by King and Hunt (1969,1972,1975, 1990). DeJong, Faulkner and Warland (1976) found evidence of six dimensions of religion. Their evidence also showed a cluster of three dimensions encompassing belief, experience and practice, which they labelled as 'generic religiosity'. The cumulative evidence from sociological and psychological studies of religious commitment continues to provide support for Stark and Glock's multi-dimensional conceptualisation of religiosity (DeJong, Faulkner and Warland 1976; Hilty and Stockman 1986; Himmelfarb 1975; Tapp 1971).

On the basis of the evidence reviewed above, this study of Christian and Muslim piety in Australia was guided by Stark and Glock's conceptualisation of religiosity. This conceptualisation was subjected to interviews with knowledgeable Australian Muslim and Christian respondents who were invited to review critically, and evaluate, various dimensions of religiosity as part of the larger task of reviewing the draft of the survey questionnaire used in this study. This process led to the identification of five dimensions of piety. These dimensions were the ideological, the ritualistic, the devotional, the experiential and the consequential. Individual respondents were also asked to indicate the appropriateness of various questions pertaining to the five dimensions, which were to be used to gather data for the five dimensions. The following section provides a brief description of each dimension and the items used to gather data for each dimension.

Dimensions of Christian and Muslim Piety

The Ideological Dimension-Religious Beliefs

This dimension comprises the religious beliefs to which Christians and Muslims are expected or even required to hold and adhere. The belief structure of Islam and Christianity can be divided into three types. The first type of beliefs warrants the existence of the divine and defines its character. The second type of belief explains the divine purpose and defines the believer's role with regard to that purpose. The third type of belief provides the ground for the ethical strictures of religion. In sociological discourse, these are generally described as warranting, purposive, and implementing belief (Stark and Glock 1965). This study focused primarily on the doctrinally inspired core beliefs Christians and Muslims hold, and not on the meaning of these beliefs for them, since the issue of meaning raises other complex questions

and requires a separate study.

A large number of doctrinally inspired core beliefs were identified from the sacred Christian and Muslim texts and were presented to the key selected informants. The following beliefs were most commonly mentioned by both Christian and Muslim respondents and, therefore, were chosen to ascertain the magnitude and intensity of the ideological dimension: belief in God/Allah: belief in the Biblical/Quranic miracles; belief in life after death; belief in the existence of the Devil; and belief that only those who believe in Christ/Mohammed can go to heaven. All these are primarily warranting and purposive beliefs.[2]

The Ritualistic Dimension

Rituals are an integral part of all formal religions. They encompass acts of religious practice including worship, devotion and 'the things people do to carry out their religious commitments' (Stark and Glock 1968, p 15). All religions include rituals of praise, petition, penance and obedience, although emphasis on each of these varies among different religions. In sociological analysis, rituals are regarded as playing an important role in the maintenance of religious institutions, the religious community and religious identity. Participation in collective religious rituals plays an important role in the socialisation of the individual through unconscious appropriation of common values and common categories of knowledge and experience (Bell 1997).

Analysis of religious rituals can be approached in at least two ways. Firstly, it can focus on distinguishing individuals in terms of the frequency with which they engage in ritualistic activities and, secondly, it can focus on the meaning of ritual acts for the individuals who engage in them. The analysis undertaken here will focus primarily on the first perspective, but will also attempt to explore the question of meaning as well. However, a deeper and proper study of meaning of rituals for the individual Muslim and Christian must wait a more appropriate future opportunity.

Christianity and Islam are both ritual rich religions. They require their adherents to perform specific rituals as an expression of their faith. The frequency and observance of religious rituals is a useful and meaningful indicator of an individual's religiousness or religiosity. In view of these considerations, the following rituals were selected to ascertain this dimension: performance of daily prayers and reading of the Bible/Quran daily or several times a week. The analysis in the study will focus on the frequency of their observance. One of the assumptions made was that these rituals are interrelated at both individual and collective levels.

The Devotional Dimension

This dimension is akin to the ritualistic dimension. Rituals are highly formalised aspects of religious expression and commitment. Often a religious person participates in personal and somewhat private acts of worship. Social pressure and other non-

religious considerations can sometimes motivate people to participate in formal religious rituals. In other words, participation in religious rituals may or may not indicate religious commitment. The measure of devotionalism in this study was based on consulting the Quran/ Bible to make daily decisions.

The Experiential Dimension

This dimension is the cognitive dimension of religiosity. It includes feelings, knowledge and emotions arising from or related to some type of communication with, or experience of, ultimate divine reality. These experiences are generally ordered around notions of concern, cognition, trust, faith or fear (Glock and Stark 1965, p 31). Such expectations are found in all religions. In particular, 'folk' or 'popular' traditions of Christianity and Islam place great emphasis on personal religious experience or communication with the divine as an affirmation of individual piety (Gellner 1981, Chapter 1).

This dimension invariably involves subjective feelings, sensations or visions, which arise out of an individual's presumed contact with supernatural consciousness. Religious experience constitutes occasions defined by those undergoing them as encounters, or contacts, between themselves and some supernatural consciousness. In this study five feelings were used to assess religious experience: a feeling of being in the presence of God/Allah; a sense of being saved by Jesus Christ/Mohammed; a sense of being afraid of God/Allah; a feeling of being punished by God/Allah for some wrong done; a feeling of being tempted by the Devil. Experiences of this character can be described as confirming, salvational, sanctioning and temptational respectively (Stark and Glock 1968).

The Consequential Dimension

All religions concern themselves with the effects of religion on the believers and their daily lives. Some religions are more explicit about these effects than others. In Christianity and Islam, submission to their religious teachings is seen as the certain way of achieving divine merit in this world and spiritual salvation in the other. Rewards sometimes are immediate and include such things as peace of mind, a sense of well being, personal happiness and even tangible success in activities of daily life.

Both religions place great emphasis on warranting beliefs about the existence of God/Allah and the divine creation of life. Disbelievers are to be condemned to eternal damnation. In this study, two conceptions were identified as defiance of divine injunctions. These were formulated as the following: 'a person who says there is no God/Allah is likely to hold dangerous political views'; and a belief that 'Darwin's theory of evolution could not possibly be true'.

Methodology: Selection of Christian and Muslim Respondents and Data Collection

This study is part of a larger study of religiosity. The main focus of the larger study is comparative Muslim religiosity. In the course of conducting this study, I realised that there were no comparative empirical studies of Christian and Muslim religiosity. The only study of Christian piety with which I could compare my findings of Muslim piety was conducted by Stark and Glock in the 1960's and published in 1968. I decided to conduct a pilot comparative study of Christian and Muslim religiosity in Australia and the United States. The study reported here is based on only Australian respondents. The following is an account of the methodology adopted in this study.

Selection of Respondents: This study is based on 87 Christian and 78 Muslim respondents. All respondents were residents of metropolitan Adelaide in South Australia. They were selected through the cooperation of religious organisations. As participation in the study was entirely voluntary a much larger number of respondents were approached, but the study was confined to only those who agreed to participate in the study by completing a survey questionnaire. This generated the Christian and Muslim sample sizes mentioned above.

The Christian respondents were recruited from Catholic and Protestant churches. The Christian respondents were about evenly divided between Catholics and Protestants. All of them were actively practicing members of their churches. The Muslim respondents were also selected from local religious organisations and were practicing Muslims. The samples consisted of both men and women. The majority of the Christian respondents (79%) was Australian born and 42 percent of Muslim respondents were also Australian born. The Muslim respondents were relatively younger and more educated. Table 1 below provides a detailed socio-demographic profile of the two groups of respondents. Needless to say, the samples are not representative of the two religious communities in Australia. The findings, therefore, are applicable only to the respondents who participated in the study. A study based on representative samples is being planned for the future.

The Survey Questionnaire. The survey questionnaire used to collect data was a slightly modified version of the questionnaire used in the international study of Muslim religiosity. The questions on various dimensions of religiosity were similar to the questions used by Stark and Glock in their study of American Piety. These questions were pre-tested and refined through interviews with Muslim and Christian informants at Flinders University. The questionnaire consisted of over 200 questions and was divided into the following sections: socio-demographic, belief and practice, images of Christianity and Islam, social class, life style and housing, attitudes towards the 'other', and household composition.

The Christian and Muslim versions of the questions were identical except that

Table 1. Sample Profile

Christian n = 87

Muslim n = 78

GENDER	Christian %	Muslim %
Male	33.3	55.1
Female	65.5	44.9
No answer	1.1	0.0
AGE	Christian %	Muslim %
<25	26.4	34.6
26-40	26.4	34.6
41-55	32.2	14.1
>56	13.8	15.4
No answer	1.1	1.3
EDUCATION	Christian %	Muslim %
Did not complete High School	23.0	9.0
Completed High School/Some University	52.9	51.3
Completed University / Higher Degree	24.1	38.5
No answer	0.0	1.3
CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	Christian %	Muslim %
Yes	57.5	45.5
No	42.5	54.5
PLACE OF BIRTH	Christian %	Muslim %
Australia	79.3	42.3
Other	20.7	57.7
RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION - CHRISTIAN	%	
Anglican	14.9	
Baptist	26.4	
Catholic	47.1	
Other	11.4	

at appropriate places individual items were amended to reflect the religious orientations of the respondents. For example, the question about miracles for the Christian respondents was as follows: 'I believe that the miracles happened just as the Bible says they did'. In the Muslim version, the word Bible was changed to Quran. The questionnaire and the survey fieldwork was reviewed and approved by the Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee of Flinders University. A copy of the questionnaire is available from the author.

Is it possible to study religiosity empirically across two religions? This is a valid question to raise. As I have indicated above, the questions seeking to measure religiosity in this study were modelled on the questions used by Stark and Glock in their seminal study of Christian religiosity. To the extent one accepts their arguments as outlined earlier, it would follow that one can also accept the appropriateness of their methodology to study Christian religiosity in Australia. But does it mean that the approach adopted here is also appropriate for the study of Muslim religiosity? I would argue that it is, for two reasons.

Firstly, the analytical framework used in the Berkeley studies is deliberately and distinctively sociological and generic, to be applied to the study of religious commitment in other religious contexts. Secondly, the objection may have some validity in that the framework developed by Stark and Glock is specifically predicated on broad understanding of the key theological principles only of Christianity alone. My response to this is that, like Christianity and Judaism, Islam is also an Abrahamic religion and shares several theological and philosophical principles with them. In these conditions it should also be possible study and analyse religious commitment in all Abrahamic religions using a common analytical framework.

These and other similar arguments may not satisfy theological purists, but if sociological scholarship is to advance theoretically as a distinctive approach to the study of social reality, then comparative studies are a major imperative. I hope that at least in this respect the present study will make a modest contribution to the advancement of sociological scholarship. In the final analysis, the question about the feasibility of comparative study of religiosity can only be settled through doing systematic empirical studies. I hope that this study will contribute towards that end.

Findings: Christian and Muslim Piety

The Ideological Dimension- Religious Beliefs

Belief in God/ Allah

Christians and Muslims were asked 'Which of the following statements comes closest to expressing what you believe about God/Allah?' The findings reported in Table 2 show that belief in Allah was almost universal among the Muslims. Ninety five

percent of Muslim and 62 percent of Christian respondents agreed with the statement that: 'I know God/Allah really exists and I have no doubts about it'. Seventeen percent of the Christians and 4 percent of Muslims agreed with the statement that: 'While I have doubts, I feel I do believe in God/Allah'. Another 17 percent of Christian respondents were more doubtful of the existence of God but agreed that there was a higher power of some kind. No respondent agreed with the statement that: 'I don't believe in God/ Allah'.

Table 2. Belief in God / Allah

	Christian %	Muslim %
*I know God/Allah really exists and I have no doubts about it	61.6	94.8
While I have doubts, I feel I do believe in God/Allah	17.4	3.9
I find myself believing in God/Allah some of the time but not at other times	4.7	0.0
I don't believe in a personal God/Allah, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind	9.3	0.0
I don't know whether there is a God/Allah and I don't believe there is a way to find out	4.7	0.0
I don't believe in God/Allah	0.0	0.0
None of the above represents what I believe about God/Allah	1.2	1.3
Other	1.2	0.0

Note: Items marked with an asterisk have been scored as 1 in the preparation of the indices.

Belief in the Biblical/Quranic Miracles

Respondents were asked: 'The Bible/Quran tells of many miracles, some credited to Jesus Christ/Prophet Mohammed, and some to other Prophets. Generally speaking which of the following statements comes closest to what you believe about Christian/ Islamic miracles?' The responses are given in table 3. Again almost all Muslim respondents (97%) believed in the Quranic miracles and agreed that miracles happened the way the Quran says they did. A significantly lower percentage of Christian respondents expressed the same belief. One fifth of the Christian respondents believed that miracles actually happened as the Bible says but can be explained by natural causes, whereas only one percent of the Muslims expressed a similar belief about the Quranic miracles. About 18 percent of the Christian respondents were not sure whether miracles really happened or not, compared with one percent of Muslim respondents.

Table 3. Belief in Miracles

	Christian %	Muslim %
I am not sure whether these miracles really happened or not	17.6	1.3
I believe miracles are stories and never really happened	4.7	0.0
I believe that miracles actually happened, but can be explained by natural causes	20.0	1.3
I believe that the miracles happened just as the Bible/Quran says they did	57.6	97.4

Life After Death

Respondents were asked to indicate how certain they were that there is life after death. The results reported in table 4 show that the Muslim respondents almost universally believed in life after death. Among the Christian respondents while little over half expressed the same belief, about 40 percent expressed doubt about this fundamental Christian belief.

Table 4. There is Life after Death

	Christian %	Muslim %
*Completely true	55.2	94.6
Probably true	23.0	2.7
Not sure	14.9	0.0
Probably not true	1.1	0.0
Definitely not true	3.4	0.0
Do not know	2.3	2.7

Belief in the Devil

The question about how certain they were that the devil really exists generated a similar pattern of responses to that about belief in an afterlife. Among the Muslim respondents 91 percent believed the devil really exists. The corresponding figure for the Christian respondents was 46 percent. About 40 percent of the Christian respondents expressed some level of doubt about the existence of the devil. About one in every 10 Christian respondents completely denied the existence of the Devil, but no Muslim respondents gave the same response (see table 5).

Table 5. The Devil Actually Exists

	Christian %	Muslim %
*Completely true	46.0	90.5
Probably true	16.1	4.1
Not sure	12.6	2.7
Probably not true	13.8	1.4
Definitely not true	9.2	0.0
Do not know	2.3	1.4

Man Cannot Help Doing Evil

The responses to the statement that 'Man cannot help doing evil' are reported in table 6 below. About equal proportions of the Christian and the Muslim respondents (44 and 46% respectively) either completely agreed or expressed qualified agreement with the statement. The Christian respondents were more likely to say that they were not sure than the Muslims, but the Muslim respondents were more likely to say that the statement was 'definitely not true'.

Table 6. Man Cannot Help Doing Evil

	Christian %	Muslim %
*Completely true	25.9	33.3
Probably true	18.8	13.3
Not sure	21.2	12.0
Probably not true	18.8	5.3
Definitely not true	12.9	28.0
Do not know	2.4	8.0

Belief that only those who believe in Jesus Christ/ Prophet Mohammed can go to Heaven

Both Christian and Muslim piety entails complete faith in the divine status and revelations and that these revelations will lead the faithful to the righteous path of salvation. One of the most significant acts of faith for a Christian is to believe that Jesus Christ is his/her saviour. Although this is not the case with respect to Mohammed in Islamic theology, a widely held belief among Muslims is that following the traditions (sunna) of the Prophet Mohammed will lead to revelation and Heaven. For Christians, Jesus Christ, as Son of God commands their total reverence. For Muslims, Prophet Mohammed is the most revered human being and an object of their total devotion and affection.

The responses of the Christian and Muslim respondents are reported in Table 7. These responses depart from the pattern noted for the other beliefs mentioned above. About the same proportion of Christians (36%) and Muslims (38%) expressed complete agreement with the statement. Another 7 percent of the Christians thought that the statement was probably true and 27 percent were either not sure or thought that it was probably not true. Twenty nine percent were certain that the statement was not true. Among the Muslims 18 percent were not sure, 27 percent thought the statement was probably not true, but only 10 percent were definite that the statement was not true.

Table 7. Only those who Believe in Jesus Christ/Prophet Mohammed can go to Heaven

	Christian %	Muslim %
*Completely true	35.6	37.8
Probably true	6.9	0.0
Not sure	11.5	17.6
Probably not true	14.9	27.0
Definitely not true	28.7	9.5
Do not know	2.3	8.1

Index of Ideological Orthodoxy - Religious Beliefs

The finding reported above show a distinctive pattern of responses about core beliefs. In general, the Muslim respondents are more 'orthodox' in their beliefs compared with the Christian respondents. In order to obtain a summary view of this dimension of piety an index of orthodoxy was constructed using the following methodology. The response 'I know God/ Allah really exists and I have no doubt about it' was given a score of one and all other responses were scored as zero. The score of one was given to the response 'I believe that the miracles happened the way the Bible and the Quran says they did'. All other responses were scored as zero. Similarly, the responses 'completely true' to 'life after death', 'the devil really exists', 'man cannot help doing evil' and 'only those who believe in Jesus Christ/Prophet Mohammed can go to heaven' were scored as one and all other answers were scored as zero. Using these scores, an index of ideological orthodoxy was constructed. In this index, the highest score of six signifies high orthodoxy and a score of zero signifies low orthodoxy.

Table 8 below reports the results of the index of orthodoxy for the Christian and Muslim respondents. If we take the scores zero to 2 as indicative of low orthodoxy 50 percent of the Christian respondents would fall in this category compared with only 12 percent of the Muslims. Similarly, if we regard the scores 4,5 and 6 as indicative of high orthodoxy then 87 percent of the Muslim respondents were in this category compared with 41 percent of the Christian respondents. These scores provide a good summary index of relative levels of ideological orthodoxy among our Christian and Muslim respondents. The results of the index are predictably consistent with their responses to the core beliefs and show that Australian Muslims who participated in this study were significantly more orthodox compared to their Christian counterparts. Unlikely the Muslim respondents the Christian respondents were about equally distributed along the orthodoxy continuum whereas the Muslims clustered only in the high orthodoxy part of the continuum.

Table 8. Index of Ideological Orthodoxy-Religious Beliefs

	Christian %	Muslim %
0	21.8	2.6
1	18.4	3.8
2	10.3	5.1
3	8.0	1.3
4	10.3	32.1
5	11.5	44.9
6	19.5	10.3

The Ritualistic Dimension—Religious Practice

Islam and Christianity are ritual-rich religions. Their followers are required to observe a number of rituals as a religious duty or as an expression of their faith. Two religious rituals that are commonly performed by Muslims and Christians were used to ascertain the ritual dimension in this study. These were: 'How often do you pray?' and 'How often do you read the Bible /Quran?'. The results are reported in the following section.

Performance of Daily Prayers

All adult Muslims are required to observe prayers five times a day as a religious duty. While there is no such religious requirement in Christianity, Christians are expected to pray regularly.[3] After consultations with informed Christian respondents it was decided to use the Muslim responses and for the Christian respondents collapse categories 'once daily', 'twice daily', 'three times daily', 'four' and 'five times daily' into one category called 'once a day or more'. The results reported in Table 9 show that 78 percent of the Muslim respondents prayed four-five times a day and 63 percent of the Christians prayed at least once a day. The evidence shows that on this indicator the majority of the respondents from both religions were involved in religious practice although comparatively Muslims were more practicing. One quarter of the Christians prayed only 'occasionally' compared with 7 percent of the Muslims.

Table 9. Frequency of Prayer

	Christian %	Muslim %
Once daily	* 21.8	3.9
Twice daily	* 19.5	5.2
Three times daily	* 4.6	2.6
Four times daily	* 2.3	1.3
Five times daily	* 0.0	* 53.2
More than five times daily	* 14.9	* 24.7
Only on Sundays	3.4	1.3
Only on special occasions	4.6	1.3
Never	3.4	0.0
Occasionally	25.3	6.5

Frequency of Bible/Quran reading

Reading of the sacred scriptures is a widely acknowledged religious duty among the Muslims and Christians. The second item used to ascertain the intensity of ritualistic dimension in the study was: 'How often do you read the Bible/Quran?'. The results displayed in table 10 indicate that 56 percent of the Muslim respondents read the Quran once a day or more or several time a week compared with 33 percent of the Christians. In general, the evidence shows that the Muslim respondents were more 'practicing' on this measure than the Christians were.

Table 10. Frequency of reading the Bible/Quran

	Christian %	Muslim %
Never or rarely	19.5	0.0
* Once a day or more	10.3	39.0
* Several times a week	23.0	16.9
Once a week	4.6	1.3
Often, but not at regular intervals	11.5	22.1
Once in a while	14.9	13.0
Only on special occasions	16.1	7.8

Index of Ritualistic Behaviour - Religious Practice

To obtain an overall estimate of the observance of religious practice, an index of ritual behaviour was constructed using the following methodology. For the Muslim respondents performance of prayers five times a day or more was scored as one and all other responses as zero. For the Christians the responses once daily, twice daily, three times daily, four times daily, five times daily and more than five times daily were scored as one and all other responses as zero. For the item 'How often do you read the Bible/ Quran?', the responses 'once a day or more' and 'several times a week' were scored as one and all other as zero for both the Muslim and the Christian respondents.

The resulting index ranged from two, indicating the high score, to zero indicating the low score. Table 11 shows the distribution of the respondents in different categories. The results confirm the evidence for the individual items. The Christian respondents

are distributed approximately evenly in all categories whereas the majority of the Muslims had score of two. The evidence clearly indicates that the Muslims respondents displayed greater commitment to ritual observance (as measured in this study) as part of the religious practice than the Christian respondents.

Table 11. Index of Religious Practice

	Christian %	Muslim %
0	35.6	21.8
1	32.2	24.4
2	32.2	53.8

The Devotional Dimension

Religious ritual and devotion are closely related but are also different kinds of behaviours. The difference between them is that whereas ritual acts are highly formalised and typically public, acts of devotion are typically personal acts of worship and contemplation (Stark and Glock 1968). All religions encourage such acts of devotionalism. Many Muslims and Christians perform acts of devotion primarily through private prayers, which are beyond their formal religious duties. One act of devotion that is both private and spontaneous for Muslims and Christians is their commitment to their Holy books - the Bible and the Quran - and the belief that their teachings are the best guide to behaviour. Consequently, many Christians and Muslims consult their sacred texts for guidance in their daily lives.

In this study the respondents were asked, 'Thinking now of your daily life and the decisions that you have to make about how to spend your time, how to act with other people, how to bring up your children, presuming you have them, and so on, what extent does what you have read in the Bible/Quran help you in making everyday decisions?'. The respondents were given a number of options and asked to indicate the one that applied to them most closely. The responses and the distribution of respondents are given in Table 12.

The findings show that the Muslims were significantly more likely to consult the Quran directly when making decisions than the Christians. Fifty seven percent of the Muslim and 30 percent of the Christian respondents agreed with the statement, 'I can think of specific times when the Bible/ the Quran has helped me in a very direct

Table 12. Extent to which the Bible/Quran helps in making everyday decisions

	Christian %	Muslim %
I hardly think of the Bible/Quran as I go about my daily life	23.0	1.3
I can't think of specific examples, neverthelessI feel sure that the Bible/Quran is still of help in my daily life	34.5	19.7
I can think of specific times when the Bibile/Quran has helped me in a very direct way in making decisions	29.9	56.6
I often consult the Bible/Quran to make decisions	10.3	21.1
Other	2.3	1.3

way in making the decisions'. Another 10 percent of the Christian and 21 percent of the Muslim respondents said that they often consulted the Bible/Quran when making decisions. About one third of the Christian and one fifth of the Muslim respondents agreed with the following response, 'I can't think of specific examples, nevertheless I feel sure that the Bible/ Quran is still of help in my daily life'. About one quarter of the Christians and only one percent of the Muslims said that they hardly think of the Bible/Quran as they go about their daily lives. The overall conclusion which can be drawn from the above evidence is that in terms of acts of religious devotion, as measured in this study, the Muslim respondents were significantly more involved in them than their Christian counterparts.

Experiential Dimension

The experiential dimension relates to some kind of personal communication or experience of the ultimate divine reality. It is an expectation found in all religions. In Islam and Christianity there are well known traditions that place great emphasis on the divine experience of some kind, as an affirmation of an individual's religiosity. In this study the experience of the divine was ascertained through questions about experience of presence of God/Allah, being saved by Jesus Christ/ Prophet Mohammed, being afraid of God/Allah, a sense of being punished by God/Allah and being tempted by the Devil. The responses to these questions are reported in Tables 13a, b, c, d, and e.

A majority of the Christian and Muslim respondents were either sure or thought

Table 13a. Have you ever experienced a feeling that you were in the presence of God/Allah?

	Christian %	Muslim %
* Yes, I'm sure I have	46.5	57.6
Yes, I think I have	23.3	21.2
No	30.2	21.2

Table 13b. Have you ever experienced a sense of being saved by Jesus Christ/ Mohammed?

	Christian %	Muslim %
*Yes, I'm sure I have	45.1	47.6
Yes, I think I have	17.1	19.0
No	37.8	33.3

Table 13c. Have you ever experienced a sense of being afraid of God/Allah?

	Christian %	Muslim %
* Yes, I'm sure I have	23.4	65.2
Yes, I think I have	20.8	23.2
No	55.8	11.6

Table 13d. Have you ever experienced a feeling of being punished by God/Allah?

	Christian %	Muslim %
* Yes, I'm sure I have	10.1	50.0
Yes, I think I have	21.5	33.8
No	68.4	16.2

Table 13e. Have you ever experienced a feeling of being tempted by the Devil?

	Christian %	Muslim %
* Yes, I'm sure I have	36.6	60.9
Yes, I think I have	19.5	26.1
No	43.9	13.0

that they had experienced a feeling that they were in the presence of God/Allah (Table 13a). In response to the question, 'Have you ever experienced a sense of being saved by Jesus Christ/ Prophet Mohammed', the Christian and Muslim respondents gave very similar answers. Importantly a majority was either sure or thought that they had had this experience (Table 13b).

The Christian and Muslim responses to the two questions about God/Allah followed a very different pattern. The overwhelming Muslim response to the question 'Have you ever experienced a sense of being afraid of God/Allah?' was 'yes'. Sixty five percent were sure and 23 percent said they thought they had. Only 12 percent said 'no'. The corresponding figures for the Christians were 23, 21 and 56 percent respectively (Table 13 c). The results clearly show that for a large majority of Muslims, the experience of Allah was one of fear, which was very different from the Christian experience.

This pattern was again reflected in the response to the question, 'Have you ever experienced a feeling of being punished by God/Allah?' Among the Muslim respondents, half were sure that they had, another 34 percent thought they had and only 16 percent said 'no'. The Christian responses were almost the opposite to that of the Muslims. A large majority (68 %) said 'no', only 10 percent said that they were sure, and another 22 percent thought that they had experienced a feeling of being punished by God. The results indicate that for the majority of the Muslim respondents, the experience of Allah was not only that of fear but also that of being punished for

some wrong they had done. This was not the case for the Christian respondents.

In response to the question: 'Have you ever experienced a feeling of being tempted by the Devil?', a majority of the Muslims respondents said that were sure they had, compared with only 37 percent of the Christians who gave the same response. Forty four percent of the Christians said 'no' compared with 13 percent of the Muslims. In summary, the evidence shows that the feeling of being tempted by the Devil was much more widespread among the Muslim than the Christian respondents (Table 13 e).

Index of Experiential Dimension

An index of experiential dimension was constructed using the following methodology. The response category 'Yes, I am sure I have', was scored as one for all the five questions, and all other responses were scored as zero. This produced an index ranging from zero to five. The distribution of the Christian and the Muslim respondents on this index is given in Table 14. It confirms the pattern revealed by the

Table 14. Index of Religious Experience

	Christian %	Muslim %
0	44.8	34.6
1	10.3	9.0
2	11.5	7.7
3	18.4	7.7
4	9.2	10.3
5	5.7	30.8

evidence reported for the individual items above.

If we consider the response categories zero to two as indicating 'low experience' and four and five as 'high experience' then 66 percent of the Christians and 51 percent of the Muslims will fall in the 'low experience' category and 41 percent of the Muslims and 15 percent of the Christians will fall in the 'high experience' category. This would suggest that significantly more Muslims have had some religious experience of the divine reality in their lives.

The Consequential Dimension

The consequential dimension refers to the secular effect of religious belief,

Table 15a. A person who says there is no God/Allah is likely to hold dangerous political views

	Christian %	Muslim %
* Agree	17.2	60.0
Disagree	63.2	28.0
Uncertain	19.5	12.0

Table 15b. Do you agree or disagree with Darwin's theory of evolution?

	Christian %	Muslim %
The theory is almost certainly true	19.8	6.8
The theory is probably true	24.4	5.4
The theory is probably false	7.0	16.2
* The theory could not possibly be true	33.7	64.9
I have never really thought about this before	15.1	6.8

practice and experience. Religious beliefs and ideologies invariably compete with other beliefs and ideologies (i.e. magic, science) in society as explanations of questions dealing with the meanings and nature of the ultimate divine reality and the nature and purposes of human life condition and destiny. In modern times, science has become the major rival of religion in explaining nature, purpose and meaning of human conditions and destiny. The beliefs and statements that counter some core religious beliefs usually evoke social and psychological pressures on the individual to reject such beliefs.

In this study, two questions were used to investigate the consequential religiosity. The questions were: 'Do you agree that a person who says there is no God/Allah is likely to hold dangerous political views?' and 'Do you agree or disagree with Darwin's theory of evolution?'. These questions were chosen because they challenged two fundamental religious beliefs widely held by the Muslims and the Christians. For each question, the respondents were offered multiple choice type responses, which are indicated in Tables 15a and 15b.

The findings show that 60 percent of the Muslims and only 17 percent of the Christians agreed, and 63 percent of the Christians and 28 percent of the Muslims

disagreed with the questions that a person who does not believe in God/Allah is likely to hold dangerous political views. In short, the majority of the Muslims agreed whereas the majority of the Christians disagreed with the questions. In response to the questions about Darwin's theory of evolution, two thirds of the Muslim respondents agreed with the response that, 'the theory could not possibly be true' and only one third of the Christians did the same. About 44 percent of the Christians compared with 12 percent of the Muslims agreed that, 'the theory is almost certainly true'. The evidence shows that a majority of the Christians either believed in the theory or had never really thought about it. The majority of the Muslims, on the other hand, thought the theory was completely false.

Index of Consequential Religiosity

An index of consequential religiosity was constructed using the following methodology. The agreement with the statement that a person who says there is no God/Allah is likely to hold dangerous political views was scored as one and other responses as zero. For the Darwin theory, the response that theory could not possibly be true was scored as one and all other responses were scored as zero. The findings

Table 16. Index of Consequential Religiosity

	Christian %	Muslim %
0	62.1	25.6
1	25.3	29.5
2	12.6	44.9

reported in table 16 confirm the observations made above.

Among the Christians 62 percent had a score of zero signifying low consequential religiosity which is consistent with findings above. Forty-five percent of the Muslim respondents scored two, which signifies high consequential religiosity. The findings show that Muslim respondents were, as predicted by the scores for the individual item above were significantly more religious as measured by the index of consequential religiosity.

Self-Reported Religiosity

The above findings show that the Australian Muslim respondents are more religious compared to the Australian Christians as measured by the five dimensions of religiosity used in this study. Is this a valid conclusion? One way to ascertain this may be to know how religious they themselves thought they were. In the study the respondents were asked, 'Would you regard yourself as a: very religious person, somewhat religious person, not very religious person, not religious at all and not sure/do not know.' The results showed that among the Christians 15 percent said they were very religious, 54 percent said they were somewhat religious and 18 percent were not very religious. The corresponding figures for the Muslims were: very religious 12 percent, somewhat religious 66 percent and not very religious 16 percent. If we combine the very religious and somewhat religious category then 78 percent of the Muslims and 68 percent of the Christians fell into this category. This again shows that in terms of self-perception comparatively the Muslims were comparatively more religious. These results also support the observation made earlier that the respondents who participated in the study were practicing Muslims and Christians.

The Religious Factor in Everyday Life

If respondents in this study were in fact religiously active, does this mean that religion played a prominent role in their everyday activities? This could be ascertained from responses to a question about the strategies that they followed when making important decisions. The respondents were asked: 'If you need to make important decisions, which one do you think is most appropriate?'. They were given the following strategies from which to choose: discuss the problem with friends, discuss the problem with a member of family, ask God/Allah for help by praying, consult a priest/minister of religion/Imam, make decisions without consulting others, do not know/no answer.

Among the Christians 42 percent said that they would discuss with a member of the family and 37 percent said they would ask God for help by praying. Among he Muslims only 13 percent responded that they would discuss with a family member and a significant majority of 62 percent said that they would ask Allah for help by praying. These finding show that religion and prayers played an important role in the daily activities of the respondents. This role, however, was significantly more prominent among the Muslims, once again confirming that level of religious commitment was comparatively higher among them. These findings received further confirmation from the responses to a question that inquired who the respondents turned to when they were confused or frustrated because they were facing an important problem. One of four Christian and one out of two Muslim respondents said that they would turn to religion and pray.

Concluding Remarks

This is probably the first attempt to compare and 'map out' different aspects of Christian and Muslim religiosity in Australia. As such, it probably has several limitations some of which I have already discussed in the methodology section. Let me restate the most obvious possible criticisms. Is the analytical approach used in this study the appropriate way to study it? Sociological methodology relies on proxy variables to understand and study social reality. The proxy variables focus on the manifestations of social reality and not on its 'essence'. That task is left to the other theorists with sociological imagination and serendipitous insights based on the evidence. This opens the quantitative approach to a legitimate criticism of whether the chosen variables are in fact the most appropriate ones.

As I have suggested already, the analytical approach adopted in this analysis is distinctively sociological which lends itself to comparative study of religious commitment. This has been demonstrated by the studies arising from the Berkeley Research Program in Religion and Society. These arguments may not satisfy the purists, but if sociological scholarship is to advance theoretically the comparative studies are a major imperative, and in this respect I hope the present study would make a modest contribution.

Notwithstanding its limitations, the findings of the study demonstrate significant differences in the level of religiosity between samples of practicing Australian Christians and Muslims in all dimensions of religiosity. Muslims are ideologically more orthodox, ritually more engaged and devoted. In particular they differ significantly in the intensity of experiential religiosity. Perhaps one of the most notable ways in which they differ is in their experience of being punished by God/Allah for something they have done. What sociological factors can account for these differences in the religious commitment? What factors account for the striking differences in their experiential religiosity?

Sociological insights of Emile Durkheim and Mary Douglas's sociology of religion can provide a useful framework to answer these questions. One of the key analytical concerns of Durkheim's sociology was the social control of cognition. He explored this problem through sociological analysis of religion. Durkheim's analysis of religious life and behaviour was based on a fundamental postulate that 'the unanimous sentiments of the believers of all times cannot be purely illusory' (Durkheim 1915, p 417). However, while he did not regard the 'unanimous sentiments of the believers' as 'purely illusory', he saw them as partly illusory, because he did not accept the explanations and justifications of their beliefs and practices offered by the faithful.

He argued that 'the reality' on which religious experience was based was not always as expressed by the believers. This did not mean that religious experience was 'false'. On the contrary, he claimed that all religions are true in their own fashions and there are no religions that are false. They were true in the sense that they stated

and expressed in a non-objective, symbolic or metaphorical form, truth about the 'reality' underlying them and giving them their 'true meaning'. The 'reality' according to Durkheim was 'society'. The believer was 'not deceived when he believes in the existence of a moral power upon which he depends and from which he receives all that is best in himself: this power exists, it is society' (Durkheim 1915, p 225).

For Durkheim religion is a system of ideas by means of which individuals represent to themselves the society of which they are members, and the obscure but intimate relations that they have with it (Durkheim 1915, p 226). Religion, therefore, can be seen as 'representing' society and social relations in a cognitive sense to the mind or intellect. In this sense, religion afforded a means of comprehending or rendering intelligible social realities as well as expressing or symbolising social relationship. In other words, for believers, religious beliefs, experiences and practices are a particular way of understanding their society and their relations with it as well as a way of expressing and dramatising these in a particular symbolic idiom.

Building on Durkheim's sociology of religion, Douglas explores the question of particular interest to students of religion: What social circumstances encourage particular kinds of religious sensibilities? She argues that the ways in which social reality constructs consciousness are as important as the ways that reality is itself socially constructed. Certain social settings encourage certain ways of seeing the world. Douglas's grid/group theory is designed to explain this relationship (Douglas 1970). In her work, she offers a sociological theory of the plausibility of different forms of religion, worldview and ideology. She attempts to relate different varieties of belief to different types of society. Individuals in different social settings, Douglas argues, are biased towards different cosmologies. People do not believe what makes no sense to them, and what makes sense to them depends on their social environment.

Douglas grid/group is a framework for classifying social relations as they are experienced by the individual. She isolates two dimensions of social life that are relatively independent of one another - vertically called 'grid' and horizontally called 'group'. She then uses the matrix they construct to describe society as the individual encounters it. Three kinds of societies, which emerge from her analysis, are described as individualist, hierarchical, and sectarian. Her theory emphasizes the human drive to achieve consonance in all layers of experience as the bridge by which cosmology and social experience are connected. She argues that the symbolic world of a people becomes structured like its social world.

The religious symbolism that focuses on boundaries - either of the body or between the human and spiritual worlds - is typical of societies made up of small competing groups, for each of which the chief social distinction is 'them and us'. Religious puritanism is typical of such sectarians, because this ideology is homologous with their experience of social structure. Religious control of the body and a strict conceptual separation between human and the divine make sense for people who daily must control their contact with others and distinguish between insiders and outsiders (Douglas 1970; Spickard 1989).

The above are at best overly simplified sketches of selected aspects of Durkheim and Douglas's analyses of the relationship between beliefs and social structure. These have been sketched out to explain the differences in religiosity of Australian Muslims and Christians, which have been reported in this paper. The differences in the level or intensity of religiosity of Christians and Muslims can be explained using Douglas theory. In her theoretical schema, Australian Muslims constitute a 'group' whose religious and cultural beliefs act as definers and organisers of individual and group identities, and generate a sense of 'us' versus 'them' in the society at large. Furthermore, their religious cosmologies are transmitted through the agency of the primary groups such as the family and the religious community, which reinforces the 'us' versus 'them' consciousness. Following the logic of Douglas's theory the Muslims, therefore, will experience society in its 'sectarian' and 'hierarchical' forms. The Christians on the other hand, as a majority group, will experience society more in its individualist form because their individual and collective identities and social relations are constrained less by 'group' loyalties than by rules emphasising ego-centred reciprocal transactions. Consequently the religious experience of the Muslim would likely be characterised by greater religious puritanism compared with the Australian Christians and this is what the evidence reported in this paper suggests.

Why is the Muslim experience of the Divine characterised by a feeling of fear and a sense of being punished for something they have done? As mentioned above, one fundamental postulate of Durkheim's sociology of religion was that, 'the unanimous sentiments of the believers... cannot be purely illusory'. But he argued that the real bases of religious experience were not those as expressed by the faithful but were grounded in the nature and 'reality' of the society. Religion for Durkheim is a system of ideas by means which individuals represent to themselves the society of which they are members, and the obscure but intimate relations that they have with it.

From this perspective the Muslim representations of the Divine (Allah) as fearsome and punishing are in reality symbolic or metaphorical representations of the society of which they are part and their relations with it. The evidence shows that the Muslim community is largely a working class and relatively poor community in Australia (Hassan 1991). Australian Muslims face the greatest level of prejudice in Australian society (Macallister, I. and Moore, R. 1989). While there may be other explanations as well of the particular Muslim perceptions of the Divine (Allah), Durkheim's theory will suggest that one explanation may be the Muslim community's economic and social position in the Australian social structure as well as the high level of prejudice expressed towards the Muslims. These social factors profoundly affect the Muslims experiences and relations in society and these are reflected in their representations of the Divine as discovered in this study.

This study is a very preliminary effort to empirically investigate Australian piety. I have focused on the Muslim and Christian piety and the results show much promise for more representative future studies of the phenomenon. The findings also

have provided an interesting opportunity to apply the theoretical insights of Durkheim and Douglas' sociology of religion to explain some of the empirical findings of the study. One final caveat - as I have mentioned earlier the findings of this study are based on purposive and non representative samples and, therefore, cannot be generalised to the whole society.

Endnotes

1. This research was funded by a grant from the Australian Research Council. I would like to thank Debbie Thomas, Kate Hoffmann, Julie Henderson, Wali Hanifi and Karima Moraby for their research assistance in data collection. I am indebted to the respondents who participated in this study for their time and cooperation. Kate Hoffmann also gave valuable assistance in data analysis. I am grateful to the two anonymous ARSR reviewers for their critical and helpful comments. I am alone responsible for the contents of this paper.

2. It should be mentioned that whereas, for Christians, orthodoxy grants to the figure of Christ direct efficacy for salvation, this is not the case in Islamic theology for Muslims in respect of Mohammed. Muslims, however, believe that following the traditions (sunna) of Prophet Mohammed will lead to salvation and heaven in life after death.

3. In this study I have attempted to find proxy variables for a sociologically meaningful comparison of Muslim and Christian religiosity. I am not comparing or examining the practice of formal Christian and Muslim theological principles

References

Bell, C. 1997. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bellah, R.N. et al. 1985. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cardwell, J.D. 1969. The Relationship Between Religious Commitment and Premarital Sexual Permissiveness: A Five Dimensional Analysis, *Sociological Analysis.* 30: 70-81.

Clayton, R.R. 1971 5-D or 1? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion.* 10: 37-40.

Clayton, R.R. and Gladden, J.W. 1974. Five Dimensions of Religiosity: Towards Demythologizing a Sacred Artifact, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion.* 13: 135-143.

DeJong, G.F., Faulkner, J.E. and Warland, R.H. 1976. Dimensions of Religiosity Reconsidered: Evidence from a Cross-Cultural Study, *Social Forces*, 54: 866-889.

Douglas, M. 1970. *Natural Symbols: Explanations in Cosmology*. London: Barrie and Rockliff.

Durkheim, E. 1915 *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life: A Study in Sociology of Religion.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Faulkner, J.E. and DeJong, G.F. 1966. Religiosity in 5-D: An Empirical Analysis, *Social Forces*, 45: 246-254.

Gibbs, J.O. and Crader, K.W. 1970. A Criticism of Two Recent Attempts to Scale

Glock and Stark's Dimensions of Religiosity, *Sociological Analysis*, 31: 107-114.

Glock, C. 1962. On the Study of Religious Commitment, *Religious Education, Research Supplement,* 57: 4, S98-S110.

Glock, C and Stark, R. 1965. *Religious and Society in Tension*, Chicago: Rand McNally.

Hassan, R. 1991. The Muslim Minority-Majority Relations in Australian Society: A Sociological Analysis, *Journal Institute of Muslim Minority Affairs,* 12: 2: 285-306.

Hassan, R. 2002. *Faithlines: Muslim Conceptions of Islam and Society*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Hilty, D.M. and Stockman, S.J. 1986. A Covariance Analysis of DeJong, Faulkner, and Warland Religious Involvement Model, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 25: 483-493.

Himmelfarb, H.S. 1975. Measuring Religious Involvement, *Social Forces*, 53: 606-618.

King, M.B. and Hunt, R.A. 1969. Measuring the Religious Variables: Amended Findings, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 8: 321-323.

King, M.B. and Hunt, R.A. 1972. Measuring Religious Variables: Replication, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* 11: 240-251.

King, M.B. and Hunt, R.A. 1975. Measuring Religious Variables: National Replication, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 14: 13-22.

King, M.B. and Hunt, R.A. 1990. Measuring Religious Variable: Final Comment, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 8: 321-323.

McAllister, I. and Moore, R. 1989. *Ethnic Prejudice in Australian Society: Patterns, Intensity and Explanations.* Canberra: Office of Multicultural Affairs, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Pratt, J.B.1907. *The Psychology of Religious Beliefs.* New York: Macmillan

Religion, 13: 135-143.

Rohrbaugh, J. and Jessor, R. 1975. Religiosity in Youth: A Personal Control Against Deviant Behaviour. *Journal of Personality*, 43: 136-155.

Spickard, J.V. 1989. A Guide to Mary Douglas's Three Versions of Grid/Group Theory, *Sociological Analysis*, 52: 2, 151-170.

Stark, R. and Glock, C. 1968. *American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment,* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tapp, R.B. 1971. Dimensions of Religiosity in a Post-Traditional Group, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* 10: 41-47.

Von Hugel, F. 1908. *The Mystical Element of Religion.* Vol. 1. London: J.M. Dent and Sons

Wulff. D.M. 1997. *Psychology of Religion: Classic and Contemporary.* New York: John Willet and Sons.