

The Effect of Sociology of Religion on the Religiosity of BA Sociology Students from the University of the Philippines Los Baños

Asia Pacific Journal of
Education, Arts and Sciences
Vol. 3 No.4, 9-16
October 2016
P-ISSN 2362-8022
E-ISSN 2362-8030
www.apjeas.apjmr.com

Mark Anthony Mujer Quintos

University of the Philippines, Los Baños, Laguna, Philippines
mmquintos@up.edu.ph

Date Received: July 19, 2016; Date Revised: October 1, 2016

Abstract - *This study tested how students' religiosity as measured by the Sta. Clara Strength of Religious Faith (SCSORF) and the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS) are affected by a semester of taking a class on Sociology of Religion following the Cognitive Dissonance Theory as framework. A survey questionnaire was administered twice to all students of the course after being briefed on the nature of the study. The first run of the questionnaire (pre-test) was done at the start of the semester before the course content was discussed. The second run (post-test) was done at the end of the semester after the course content has been discussed. The mean scores obtained from the pre- and post- tests of the SCSORF and CRS were then analysed through a Paired Samples T-test procedure. All cases with missing data on the pre- and/or post- test scores were omitted pairwise. The results indicate that taking a class on Sociology of Religion caused a significant decrease in students' religiosity in terms of their cognitive appreciation of religion, private religiosity, and religious conviction. However, despite their religiosity depreciating, these students continue to follow social expectations of public religious performance and are still susceptible to religious experiences.*

Keywords: *Education, Faith, Religion, Apostasy*

INTRODUCTION

Religious conservatives and social thinkers have long recognized the potential impact of education on religiosity. Modern education has often been viewed as a possible factor for the weakening, or even loss, of one's faith and adherence to religious practices, primarily because of the supposed emphasis on scientific principles which are perceived to inevitably conflict with religious beliefs. This has led to an averse relationship between some religious members

of society and the academe [1]. Indeed, as far back as the dawn of the industrial society, social thinkers such as Thomas Masaryk considered the presence of secular, scientific, education as a major factor the leads to the decline of religiosity which then leads to other social crises [2]. This is believed to primarily be because as an individual becomes more learned through scientific inquiry, he or she becomes less inclined to subscribe to religious interpretations of social reality [3]-[5]. More than a century since Masaryk expressed this concern on the relationship between religion and education, the two institutions of society can still be found to be at odds on several instances.

One of the most famous instances of the volatile relationship between religion and education is on the issue of teaching of the Theory of Evolution and the Big Bang Theory in the classroom. The topics of evolution and the Big Bang theory, as some sectors would claim, is detrimental or even directly against the doctrine of certain religious ideologies. This is due to the perception that the specificities of these scientific knowledge are in conflict with the religious claims on how humans came into being and how the world was formed. Much of the attention has been focused on the opposition to the teaching of these natural science topics in the classroom. Interestingly, a survey from the United States has shown that despite students' exposure to lessons on evolution, the rate of faith in the country did not experience a significant change [6]. This is supported by a more recent study which found that college education has no liberalizing effect on the religious beliefs of the youth [7]. On the other hand, a study which also uses national level data found that college education has a negative effect on the strength of religious beliefs, albeit the influence is limited. The negative effect of education to religious belief was only salient among students of elite higher

educational institutions but is absent among those who did not finish college education and those who attended sectarian educational institutions [8]. Hill also suspects that the reason why those coming from elite educational institutions report a significant change in the strength of religious beliefs is because these elite institutions often have a liberal atmosphere to which students feel the need to conform. The same can be said, however, of why those coming from the sectarian institutions did not report any significant change in the strength of their religious beliefs: they have to conform to the religious atmosphere of their campuses.

While evolution in the classroom often receives a lot of controversy, less attention has been given to how social science education can affect religiosity. Yet, according to existing data [9], scientists are generally less likely than the general population to subscribe to religious beliefs. A further distinction exists among the scientists, with those from the social sciences being found to be significantly less religious than their colleagues from the natural sciences. The researchers noted that the fact that social scientists are less religious than natural scientists is often regarded by people as proof that religion and science are not inherently in conflict with each other – going by the rationale that if there really is a discord between science and religion, it should be the natural scientists who would be more disillusioned with religious beliefs. One may argue, however, that social scientists should be expected to be less religious because their foci of scientific inquiry often involve religion as a social fact as compared to those from the natural sciences whose research thrusts may not necessarily have any relation with religious beliefs and therefore, there are less chances, and need, of skeptical inquiry of religion and the potential subsequent disillusionment. Furthermore, findings from the natural sciences may not necessarily shed doubt to the existence of a supreme being. The complexity of an organism, for example, may be interpreted as further support to the so-called intelligent design of a supreme being, albeit this in itself may be considered fallacious as the oft-termed watchmaker's analogy. For the social scientists, on the other hand, religion will often be treated as a social construct that can be found in societies, its supernatural claims often only being regarded as cultural nuances reported in qualitative social inquiry - not as objective fact but subjective constructs.

This study was conducted to determine how taking a class on the Sociological inquiry of religion – which regards religions as mere social constructs and religious experiences as by-products of social phenomena such as manifestations of Durkheimian social currents, altered states of consciousness, or groupthink – will affect the religiosity of Sociology students taking the course. This study was guided by the research question: Is there a significant difference in the religiosity of students after taking a course on Sociology of Religion for one whole semester? This study hypothesized that a semester of classes on Sociology of Religion will significantly decrease the religiosity of the students of the course.

Discussion of the Sociology of Religion Curriculum

It becomes necessary at this point to introduce the syllabus utilized during the semester of the study. A copy of the course syllabus is provided in the appendix. The course content has four major parts. The first part introduced the concept of religion and how its definition may encompass more than the typical construct of laymen of religion as limited to the major belief systems such as Roman Catholicism and Islam. Students of the course were also oriented in this part about the importance of the sociological inquiry of religion. The necessity for subjecting religion to skeptical inquiry instead of treating it as a sanctified concept is given importance early on in the course. Emphasis is also given here on the capability of religion to either resist or effect social change either directly or indirectly through its effects on the other institutions of society as manifested in the conflicts and developments in the Philippines and the world in general. It is also at this part of the course that students are introduced to the different methods frequently utilized in Sociology of Religion as well as the ethical implications which must be considered during scientific inquiry.

The second part of the course discussed theories relating to religion. Despite the course being considered as “Sociology of Religion”, the theories discussed are multidisciplinary including those often considered to be under the domains of Anthropology, Psychology, and Sociology. The theories discussed in this part of the course included those of Tylor, Muller, Freud, Durkheim, Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, and Weber. Theories on the phenomenon of secularization are also discussed in this part of the course. This includes the theories of Berger, Parsons and Bellah, and O’Dea. The third part of the course focused on the

concept of religiosity and the phenomena of religious conversion and religious commitment. This part of the course included discussions on the social psychology of religious conversion as well as the social psychology of group influence. This part of the course also featured theories of conversion and commitment as postulated by Kanter and Lofland. Finally, this part of the course also dealt with discussions on phenomena such as altered states of consciousness as factors which might predispose people to supernatural or religious experiences.

The last part of the course deals with Filipino religiosity, particularly on its most salient features and how Filipino religiosity differs in prevalence and in character with other countries as shown in social research such as the study findings of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) and the Social Weather Stations (SWS). This part also dealt with recent interactions of religion as an institution with the greater society such as the issues of divorce, inequality, and the conflict pertaining to the passage and implementation of the RH Law.

Out of the four major parts of the syllabus, the second and third part may have the biggest threat to belief. The second part, for example, deals with the theories explaining the origin of religion and its effects on society. As far as origins go, religion is appreciated not as a divine construct but rather one that existed simply because of a utilitarian reason: to make sense of reality whilst science has yet to develop. When it comes to theorizing its effect on society, religion is appreciated as an element that can be used to perpetuate structures that condone social inequalities. The third part of the course, on the other hand, could be a potential detriment to religious belief because of the lessons that discuss religious conversion as a mundane form of socio-psychological persuasion process. In these lessons, religious conversion and experience are often appreciated as a result of altered states of consciousness brought about by emotional upheavals, mass hysteria, or physiological factors such as hunger, thirst, and lack of sleep.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objective of this study is to determine if ideas learned in the classroom can have an impact on the personal lives of students. In particular, this study aimed to test the effect of taking classes in Sociology of Religion on the religiosity of BA Sociology students. In order to accomplish this objective, this

study attempted to answer the research question: Is there a significant decrease in the religiosity of BA Sociology students after studying Sociology of Religion for one semester?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Theory of Cognitive Dissonance [10] states that there is a tendency for human beings to seek consistency between their cognition (attitude, belief, opinion) and their behavior. Should there be a conflict or inconsistency between these two elements, the result is an aversive state called cognitive dissonance. In order to reduce or eliminate this aversive mental state, a person can either (a) change the behavior to keep it in line with his or her cognition, (b) change their cognition to keep it in line with their behavior, or (c) rationalize the disparity between their cognition and their behavior.

In the context of this study, the context of the potential cognitive dissonance is on the situation of being religious yet having to learn concepts and theories which regard religious beliefs and experiences as mundane phenomena devoid of any supernatural element. In light of this learning content, a student will experience the conflict between his or her religious beliefs and the skeptical inquiry on these religious beliefs which may result in cognitive dissonance. Unfortunately for the student, he or she cannot avoid this dissonance by changing the behavior – the course is a requirement for the completion of the BA Sociology curriculum. The student is then left with two options: a belief revision in light of an unavoidable behavior of going to class and passing the course, or a rationalization that one is only studying for the course to pass without necessarily believing the course content. All the students involved in this study passed the course. Their completion of the course may have been accompanied with either a belief change or a rationalization that they only persevered in the course to pass despite not believing the course content. If the latter is true, then the results of this study would show no significant decrease in their religiosity. If the former is true, then the results would show a significant decrease in the religiosity of the students.

METHODS

Sixty-six students of Sociology of Religion were engaged as participants in the study after being informed of the research purpose. These students are from ages 16 to 22, most of which are 17 (33.8%) and

18 (27.8%). A greater proportion of these students are females (65.3%). In terms of student classification, the class is comprised mostly of sophomores (55.6%). Almost half of these students (47.2%) reportedly live in an urban area while 27.8% reportedly live in a rural area. A quarter of the participants did not identify their place of residence. In terms of religious affiliation, these participants are comprised of students coming from 12 different religions, though almost half (45.8%) declared themselves as Roman Catholics.

All students were asked to answer a survey questionnaire twice during the semester: first during the start of the semester and second during the end of the semester. The survey instrument used for the study is comprised of three parts. The first part is comprised of questions designed to obtain information about their socio-economic characteristics. The second part is the Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire (SCSORF) constructed by Plante and Boccaccini [11]. It was designed to measure the strength of the subjects' religious faith, regardless of their religious denomination or affiliation based on their answers to 10 items measured in a Likert response format ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (4) Strongly agree. The scores obtained from the SCSORF can range between 10 and 40. Higher aggregate scores in the SCSORF reflect stronger levels of religiosity or religious faith.

In addition to the SCSORF, the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS) by Huber and Huber [12]. This instrument presents a more complex approach to measuring religiosity. Instead of treating religiosity as a single construct, the CRS measures the subject's intensity of religiosity in five dimensions which are assumed to represent the totality of religious life. These dimensions are as follows:

Public Practice Dimension. This dimension is measured through elements such as the subject's frequency of public participation in religious rituals and communal activities. It also includes the degree to which participation in these religious rituals are considered by the subject as important as well as the degree to which inclusion in a religious community is valued by the subject. Subjects who obtain high scores in this dimension can be said to possess high valuation on the sense of belonging that can be obtained from a religious community.

Private Practice Dimension. As opposed to the Public Practice Dimension, this dimension is measured through elements such as the subject's subscription to individualized religious activities and

rituals despite the lack of an audience. It includes elements pertaining to the importance and frequency of the subject's prayer and meditation or any other method to connect personally with the "divine". Subjects who obtain high scores in this dimension can be said to possess high devotion to transcendence and spirituality.

Religious Experience Dimension. This dimension is measured through elements that pertain to the subject's emotionality when it comes to religious phenomena. This includes elements such as self-reported experiences of feeling a supreme being intervenes in one's life or is communicating with the subject, feeling that a supernatural entity is present, or feeling of oneness with the cosmos. Subjects who obtain high scores in this dimension can be said to possess high belief in the authenticity of religious experiences.

Ideology Dimension. This dimension is measured through elements such as the subject's belief in the plausibility of the existence of deities and other supernatural concepts such as the afterlife. Subjects who obtain high scores in this dimension can be said to possess strong convictions about the authenticity or veracity of their religious beliefs.

Intellectual Dimension. This dimension is measured through elements such as the subject's frequency of thinking about religious issues, knowledge and interest in learning more about religious topics, and his or her active agency in seeking out further information pertaining to religious matters. Subjects who obtain high scores in this dimension can be said to be knowledgeable about religion and are capable of explaining their views on matters of religion, spirituality, and transcendence. It is worth noting that this dimension encompasses one's cognitive interest about religion in general instead of being limited to just one particular religion.

The mean scores obtained from the pre- and post-tests of the SCSORF and CRS were then analysed through a Paired Samples T-test procedure. All cases with missing data on the pre- and/or post- test scores were omitted pairwise. A total of 53 cases were viable for the statistical procedure when comparing the mean scores obtained from the SCSORF. Meanwhile, the CRS scores have 36 viable cases for comparison – except for the Religious Experience dimension which has 35 viable cases for the statistical procedure.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part of the article is divided into three parts. The first part introduces the participants of the study in terms of their socio-economic characteristics. The second part discusses the results obtained from the SCSORF instrument of the study. The third part discusses the results obtained from the CRS instrument of the study.

Results of the Sta. Clara Strength of Religious Faith instrument

The SCSORF is designed such that the scores of the participants will range from 10 to 40, with the higher scores indicating greater strengths of faith. The results of the t-test analysis on the SCSORF scores are summarized in Table 1.

With a mean SCSORF score of 27.89 ± 7.86 during the pre-test, it can be said that the subjects of the study have moderate to strong religious faith during the start of the semester. The strength of their religious faith was observed to have decreased during the end of semester (mean score= 26.25 ± 8.10). With $t(52) = 1.783$, $p < 0.10$, this indicates that there is a statistically significant decrease in the religious faith of the participants as measured by the SCSORF. It should be noted, however, that the observed difference between the mean SCSORF scores is small, albeit statistically significant. In effect, though there is a statistically significant decrease in the strength of faith of the subjects, they remain to have a moderately strong faith as measured by the SCSORF at the end of the semester.

What could be the reason for this significant, albeit mild, decrease? During the researcher's time as a student of the BA Sociology program, the researcher was a devout Catholic with aspirations for priesthood. This devotion was challenged when the researcher took Sociology of Religion especially when the topic focused on Freud's and Feuerbach's appreciations of religion and on altered state of consciousness as the rational explanation behind religious experiences which felt transcendental. The experience, however,

cannot be described as a swift destabilization of one's faith. What the lessons did instead is to plant the seeds of doubt on what the faithful once considered to be absolute, infallible truths.

Such experiences are not limited to the researcher. Among the BA Sociology student population, there used to be a running joke that once one has taken Sociology of Religion, then one loses the will to pray and go to religious services. Conversations with younger batches of BA Sociology students regarding what they know of Sociology of Religion indicate that the course's reputation persists. It is also quite telling that during a special lecture which the researcher was invited to deliver among a group of Junior and Senior BA Sociology majors (who, by the time, have already taken Sociology of Religion), the researcher asked through a show of hands who among the audience considered themselves as religious. The number of raised hands was observed to be in the minority. It is possible that the same experience is what the subjects of this study experienced. That they retained a moderately strong faith even after a significant decrease occurred means that their belief in a theistic worldview was not completely shaken, but doubt has been planted, and cracks in the religious lenses through which the subjects used to see the world have already appeared. Comments from the students during the semester may lend greater credence to this interpretation. For the duration of the semester when Sociology of Religion was taught, memetic expressions such as "existential crisis" and "mind=blown" have often been uttered in class. Based on the observation of the researcher, the former is often used to signify, albeit light-heartedly, that one is confused about life and does not know what to believe in anymore. The latter, on the other hand, is often used as a response to an information that is contradictory to the student's worldview yet is convincing enough that the student had to take a pause and recognize audibly how his or her appreciation of life has been altered. Both expressions suggests that the lessons of the course had a significant impact on them.

Table 1. T-test Results of the Sta. Clara Strength of Religious Faith Instrument.

Sta. Clara Strength of Religious Faith Scores	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pre-Test	27.89	53	7.86	1.08			
Post-Test	26.25	53	8.10	1.11	1.783	52	.080*

*significant at $\alpha=0.10$

Results of the Centrality of Religiosity instrument

A comparison of means was conducted for each of the five dimensions of the Centrality of Religiosity Scale. The results of these statistical tests are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. T-test Results of the Centrality of Religiosity Scale by Dimension.

Centrality of Religiosity Scores	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
<i>Intellectual Dimension</i>							
Pre-Test	4.13	36	.85	.14	6.363	35	.000*
Post-Test	2.81	36	.79	.13			
<i>Ideological Dimension</i>							
Pre-Test	3.20	36	1.17	.20	1.809	35	.079*
Post-Test	2.77	36	1.03	.17			
<i>Public Practice Dimension</i>							
Pre-Test	3.34	36	1.40	.23	1.073	35	.291
Post-Test	3.10	36	1.07	.18			
<i>Private Practice Dimension</i>							
Pre-Test	3.81	36	1.41	.23	1.843	35	.074*
Post-Test	3.28	36	1.34	.22			
<i>Religious Experience Dimension</i>							
Pre-Test	3.07	35	1.14	.19	.630	34	.533
Post-Test	2.93	35	1.08	.18			

*significant at $\alpha=0.10$

The results of the study shows that when it comes to the Intellectual Dimension, the mean score of the participants decreased from 4.13 during the pre-test down to 2.81 during the post-test. With $t(35) = 6.363$, $p < 0.10$, this indicates that there is a statistically significant decrease in the centrality of religiosity among the participants in terms of their Intellectual dimension. As such, it can be said that after taking a semester of classes on Sociology of Religion, the student participants had a decline in their willingness to subject religion to sceptical inquiry.

The results also shows that when it comes to the Ideological dimension, the mean score of the participants decreased from 3.20 during the pre-test down to 2.77 during the post-test. With $t(35) = 1.809$, $p < 0.10$, this indicates that there is a statistically significant decrease in the centrality of religiosity among the participants in terms of their Ideological dimension. This means that taking a whole semester worth of classes in Sociology of Religion causes a substantial disturbance in the students' religious convictions.

When it comes to the Public Practice dimension, the mean score of the participants decreased from 3.34 during the pre-test down to 3.10 during the post-test. With $t(35) = 1.073$, $p < 0.10$, this indicates that there is no statistically

significant decrease in the centrality of religiosity among the participants in terms of their Public Practice dimension. In other words, taking Sociology of Religion classes for a whole semester does not decrease nor increase the tendency of students to participate in public religious activities.

The data also pointed out that when it comes to the Private Practice Dimension, the mean score of the participants decreased from 8.81 during the pre-test down to 3.28 during the post-test. With $t(35) = 1.843$, $p < 0.10$, this indicates that there is a statistically significant decrease in the centrality of religiosity among the participants in terms of their Private Practice dimension. This means that there is a significant change in the behaviour of students when it comes to private religious acts such as praying and meditating after taking one semester of classes in Sociology of Religion.

Finally, the results shown in Table 2 indicate that in terms of the Religious Experience Dimension, the mean score of the participants decreased from 3.07 during the pre-test down to 2.93 during the post-test. With $t(34) = 0.630$, $p < 0.10$, this indicates that there is no statistically significant decrease in the centrality of religiosity among the participants in terms of their Religious Experience dimension. This suggests that what O'Dea [13] termed as "mysterium tremendum" which fills the believer with great wonder in the face of a religious experience is not significantly affected by taking a class on Sociology of Religion.

In summary, the students of Sociology of Religion, who were predominantly 17-18 year old females living in an urban area and are members of the Roman Catholic Faith, have moderately religiosity during the time that they took the course. After one semester of taking the course, they experienced a small but significant decline in the strength of their faith (SCSORF) as well as in their interest in subjecting religion to scientific inquiry (Intelligence dimension), their religious conviction (Ideology dimension), and their observance of private religious activities (Private Practice dimension).

CONCLUSION

The results of this study provides strong support to the hypothesis that taking a class on Sociology of Religion will have a negative impact on the religiosity of the students. This much has been proven by the results of the T-test in the SCSORF. The results of the CRS functions mostly to provide richer insights into the effect of Sociology of Religion on religiosity.

This negative impact on religiosity is assumed to be a by-product of the cognitive dissonance experienced when trying to reconcile one's religiosity and the content of the course. Given that the content of the course contradicts the student's religious worldviews, the continuous discussion of the course content must have been aversive or uncomfortable stimulus for the student. This is corroborated by the statistically significant decrease in the Intellectual

dimension in this study. The usual response to an aversive stimulus is to avoid exposure to that aversive stimulus. Unfortunately for the student, Sociology of Religion is a prerequisite for the completion of the requirements of the BA Sociology degree. The student, therefore, has no other choice but to continue being exposed to the aversive stimulus and suffer cognitive dissonance. In order to diffuse this cognitive dissonance without the possibility of avoiding continuous exposure to the course, the only recourse is through belief change. This is shown through the statistically significant decreases observed in the religiosity of the students as measured by the Sta. Clara Strength of Religious Faith (SCSORF) instrument as well as a the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS). However, it is worth noting that when it comes to the CRS, it was found that taking a semester-long class on the Sociology of Religion has no statistically significant impact on religiosity of students when it comes to their Public Practice and Religious Experience dimensions.

The students reported lesser willingness to make scientific inquiries about religion during the end of the semester. This is shown in the statistically significant decrease in the Intelligence dimension. This may be because of their aversion to the discomfort experienced after a whole semester of looking at religion, which is cognitively and emotionally important to them, as nothing more than a social construction. This is especially the case when the topics delve into the discourses of social thinkers such as Freud, Marx, and especially, Feuerbach, whose discussions could very easily be considered antagonistic to a religious worldview. Feuerbach here is emphasized due to his claim that the rejection of a god is the only solution to humanity's problem and that a god, which is an integral part of most religions, is a social construct that is detrimental to total human fulfilment – in atheism is the salvation.

Despite their resistance to further sceptical inquiries into religion, the depreciation in their religious fervour has already transpired. This has caused them to give less importance to the execution of their private religious rituals, as shown in the statistically significant decrease in the Private Practice dimension. Despite the decrease in their personal religiosity, these students are still social beings who are coerced by the external structures around them – slaves, so to speak, to the dynamics of the group. As such, though their personal religious beliefs have been shaken, they still adhere to the public methods of pronouncing one's religious faith. This is manifested in the lack of any statistically significant decrease in the Public Practice dimension despite the decrease in the other domains.

Finally, while the students who took the course might have been affected cognitively, and by extension, behaviourally, by the course, the same cannot be said about their emotions. This is understandable; religious experiences, after all, are primarily products of social currents. Therefore, it is within expectations that those who

participate in public religious activities can find themselves caught in the collective effervescence of religious activities.

Scope, Limitations, and Recommendations for further study

This study was conducted with the intention of initiating scientific inquiries in how classes where the subject matter may be contradictory to the tenets of religious beliefs can have an effect on the religious worldviews of the students. The class, SOC 116: Sociology of Religion, is a course offered only once every academic year to BA Sociology students and students outside the program who wish to take the course as an elective. This study was only able to account for all students of the course during one academic year. It remains to be seen if the same results can be observed in the succeeding batches of Sociology of Religion students. Future studies are advised to conduct longitudinal studies following a similar design to see if the findings of this study will hold true in other classes with a different composition or a different source of instruction. Furthermore, a qualitative social research may also be beneficial in exploring the nuances in the lived experiences of students as they struggle to manage the dual identity of being religious and being a student of the course.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sebby, R.A., & L. Schaefer. (2008). Change in religious beliefs, parental pressure, and attitudes of college students toward higher education as related to religious fundamentalism. *Psychology Reports*, 102(1):169-80.
- [2] Novak, Josef. (1988). *On Masaryk: Texts in English and German*. Amsterdam: The Netherlands.
- [3] Larson, E.J., & L. Witham. (1998). Leading scientists still reject God. *Nature*, 394, 313-314.
- [4] Gervais, W. & A. Norenzayan. (2012). Analytic Thinking Promotes Religious Disbelief. *Science*, 336(6080):493-496.
- [5] Zuckerman, M., Silberman, J., & J.A. Hall. (2013). The relation between intelligence and religiosity: a meta-analysis and some proposed explanations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 17(4):325-54.
- [6] Harris Poll. (2006). While most U.S. adults believe in God, only 58 percent are "absolutely certain". Retrieved April 12, 2016 from http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=707.
- [7] Mayrl, D. & J. Uecker. (2011). Higher Education and Religious Liberalization among Young Adults. *Social Forces*, 90(1):181-208.
- [8] Hill, J. P. (2011), Faith and Understanding: Specifying the Impact of Higher Education on Religious Belief. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 50: 533–551.
- [9] Ecklund, E. H. and C. P. Scheitle. 2007. Religion among Academic Scientists: Distinctions, Disciplines, and Demographics. *Social Problems*, 54: 289–307.

- [10] Festinger, L. (1957). A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- [11] Plante, T.G. & Boccaccini, M.T. (1997). The Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire. *Pastoral Psychology*, 45, 375-387.
- [12] Huber, Stefan; Huber, Odilo W. (2012). "The Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS)." *Religions*, 3(3):710-724.
- [13] Roberts, Keith and David Yamane. (2012). *Religion in Sociological Perspective* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Appendix

Course Outline of Sociology of Religion

- I. Introduction to the nature and importance of Sociological Inquiry of Religion
 - a. Defining "Religion"
 - b. Importance of the Sociology of Religion
 - d. Methods of Sociological research on religion
- II. Theorizing Religion: Its Strengths and Discontents
 - a. Anthropological theories of religion
 - b. Psychological theories of religion
 - c. Sociological theories of religion
 - d. Secularization theory
- III. The tools of Sociological Inquiry of Religious Experience and Commitment
 - a. Factors of religiosity
 - b. Measures of religiosity
 - b. Comparative methods of religiosity
 - c. Factors and processes of religious conversion, commitment, and apostasy
- IV. Religion and Society: From the Philippines and Beyond
 - a. Defining Filipino religiosity
 - b. Factors of Filipino religiosity
 - c. Comparing Filipino religiosity with the rest of the world
 - d. Filipino religiosity and its impact on Philippine society