

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/64758>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2019-06-26 and may be subject to change.

'BRIDGE OVER TROUBLED WATER'. FURTHER RESULTS REGARDING THE RECEPTIVE COPING SCALE

MARINUS VAN UDEN, JOS PIEPER & HANS ALMA

Abstract

In this article, we describe research on the Receptivity Scale we developed in response to some of the problems we met when using Kenneth Pargament's religious coping-scales in the Netherlands (cf. Alma, Pieper & Van Uden, 2003). The main problem with Pargament's three-fold conceptualisation of religious coping (self-directing, deferring and collaborative) is the underlying view of an active, personal God. The Receptivity Scale does justice to the idea of a more impersonal God, which is probably more common in the secularised Netherlands. Furthermore, the scale takes into account that people are not always directly focused on the solution of problems, either with or without God. The scale is administered to two populations in Belgium and two populations in The Netherlands. We compare a) the scores of the respondents on the scale with their scores on other measures of religiosity and other psychological measures, and b) the scores of theology students with the scores of psychology students. We come to the conclusion that between the attitudes of basic trust on the one hand and trust in a personal God on the other hand, there are different degrees of relating to the transcendent in times of trouble.

INTRODUCTION

Measuring coping has become widespread in the second generation of coping researchers in clinical and social psychology, where it replaced the psychodynamic ego development perspective. This generation emphasises processes rather than structures (personality traits). The processes are treated as transactions between person and environment. In these transactions, cognitions and behaviours are rated more highly than before (Suls, David & Harvey, 1996). Lazarus and Folkman are well-known representatives of this generation. Together with others they developed the Ways of Coping scale. The scale consists of eight subscales: confrontive coping, distancing, self-control, seeking social support, accepting responsibility, escape-avoidance, planful problem solving and positive reappraisal (Folkman et al., 1986). The last subscale contains two religious items: 'found new faith' and 'I prayed'. Carver, Scheier and Weintraub (1989) have extended this scale. Their new scale (COPE) consists of 13 subscales. The last subscale is called 'turning to religion' and contains four items: 'I seek God's help', 'I put my trust in God', 'I try to find comfort in my religion' and

'I pray more than usual'. In a study of women in treatment for early-stage breast cancer, these items were changed into: 'I've been getting emotional support from the people in my church'; 'I've been going to church or prayer meetings'; 'I've been talking with my priest or minister'; 'I've been trying to find comfort in my religion or spiritual beliefs' (Alferi et al., 1999, 347). Parker and Brown (1982) found six dimensions of coping behaviour: recklessness, socialisation, distraction, problem solving, passivity and self-consolation. They used one religious item ('I prayed'). This item was part of the problem-solving dimension. All these scales lack systematic treatment of the place of religion in the coping process.

Psychology of religion has developed measures focusing specifically on religious coping. One measure of religious coping is that of Koenig et al. (1992). Their Religious Coping Index (RCI) consists of three items. The first question is open-ended: what enables the subject to cope with stress? A score of 10 was assigned to a religious response (God, prayer etc.). Secondly, subjects are asked to rate the extent to which they use religion to cope on a visual analogue scale ranging from 0 to 10. Finally, the interviewer discusses with subjects how they use religion to cope and asks for specific recent examples. On the basis of the discussion the interviewer rates subjects on a scale of 0 to 10 in respect of their use of religion as a coping behaviour. The three scores are summed. This measure focuses only on the extent to which religion is used in the coping process (quantitative). Specific ways of religious coping (qualitative) are not assessed.

Pargament and his co-researchers followed another road. In 1988 they presented three styles of religious coping in the problem-solving process (Pargament et al., 1988). These are: self-directing (the individual is responsible for solving problems), deferring (God is made responsible for problem-solving) and collaborative (both the individual and God are responsible). These styles vary on two key dimensions: God-human being and active-passive. Wong-McDonald (2000) suggested an additional coping style: surrender. 'Surrender differs from deferring in that it is not a passive waiting for God to solve all problems: rather, it is an active choice to surrender one's will to God's rule' (Wong-McDonald, 2000, 149). This style is probably only applicable to the very committed, Bible-oriented believer (it represents the New Testament concept of losing one's life in Christ).

These four religious problem-solving styles measure only a small part of possible religious coping activities. Recently, Pargament, Koenig and Perez (2000) developed the RCOPE, a new theoretically based measure that assesses the full range of religious coping methods. 'They encompass active, passive, and interactive coping methods. They include problem-

focused and emotion-focused approaches. They cover cognitive, behavioural, interpersonal, and spiritual domains' (Pargament, Koenig & Perez, 2000, 525). The authors discern five main areas, connected to five religious functions: religious coping methods for finding meaning; for gaining control; for gaining comfort and closeness to God; for gaining intimacy with others and closeness to God; and for achieving a transformation of life. Pargament's three religious problem-solving styles are part of the 'gaining control' domain. Two additional styles complete this domain. The first one is pleading for direct intervention. This means seeking control indirectly by pleading to God for a miracle or divine intervention. The second one is active religious surrender, an active handing over of control to God. This means that individuals first try their best, but at a certain point they leave the rest to God. The RCOPE can be divided in two parts: positive and negative religious coping. The RCOPE is a very extensive measure. For that reason, the researchers have also developed an abridged RCOPE (Pargament et al., 1998), based on the identification of positive and negative patterns or clusters of religious coping methods.

Earlier we (Alma, Pieper & Van Uden, 2003) reported on our attempts to use Pargament's three religious problem solving styles in the Netherlands, the problems we encountered and the alternative scale we tried to develop: the Receptivity scale. The main problem with Pargament's threefold conceptualisation of religious coping (self-directing, deferring and collaborative) is the underlying view of an active, personal God, which ignores the notion of a more impersonal God that is probably more common in the secularised Netherlands. The Receptivity scale allows for such an impersonal view of God. Furthermore, the scale takes into account that people do not always focus directly on problem solving, either with or without God. A receptive attitude might allow them to be open to what they cannot control. Confronted with a problematic situation, they may be open to what could be in store for them.

The scale we presented consisted of three items which contained no reference to a specific interpretation of a transcendent reality. The items were about trust, finding deeper meaning, receptivity and enlightenment. The scale yielded some interesting results, but we came to the conclusion that it was too brief and that more attention should be paid to a religiously receptive interpretation of coping in future research. In this article we will present a more definitive version of our so-called Receptivity Scale. This version has been administered to two populations in Belgium and two populations in the Netherlands. We will examine the precise meaning of this scale by comparing the respondents' scores on this scale with their scores on other measures of religiosity and other psychological measures.

We also compare the scores of theology students with the scores of psychology students. Thus we gain more insight into the validity of the scale.

One of the items in the brief version of the scale was “When I find myself in times of trouble, I have faith in the eventual revelation of their meaning and purpose.” This reminded us of the Beatles’ song “Let it be”, in which Mother Mary comes to the singer in times of trouble. In the context of this article, Simon and Garfunkel’s song “Bridge over troubled water” fits our intentions best. The Receptivity scale tries to bridge the gap between religious coping with specific reference to a personal God and ways of coping, which without explicitly mentioning God, can still be called religious.

THE RECEPTIVITY SCALE

In cooperation with Dirk Hutsebaut and Bart Neyrinck (University of Louvain), we first developed a six-item and finally an eight-item version of the Receptivity scale. (The items in italics were not included in the six-item version):

“People cope with their problems in different ways. Please indicate how often you deal with your problems in the ways described in the following statements.” (never/seldom/sometimes/often/always)

1. When I am worried, earlier experiences make me trust that I will be shown a way out.
2. After a period of difficulties the deeper significance of my problems will be revealed to me.
3. When I find myself in times of trouble I have faith in the eventual revelation of their meaning and purpose.
4. *When I have problems, I trust that a solution will be presented to me.*
5. When I wonder how to solve a problem, I trust that a solution will be shown to me in due course.
6. *In difficult situations I trust that a way out will unfold.*
7. In solving my problems I am sometimes struck by the fact that things just fall into place.
8. In difficult situations I open myself to solutions that arise.

RESEARCH FINDINGS: HUTSEBAUT AND NEYRINCK

The Receptivity scale was administered to various populations. Hutsebaut and Neyrinck used the six-item version in their research in Belgium. The six items were part of a survey that was first conducted with a sample of

225 final year high school and undergraduate students, and then with a second sample of 118 adults, all from the Flemish-speaking part of Belgium. A principal component analysis was carried out on the six items. A scree test pointed to a one-component solution. The six items were used to construct the Receptivity scale. An estimate of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha coefficient) was 0.64 ($M = 3.31$; $SD = 0.53$). One item, which loaded less than .40, was not omitted from the analyses because doing so did not improve internal consistency.

Among the other measures in the survey was a seven-point Likert-type question 'How religious are you?', to measure religiosity, and the Post-critical Belief scale that captures four approaches to religion: orthodoxy, external critique, relativism and second naïveté. A combination of instruments measured Erikson's concept of basic trust versus basic mistrust; commitment to the transcendent was measured by twelve items from the Spirituality Inventory constructed by Luchtmeijer, Verbiest and Wouters (2001) and finally, the Trait Anxiety part of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) was used. In the adolescent sample, receptivity correlated positively with relativism and second naïveté, two approaches to religion that interpret expressions of religious faith symbolically. It correlated negatively with external critique and not at all with orthodoxy, two approaches to religion that interpret expressions of religious faith literally (see table 1). In the adult sample, however, receptivity correlated positively with Second Naïveté and negatively with external critique, whereas it did not correlate with orthodoxy and relativism. In both the adolescent and the adult samples, receptivity correlated positively with religiosity, commitment to the transcendent, and basic trust, and negatively with trait anxiety (see table 2). The correlations were stronger in the adult sample. According to Hutsebaut and Neyrinck, the differences between the adolescent and adult samples are due to the adult sample's stronger involvement in general religiosity.

Table 1: *Correlations between receptivity and the other measures in the survey: adolescent sample*

| | Receptivity |
|-------------------|-------------|
| Orthodoxy | -.01 |
| External critique | -.15* |
| Relativism | .34** |
| Second naïveté | .29** |

Table 1 (*cont.*)

| | Receptivity |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Religiosity | .19* |
| Commitment to the transcendent | .37** |
| Basic trust | .37** |
| Anxiety | -.19* |

N = 225; *p < .05; **p < .01

Table 2: Correlations between Receptivity and the other measures in the survey: adult sample

| | Receptivity |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Orthodoxy | .12 |
| External critique | -.31** |
| Relativism | -.07 |
| Second naïveté | .29** |
| Religiosity | .33** |
| Commitment to the transcendent | .54** |
| Basic trust | .52** |
| Anxiety | -.34** |

N = 118; *p < .05; **p < .01

From these results, Hutsebaut and Neyrinck conclude that religiosity and receptivity do not necessarily go together: it depends on the way an individual approaches religion. In both samples people scoring high on second naïveté – interpreting religion symbolically and including transcendence – can be said to be high in receptivity. It is not surprising that receptivity correlates positively with the symbolic dimension. Both symbolic and receptive thinking can be said to have a certain kind of openness. People scoring high on external critique – interpreting religion literally and excluding transcendence – can be said to be low in receptivity. Literal thinking seems to be the opposite of receptive thinking. Receptivity and basic trust have a strongly positive correlation, but the two concepts are not the same. Receptivity has a stronger positive correlation with commitment to the transcendent than basic trust, whereas basic trust has a stronger negative correlation with anxiety. One might argue that receptivity is an open way of perceiving and thinking about problems, based on basic trust and commitment to the transcendent.

RESEARCH FINDINGS: ALMA, PIEPER AND VAN UDEN

Characteristics of the sample

Alma, Pieper and Van Uden used the eight-item version in research in the Netherlands. The sample consisted of 113 subjects: 77 psychology students at the Catholic University of Nijmegen and 36 theology students at Leiden University and the Catholic University of Nijmegen, respectively. Nineteen percent of the psychology students and 39% of the theology students described themselves as either Protestant or Roman Catholic. Four percent and 28%, respectively, called themselves Christian. Twenty-five percent and 22% respectively adhered to another religion. Eight percent and 11%, respectively referred to themselves as agnostic and 44% and 0%, respectively, as unbelievers (see table 3).

Table 3: *Religious self-description*

| Religious self-description | Psychology | Theology |
|----------------------------|------------|----------|
| Protestant/Roman Catholic | 19% | 39% |
| Christian | 4% | 28% |
| Agnostic | 8% | 11% |
| Unbeliever | 44% | 0 |
| Other | 25% | 22% |

N = 113

As to religious participation, we asked people how often they attended church (see table 4).

Table 4: *Religious participation*

| Church Attendance | Psychology | Theology |
|---------------------------|------------|----------|
| weekly or often | 10% | 58% |
| only on special occasions | 25% | 19% |
| hardly ever or never | 65% | 22% |

N = 113

Asked to indicate how religious they were, 55% of the psychology students and 3% of the theology students responded 'not at all'; 14% of the psy-

chology students and 67% of the theology students responded ‘very strongly’. Clearly, and as was to be expected, more theology students than psychology students saw themselves as religious.

Religious coping

In addition to the receptivity items, we presented participants with Pargament’s three religious coping style scales. Each of the three subscales consists of six items, which are scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = always). A Principal Component analysis (with varimax rotation; missing pairwise, mineigen = 1, factor loading > 0.40) was carried out on the 18 items and yielded two components (explained variance 66.6% + 8.5% = 75.1%; KMO = 0.95) (see table 5).

Table 5: *Two coping factors*

Factor 1: Collaborative versus self-directing

| | |
|--|------|
| When I have a problem, I talk to God about it in my prayers to decide together what it means. | .84 |
| When considering a difficult situation, I put it to God in my prayers in order to think of possible solutions together with him. | .82 |
| When putting my plans into action, I can work together with God. | .81 |
| When I feel anxious or nervous about a problem, I search in my prayers together with God for a way to relieve my worries. | .80 |
| When it comes to deciding how to solve a problem, my faith makes it possible that God and I work together as partners. | .79 |
| After solving a problem, I work with God to make sense of it. | .72 |
| When thinking about a difficulty, I try to come up with possible solutions without God’s help. | -.84 |
| I act to solve my problems without God’s help. | -.82 |
| When I have difficulty, I decide what it means by myself without help from God. | -.82 |
| When faced with trouble, I deal with my feelings without God’s help. | -.82 |
| When deciding on a solution, I make a choice independently of God’s input. | -.77 |
| After I’ve gone through a rough time, I try to make sense of it without relying on God. | -.76 |

Factor 2: Deferring

| | |
|--|-----|
| Rather than trying to come up with the right solution to a problem myself, I let God decide how to deal with it. | .86 |
| I do not think about different solutions to my problems because God provides them for me. | .82 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| When a situation makes me anxious, I wait for God to take those feelings away. | .79 |
| In carrying out solutions to my problems, I wait for God to take control and know somehow he'll work it out. | .74 |
| When a troublesome issue arises, I leave it up to God to decide what it means for me. | .72 |
| I don't spend much time thinking about troubles I've had; God makes sense of them for me. | .58 |

A forced three-factor solution didn't yield an interpretable result. In the two-factor solution presented here, the collaborative and the self-directing styles are opposite poles of the same factor, with collaborative loading positively, self-directing loading negatively. It is a coping style in which individuals take responsibility themselves or are collaborating with God. Yet, we used the three scales theoretically assumed by Pargament. The estimates of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha coefficient) are high: 0.96 (collaborative), 0.94 (self-directing) and 0.90 (deferring), respectively. From Pargament's studies, the styles appeared to be interconnected. Our study, too, showed a clear correlation. There was a positive correlation of $r = .76$ between the deferring and collaborative styles. In both styles, God plays an important role. The self-directing style contrasted with the other two styles: with the deferring style ($r = -.70$), but even more so with the collaborative style ($r = -.88$).

A Principal Component analysis (with varimax rotation; missing pairwise, mineigen = 1, factor loading > 0.40) was carried out on the eight receptivity items, again yielding two components (explained variance 42.1% + 18.1% = 60.2%; KMO = 0.77) (see table 6).

Table 6: Two receptivity factors

Factor 1: Something is revealed by an agent

| | |
|---|-----|
| When I find myself in times of trouble, I have faith in the eventual revelation of their meaning and purpose. | .80 |
| After a period of difficulties, the deeper significance of my problems is revealed to me. | .78 |
| When I have problems, I trust that a solution will be presented to me. | .67 |
| When I wonder how to solve a problem, I trust that a solution will be shown to me in due course. | .67 |
| When I am worried, earlier experiences make me trust that I will be shown a way out. | .51 |

Factor 2: Something reveals itself

- In difficult situations I trust that a way out will unfold. .81
- In solving my problems I am sometimes struck by the fact that things just fall into place. .74
- In difficult situations I open myself to solutions that arise. .72

An estimate of internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha coefficient) was 0.78 for factor 1 and 0.70 for factor 2. The items of the first factor refer to an active agent that is present and reveals, presents and shows something. The formulation makes it possible to imagine this agent as a more or less personal God. The items of the second factor seem to refer to opening oneself to fate, or the laws of the cosmos. The agent is absent and something reveals itself.

Validity

We performed three analysis to gain more insight into the precise meaning of the two receptivity factors. First we correlated the two factors with Pargament’s three religious coping styles. The correlations are in line with our interpretation of the two factors and add to our understanding of the receptivity subscales (see table 7).

Table 7: *Correlations between receptivity and the other religious coping styles*

| | Deferring | Collaborative | Self-directing |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| Receptive-agent | .44** | .47** | -.51** |
| Receptive-no agent | .18 | .18 | -.18 |
| Receptive-total | .41** | .43** | -.46** |

N = 113; **p* < .05; ***p* < .01

We see that receptive-agent is associated with the other religious coping styles (deferring and collaborative), in which a personal God is addressed, and receptive-no agent is not.

Secondly, to gain more information about the precise meaning of the two receptivity scales we correlated them with four other measures: religiosity, psychological well-being, basic trust and commitment to the transcendent.

As in the research of Hutsebaut and Neyrinck, we measured the degree

of religiosity with a seven-point Likert-type question, 'How religious are you?'

Psychological well-being was measured on a psychological scale, the ZBV. The ZBV is a self-examination questionnaire that is used to determine the degree of anxiety felt. This questionnaire is the Dutch version of Spielberger's State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) (Van der Ploeg, Defares & Spielberger, 1980). The ZBV consists of two separate questionnaires which measure two distinct concepts of anxiety, state anxiety and trait anxiety. As we were interested in long-term rather than short-term effects we opted for the Trait Anxiety scale. This scale consists of twenty statements like 'I feel fine' and 'I feel nervous and agitated'. Ten statements are symptomatically positive and ten are symptomatically negative in their formulation. The response alternatives are: 'hardly ever', 'sometimes', 'often' and 'nearly always'. One can score 1, 2, 3, or 4 points per item. A principal component analysis was carried out on the items. A scree test pointed to a one-component solution. This two-tailed factor could be interpreted as anxiety versus good feeling. Two items, loading less than .40, were removed from the analysis ('I lack self-confidence' and 'I am a calm person'). Eighteen items were then used to compute the Anxiety scale. The scores on the positively formulated items were reversed. The scale was internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha coefficient = 0.88). The scores can range from 18 to 72. The mean score was 34.4 (SD: 7.10).

Erikson's concept of basic trust versus basic mistrust was measured with a combination of instruments. The participants completed a total of 30 items. All items were scored on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = never; 2 = seldom; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = always). A principal component analysis was carried out on these items. A scree test plot pointed to a one-component solution. Twelve items loaded less than .40 on this component and were removed from the analysis. The remaining 18 items were used to construct the Basic Trust scale, in which scores of basic mistrust items were reversed. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.87; mean was 66 on item-level 3.67 (i.e. close to 'often').

Commitment to the transcendent was measured by twelve items from the Spirituality Inventory constructed by Luchtmeijer, Verbiest and Wouters (2001). All items were scored on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = never; 2 = seldom; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = always). A principal component analysis was carried out on these items. A scree test plot pointed to a one-component solution. One item ('I believe there is a transcendent dimension') only loaded 0.17 on this factor. The remaining 11 items loaded at least 0.40. These eleven items were used to construct the Commitment

to the Transcendent scale. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.95; mean was 32.20 on item-level 2.93 (= 'sometimes').

When we relate these scales to the religious coping scales, we get the following results that underline the discriminatory validity of our scales (see table 8).

Table 8: *Correlations between religious coping styles and religiosity, anxiety, basic trust and commitment to the transcendent*

| | Religiosity | Anxiety | Basic Trust | Transcendent |
|--------------------|-------------|---------|-------------|--------------|
| Receptive-total | .32** | -.24* | .44** | .51** |
| Receptive-agent | .39** | -.14 | .30** | .54** |
| Receptive-no agent | .05 | -.35** | .55** | .25* |
| Deferring | .54** | -.07 | .08 | .56** |
| Collaborative | .66** | -.08 | .11 | .70** |
| Self-directing | -.67** | .07 | -.10 | -.65** |

N = 113; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Receptive-no agent is most clearly negatively related to anxiety and positively to basic trust. It is not related to religiosity and less clearly than receptive-agent to transcendence. Receptive-agent is most clearly related to transcendence and to religiosity, but is also related to basic trust. There is no relation with anxiety. The pattern of the deferring and collaborative relationships with the other variables is the same. The correlations with self-directing are in the opposite direction. This is in line with the correlations between these religious problem-solving styles.

A final and third way to gain more insight into the meaning of the receptivity scales is a comparison between the scores of the theology and psychology students (known group validity). These differences indicate that the former are more inclined to cope with problems in a deferring (mean scores 1.82 vs. 1.34) ($F = 16, 161$; sig.: 0.000; $\eta^2 = 0.13$; $N = 113$), collaborative (mean scores 2.58 vs. 1.61) ($F = 22.916$; sig.: 0.000; $\eta^2 = 0.17$; $N = 113$) and receptive-agent (mean scores 3.54 vs. 3.20) ($F = 6.435$; sig.: 0.013; $\eta^2 = 0.06$; $N = 113$) manner. Psychology students are more inclined to cope with problems in a self-directing way (theology 3.35 versus psychology 4.19) ($F = 16.681$; sig.: 0.000; $\eta^2 = 0.13$; $N = 113$). The scores on receptive-no agent do not differ significantly (mean scores theology students versus psychology students: 3.83 vs. 3.84). Again it is evident that the receptive-agent scale (favoured by theology students) is more associated with religiosity than the receptive-no agent scale. It should

also be noted that the psychology students' most commonly used ways of coping are self-directive and receptive-no agent (a largely nonreligious coping pattern). Theology students typically cope in a receptive-no agent and receptive-agent style. The later is a more religious coping style, but direct reference to a personal God (deferring and collaborative) is not popular.

CONCLUSIONS

In the introduction we said that the receptivity scale tries to bridge the gap between religious coping with reference to a personal God, as measured by Pargament's religious coping style scales, and ways of coping which, while not specifically referring to God, can still be called religious. The items we developed seem to serve this purpose well: in research both in Flanders and in the Netherlands the scale related positively to commitment to the transcendent. The research by Hutsebaut and Neyrinck pointed out that receptivity relates positively to approaches to religion in which the symbolic dimension plays an important part: both symbolic and receptive thinking seems to demand a certain kind of openness in imagining the transcendent. In the research of Alma, Pieper and Van Uden, in which the longer, 8-item version of the Receptivity scale was used, it was found that this scale consisted of two subscales: one referring indirectly to an *agent* who helps in coping with problems, and another referring to an attitude of trust without feeling helped by an agent. Receptive-agent relates positively to religiosity and to the deferring and collaborative coping styles, in which the person feels helped by God. It relates negatively to the self-directing scale, which can hardly be called a *religious* coping scale. Receptive-no agent, however, does not relate significantly to any of the items mentioned. It relates positively to basic trust and to commitment to the transcendent. We can conclude that this coping style is less clearly religious in a traditional sense of belief in God than receptive-agent, but it still differs from basic trust in its positive relationship with a conception of transcendence. It relates negatively to anxiety. This negative relationship is interesting, because the other styles of religious coping do not relate to anxiety. From this we conclude that the attitudes of basic trust and trust in a personal God entail different degrees of relating to the transcendent in times of trouble. Receptive-agent comes closer to belief in God, receptive-no agent comes closer to, but is not the same as, basic trust in general. In order to get a clearer view on receptivity, we will conduct further research into these two pillars of our bridge over troubled water.

REFERENCES

- Alferi, S.M., Culver, J.L., Carver, C.S., Arena, P.L. & Antoni, M.H. (1999). Religiosity, religious coping, and distress. A prospective study of Catholic and Evangelical Hispanic women in treatment for early-stage breast cancer. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 4, 343-356.
- Alma, H.A., Pieper, J.Z.T. & Uden, M.H.F. van (2003). When I find myself in times of trouble: Pargament's religious coping scales in the Netherlands. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, 24, 64-74.
- Carver, C.S., Scheier, M.F. & Weintraub, J.K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 267-283.
- Folkman, S., Lazarus, R.S., Dunkel-Schetter, C., DeLongis, A. & Gruen, R.J. (1986). Dynamics of a stressful encounter: cognitive appraisal, coping, and encounter outcomes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50-5, 992-1003.
- Koenig, H.G., Cohen, H.J., Blazer, D.G., Pieper, C., Meador, K.G., Shelp, F., Goli, V. & DiPasquale, B. (1992). Religious coping and depression among elderly, hospitalized medically ill men. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 149, 1693-1700.
- Luchtmeijer, G., Verbiest, K. & Wouters, I. (2001). *Spiritualiteit, een bepaling van het concept: Een zoektocht naar eenheid in de veelheid*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Louvain.
- Pargament, K.I., Kennell, J., Hathaway, W., Grevengoed, N., Newman, J. & Jones, W. (1988). Religion and the problem-solving process: Three styles of coping. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 27, 90-104.
- Pargament, K.I., Koenig, H.G. & Perez, L.M. (2000). The many methods of religious coping: development and initial validation of the RCOPE. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 56-4, 519-543.
- Pargament, K.I., Smith, B.W., Koenig, H.G. & Perez, L.M. (1998). Patterns of positive and negative religious coping with major life stressors. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37, 710-724.
- Parker, G.B. & Brown, L.B. (1982). Coping behaviors that mediate between life events and depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 39, 1386-1391.
- Ploeg, H.M. van der, Defares, P.B. & Spielberger, C.D. (1980). *Handleiding bij de Zelf-Beoordelingsvragenlijst*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Suls, J., David, J.P. & Harvey J.H. (1996). Personality and coping. Three generations of research. *Journal of Personality*, 64-4, 711-735.
- Wong-McDonald, A. (2000). Surrender to God: an additional coping style. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 28, 149-162.

Marinus H.F. van Uden, Professor of Clinical Psychology of Religion, Theological Faculty of the University of Tilburg and University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

Joseph Z.T. Pieper, Assistant Professor in Psychology of Religion, Theological Faculty of the University of Utrecht and Catholic University Utrecht, The Netherlands.

Hans A. Alma, Professor of Psychology and Life's Meaning, University for Humanistics (Utrecht) and Leiden University, The Netherlands.

Address for correspondence: Prof.dr. Marinus H.F. van Uden, University of Nijmegen, Department of Cultural and Personality Psychology, Montessorilaan 3; P.O. Box 9104, NL 6500 HE Nijmegen; The Netherlands.