

Kamden Strunk, Department of Theology
and
Geoffrey W. Sutton, Department of Behavioral Sciences
Evangel University, Springfield, MO

Holy Spirit Baptism and Christian Empowerment: Community Expectations and Perceived Performance

ABSTRACT

The relationship between the Holy Spirit Baptism, Christian character and empowerment, and other demographic factors was investigated. The measures used were the Evangelism Effectiveness scale, which was developed for this study, and the Spiritual Assessment Inventory, which has 6 subscales. These measures were taken both by self-report and by peer-report. The results indicated significant correlation with gender, college classification, and with Holy Spirit Baptism and the measures used. The results also indicated significant interaction effects in 2 x 2 ANOVA's. A multiple regression analysis also found that all three variables significantly contributed to the model. The findings partially supported the hypothesis that those who have received the Holy Spirit Baptism would score significantly higher on the measures than would those who have not.

There is a large segment of modern Christianity associated with the Pentecostal movement. Common among Pentecostals is the belief in the Baptism in the Holy Spirit (HSB). The Assemblies of God hold the belief that the HSB is an experience subsequent to salvation, which empowers the believer to be an effective witness for Christ as well as to live a successful Christian life.¹ Another very large Pentecostal denomination is the Church of God in Christ. They also believe in the HSB and cite it as a "gift bestowed upon the believer for the purpose of equipping and empowering the believer, making him a more effective witness for service in the world."² Both the General Council and Church of God in

¹ General Council of the Assemblies of God, *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit: The Initial Experience and Continuing Evidences of the Spirit-filled Life* (2000), retrieved from http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position_Papers/pp_4185_spirit-filled_life.cfm.

² Church of God in Christ, Inc. *The Doctrines of the Church of God in Christ*, retrieved from <http://www.cogic.org/dctrn.htm>.

Christ statements cite Jesus' statement that his followers would "receive power" after the Holy Spirit came upon them to be "witnesses" (Acts 1:8). Although the belief in this power is commonly held, it has barely even been researched. Also, little research exists on the main issue related to the HSB, which is empowerment.³

However, researchers have focused their attention on the relationship between spirituality and various life issues. Some research has established a connection between religiosity and pro-social behaviors.⁴ Dodds found a significant relationship between having a relationship with the Holy Spirit and different positive personality attributes.⁵ However, these results are somewhat questionable due to the lack of empirical data. The relationship between religious behavior, spirituality, and what one might call an empowered life, marked by a mature spiritual life, still finds well-grounded support in other research. Marks, et. al. found a significant relationship between religious behaviors and longevity among African-Americans.⁶ Their study indicated an average of a 13 year advantage in longevity for those demonstrating religious behaviors compared with those who did not. Researchers have also suggested a relationship between level of religious commitment and overall life satisfaction.⁷ Trice found that, among a sample of Pentecostal Christians, the more orthodox a person was in his or her religious beliefs, the less depression that person reported.⁸ Interestingly, the same study also found that, overall, Pentecostals had somewhat higher depression scores than the previously recorded population mean.⁹ Also, Koenig, et al. found that major depression rates were significantly higher among Pentecostals than the population of middle-aged and older adults.¹⁰ However,

³ Fee, J. L., and J.A. Ingram, "Correlation of the Holy Spirit Questionnaire with the Spiritual Well-Being Scale and the Spiritual Assessment Inventory," *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 32 (2004), 104-114.

⁴ Saroglou, V., I. Pichon, and L. Trompette, "Prosocial Behavior and Religion: New Evidence Based on Projective Measures and Peer Ratings," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 44 (2005), 323-348.

⁵ Dodds, L. A., "The Role of the Holy Spirit in Personality Growth and Change," *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 19 (1999), 129-139.

⁶ Marks, L., O. Nesteruk, M. Swanson, B. Garrison, and T. Davis, "Religion and Health among African Americans: A Qualitative Examination," *Research on Aging* 27 (2005), 447-474.

⁷ Maton, K. I., and J. Rappaport, "Empowerment in a Religious Setting: A Multivariate Investigation," *Prevention in Human Services* 3 (1984), 37-72.

⁸ Trice, P. D., "Pentecostal Beliefs Concerning the Causes and Treatments of Depression," *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering* 64:3-B (2003), 1510.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Koenig, H. G., L. K. George, K. G. Meador, & D. G. Blazer, "Religious Affiliation and Psychiatric Disorder among Protestant Baby Boomers," *Hospital and Community Psychiatry* 45 (1994), 586-596.

these studies all fail to address the issue of the relationship between HSB and empowerment. All of these studies focused on the difference between nonbelievers and believers. However, HSB is commonly held to be a separate experience from the initial Christian experience of salvation, and one that not all Christians claim to have experienced.

One primary issue in evaluating the effects of the empowerment by the HSB is to operationally define empowerment. One common definition of empowerment is primarily becoming an effective witness.¹¹ This definition holds that a person baptized in the Holy Spirit will be better at sharing their faith with non-Christians than will a person without the Baptism. Another definition found both in the General Council and the Church of God in Christ position papers is that the Baptism will make a person more able to live and exhibit a Christian lifestyle, which includes a closer relationship with God and a higher level of obedience to Him and His commands.

Little empirical research exists on the subject of HSB. Much has been written on the subject, but the bulk of this material is comprised of opinion and theoretical materials.¹² An article written by Ingram created a theoretical model for the psychological components of the Baptism experience and their long term effects.¹³ Ingram concluded that the person and work of the Holy Spirit are issues which should be addressed in counseling with Christians. One study by McGraw suggested that people experiencing charismatic phenomena, such as speaking in tongues, commonly associated with HSB, tend to have higher self-actualizing tendencies, higher perception of their ability to reach a community, and a more definite sense of purpose.¹⁴ This study did not look specifically at the HSB, but rather just at charismatic experiences in general. Fee and Ingram examined the relationship between knowledge of the Holy Spirit, measured by their Holy Spirit Questionnaire, and spiritual well being.¹⁵ This study did not specifically examine any relationships with HSB. A study by Poloma & Pendleton used 1725 Assemblies of God adherents as participants and found that the ecstatic religious experiences (such as speaking in tongues, prophecy, and divine healing) were strongly correlated with evangelistic activities, and that frequent bible reading

¹¹ General Council, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*; Church of God in Christ, *Doctrines*.

¹² Decker, E. E., "The Holy Spirit in Counseling: A Review of Christian Counseling Journal Articles," *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 21 (2002), 21-28.

¹³ Ingram, J. A., "Psychological Aspects of the Filling of the Holy Spirit: A Preliminary Model of Post-Redemptive Personality Functioning," *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 24 (1996), 104-113.

¹⁴ McGraw, M. A., "How Christian Spiritual Practices and Charismata Influence Perceptions of Workplace Outcomes and the Ability to Attain a Sense of Purpose and Become Self-Actualizing," *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering* 66:5-B (2005), 2866.

¹⁵ Fee and Ingram, "Correlation of the Holy Spirit," 104-114.

was a strong predictor of these religious experiences.¹⁶ Although the researchers did look at specifically Pentecostal churches and experiences common to them, they still did not look directly at the question of HSB. Craker opined that most Christians view God as a person (personified in Christ) and thus the interaction between God and man is not only available for research, but necessary.¹⁷

There is a clear lack of research on the issue of the effect of experiencing HSB. As the Pentecostal movement continues worldwide it is only reasonable to investigate the possible advantages this experience may offer a Christian. Some would argue that theology has no place in psychology,¹⁸ but if a person's beliefs affect (as the research has shown that they do) a person's emotional state, then it is important to research and understand the relationship.¹⁹ This area of research is important for other reasons as well. If it is true that people who have experienced HSB become more empowered people, better able to reach non-Christians, and have closer relationships with God, then researching the topic can only bring more credibility to the Pentecostal movement. If there is no significant relationship, perhaps it would be prudent for the leaders of the Pentecostal movement to reassess their doctrinal emphases. This study will serve as an initial investigation of possible relationships between HSB and measures of spirituality.

My first study sought to investigate any correlation between the Baptism in the Holy Spirit and self- and peer-perceptions of Christian empowerment and spiritual development. My hypothesis was that those who have received HSB will score significantly higher on measures of Christian spiritual development and effectiveness in evangelism than will those who have not.

¹⁶ Poloma, M. M., and B. F. Pendleton, "Religious Experiences, Evangelism, and Growth Within the Assemblies of God," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28 (1989), 415-431.

¹⁷ Craker, W. D., "The Holy Spirit and Human Personality," *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 4 (1976), 269-279.

¹⁸ Walters, O. S., "Psychodynamics and the Holy Spirit," *Journal of Religion and Health* 10 (1971), 246-255.

¹⁹ Kilian, M. K., "The Relationship between Unipolar Depression and Religiosity: Towards a Multidimensional Assessment of Religious Functioning," *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 65:10-B (2005), 5046; Paek, E. S. K., "The Role of Religiosity in Emotional Intelligence: An Empirical Study of Christians," *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering* 65:3-B (2004), 1599; Whitcomb, J. F., "Religiosity and Other Selected Variables as Predictors of Current and Retrospective Depression Scores," *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 63:10-A (2003), 3488.

Study 1

Method

Participants

Participants were volunteers from a small Midwestern university. The age range of participants was from 18 to 30 years ($M = 19.83$, $SD = 2.12$). The sample included 30 men and 82 women. There were 89 participants who had received the HSB and 23 participants who had not. Of those who had received HSB, the range of how long it had been since they received it was 0.1 to 14 years ($M = 6.55$, $SD = 3.56$). Eighty-six participants reported that they were Assemblies of God, 5 that they were Baptist, and 20 were other Christian denominations. Forty-three participants were freshmen, 32 were sophomores, 24 were juniors, and 13 were seniors.

Materials

The materials consisted of a demographics form, a short questionnaire about HSB, and two measures. The demographics form asked for information about classification, age, ethnicity, gender, and religious affiliation. The questionnaire about HSB asked the participant whether they had received HSB, if so, how long ago they had received it, and if not, whether or not they believed in this experience. The first measure was the Evangelism Effectiveness Scale (EES) developed for the purpose of this study. This measure is a ten-item scale on which the participants mark on a line how strongly they agree or disagree with the ten statements. The responses are scored by measuring how far from the endpoint of the scale the participant has marked their line. Two of the ten items are reverse-scored to offset any positive or negative answering bias. In a pilot study, the reliability of the scale was calculated at $\alpha = .85$. Item-to-item inter-correlations ranged from .04 to .96. The other measure was the Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI) which was developed by Hall & Edwards (2002). The SAI is a 54 item measure using a 5 point Likert-type scale with alpha levels of .83 or higher. This measure has six subscales: acceptance, disappointment, realistic acceptance, instability, grandiosity, and impression management. The acceptance subscale includes statements such as, "I have a sense of how God is working in my life." The disappointment subscales includes statements such as, "There are times when I feel disappointed with God." The realistic acceptance subscale was formed by follow-up statements to the disappointment scale such as, "When this happens, I still have the sense that God will always be with me." The instability subscale included statements such as, "I feel I have to please God or he might reject me." The impression management subscale included statements such as, "I am always as kind at home as I am at church." Finally, the grandiosity subscale included statements such as, "God understands that my needs are more important than most people's."

Participants were also given a packet to have a peer, roommate, or colleague fill out about them. These packets were matched by number only and not by name. These packets included the same dependant measures, but the

measures were modified to make the questions about the participant. For example, instead of “I feel that I am...” the question would be changed to read “He/she seems to feel that he/she is...” I took out all questions from the impression management subscale on the SAI for the peer packets because they did not make sense for a peer to rate. These packets were used to gain a different perspective of the participant’s level of spiritual development and effectiveness in evangelism than self-report alone could provide.

Procedure

University participants were asked to come to specified locations for the study. They signed an informed consent form, in which they were told that the purpose of the study was to study factors affecting Christian empowerment. The measures were counterbalanced to control for order effects. The participants then filled out the packets and left them with the researcher. The participants also took the corresponding packet with them to have a peer or colleague fill out about them. Their peer then filled out the packet and returned it directly to the researcher. In cases where participants were to receive extra credit for a course for their participation, the peer signed across the seal of the envelope holding their responses and the participant returned the packet in order to receive a voucher for extra credit. This was done to encourage a high rate of return for these packets and to ensure the confidentiality of the peer’s responses.

Results

I first ran descriptive statistics, which indicated some mean differences on each group.²⁰ Because I collected data both from the participant and from a peer, I ran dependent samples t-tests and Pearson’s correlations between the self-report scales and the peer-report scales. Of the 113 total participants, 86 returned the packet their peer filled out. All self-report measures were significantly correlated ($p < .05$) to their peer-report counterparts with the exception of the disappointment subscale which was marginally significant ($p = .065$). All p values ranged from less than .001 to .026, with the exception of the disappointment subscale noted above. It seems, then, that self-perceived and peer-perceived levels of Christian empowerment tend to vary together for this sample.

Of the demographic information collected, gender, college classification, and denomination were the only demographic factors significantly related to the measures. Age was not significantly correlated with any measures, nor was ethnicity. Gender was significantly related by self-report to the EES ($p = .001$), the acceptance subscale ($p = .004$), the impression management subscale ($p =$

²⁰ The mean score by self-report on the Evangelism Effectiveness Scale was 64.24 ($SD = 13.82$). For the Spiritual Assessment Inventory subscales by self-report, the means were 3.70 ($SD = .70$) for acceptance, 4.16 ($SD = .69$) for realistic acceptance, 2.71 ($SD = .87$) for disappointment, 1.65 ($SD = .53$) for grandiosity, 2.22 ($SD = .72$) for instability, and 2.86 ($SD = .73$) for impression management. The mean score by peer-report on the EES was 68.44 ($SD = 16.74$). For the SAI subscales by peer-report, the means were 3.88 ($SD = .65$) for acceptance, 4.17 ($SD = .67$) for realistic acceptance, 2.41 ($SD = .93$) for disappointment, 2.20 ($SD = .79$) for grandiosity, and 1.85 ($SD = .73$) for instability.

.014), by peer-report the EES ($p < .001$), the acceptance subscale ($p = .007$), and the realistic acceptance subscale ($p < .001$). In all cases where a significant relationship existed with gender, the mean was higher among women. Due to the unequal sample size between men and women, I also ran a supplementary data analysis. Because there were 30 men and 82 women, I randomly removed 52 women from the database in order to determine if the difference would still be significant for equal sample sizes. In this supplementary analysis, all of the relationships mentioned above remained the same with the exception of the acceptance scale by self-report, which was no longer significant ($p = .107$).

In an ANOVA analysis, college classification was significantly related to the EES by self-report ($p = .001$), the acceptance subscale by self-report ($p = .006$), and the instability scale by peer-report ($p = .003$). The disappointment subscale by peer-report was marginally significant ($p = .027$). In all cases where a significant relationship existed with classification existed, it was a negative relationship. In other words, seniors scored lower than juniors, juniors lower than sophomores, and sophomores lower than freshman.

For the purpose of examining the relationship of denomination to the dependant measures, I assigned each participant to one of two groups: Assemblies of God or other. I did this because of the extremely low numbers of non-Assemblies of God participants. I then ran a one-tailed t-test and found marginally significant differences between denominations for the realistic acceptance scale by self-report ($p = .023$) as well as the disappointment subscale by self-report ($p = .029$). In both cases, Assemblies of God participants scored higher than non-Assemblies of God participants.

I then moved on to examine my main quasi-independent variable, which was HSB. Among those who had received the HSB, the mean score on the EES by self-report was 64.66 ($SD = 13.89$). Among those who had not received the HSB, the mean was 61.47 ($SD = 12.75$). For the SAI, those with the HSB scored a mean of 3.75 ($SD = .63$) while those without it scored a mean of 3.44 ($SD = .85$) on the acceptance subscale. For the realistic acceptance subscale, those with the HSB scored a mean of 4.23 ($SD = .61$) while those without it scored a mean of 3.83 ($SD = .87$). For the disappointment subscale, those with the HSB scored a mean of 2.75 ($SD = .89$) while those without it scored a mean of 2.63 ($SD = .80$). For the grandiosity subscale, those with the HSB scored a mean of 1.67 ($SD = .52$) while those without it scored a mean of 1.53 ($SD = .54$). For the instability subscale, those with the HSB scored a mean of 2.26 ($SD = .76$) while those without it scored a mean of 2.13 ($SD = .58$). Finally, on the impression management subscale those with the HSB scored a mean of 2.89 ($SD = .69$) while those without it scored a mean of 2.72 ($SD = .85$).

Due to the extremely unbalanced sample sizes between those who had received HSB and those who had not, I set significance at $p < .01$. I ran one-tailed independent samples t-tests to determine if any significant relationships exist. The relationship between HSB and the EES by self-report was not significant ($p = .161$), and the relationship to the EES by peer-report was also not significant ($p = .485$). There was a significant relationship, however, between HSB and the

realistic acceptance scale by self-report ($p = .007$). The acceptance scale by self-report was marginally significant in its relationship to HSB ($p = .027$).

The number of participants who had received HSB and those who had not was extremely unbalanced, so I ran supplementary analysis with some of those who had received HSB randomly deleted to equalize the sample sizes. For the equalized samples, I ran one-tailed t -tests and found significant relationships with the acceptance subscale by self-report ($p = .005$) and the realistic acceptance scale by self-report ($p = .004$). There was also marginal significance in the relationship between HSB and the EES by self-report ($p = .02$), the grandiosity subscale by self-report ($p = .023$), and the impression management subscale ($p = .05$). This suggests that were the sample sizes more equal, the mean differences might be more statistically significant.

I then ran a 2×2 ANOVA with gender and HSB as the quasi-independent variables and found a significant interaction ($p = .005$, $\eta^2 = .169$) with the acceptance subscale by self-report. I also found marginally significant interaction effects with the impression management subscale by self-report ($p = .046$, $\eta^2 = .097$) and the acceptance subscale by peer-report ($p = .065$, $\eta^2 = .122$).

Finally, based on the intercorrelations, I explored the contributions of HSB, gender, and class standing to explaining the variance in the self-reported acceptance subscale. I ran a multiple regression analysis and found all three significantly contributed to the model ($R = .422$, $R^2 = .178$, $R^2_{adj} = .155$, $p < .001$). See Table 3 for the regression weights.

Discussion

The first issue which I designed my study to control for was the fundamental problem with self-reported measures: they are simply what the participant perceives about him/herself. To attempt to control for this possible issue I requested self-reported data and peer-reported data from each participant and achieved a relatively high return rate for the peer-reported data. There were significant correlations between self-perceptions and peer-perceptions for the EES and all but one subscale of the SAI. Not all correlations which were significant by self-report were significant by peer-report, but this can be explained by the higher variance levels on the peer-reported measures. Thus, it appears that the self-report issue was not a problem for the purposes of this study.

My hypothesis was that those who had received HSB would score significantly higher on measures of evangelism effectiveness Christian empowerment, and Christian character. This hypothesis was partially supported by the data. There does appear to be some relationship between HSB and some subscales of the SAI, but no detectable relationship between HSB and the EES. However, there are mean differences on every measure consistent with the hypothesis but none of these differences are statistically significant. Perhaps a larger sample size with equal group sizes would yield significance.

I also found several relationships I had not anticipated. Gender was strongly related to several the dependant variables, with women consistently scoring higher than men. Granted, there were highly uneven group sizes, but when I attempted to compensate for this difference by removing some women from the data, gender was still strongly related to the dependant variables. It seems that college-age women are more likely to score higher on measures of Christian empowerment and evangelism effectiveness than are men. More research needs to be done to determine the exact nature and possible causes of this relationship.

I also discovered a significant relationship between students at this particular Pentecostal university's class rank and some measures. Because this was an inverse relationship, the data suggest that the more advanced a person is at this particular university, the lower they will score on these measures of empowerment and evangelism effectiveness. This university has a stated mission of integrating faith and life, and students are required to take classes designed to enhance biblical knowledge and spiritual development. In discussing this issue with university officials and faculty, many theoretical explanations were offered such as dissonance, measurement error, and even that the inverse correlation could be a result of unmeasured spiritual growth. However, given the mission of the university and the importance they place upon it, more empirical investigations should be done to explore whether these theoretical explanations are viable or not.

With respect to the main goal of my research, to examine the relationship between HSB and evangelism effectiveness, Christian spiritual development, and empowerment, the results are simply not clear enough to draw any final conclusion. Clearly, between-groups differences on self-perceived and peer-perceived measures do exist, but the extent and importance of these differences were not entirely clear given the limitations of this study. It is essential that more research be done on this subject with larger sample sizes, more diverse populations, and possibly different dependant measures.

There are several threats to internal validity with this study. First, the sample was entirely from a small Pentecostal university which may have affected their responses to questions of spirituality. Also, participants were asked to take a packet with them for a peer to fill out. Many participants did not return their peer packet at all, and these packets were not taken in a controlled environment. Also, even when the peer filled the packet out, the peer may have felt inclined to answer in such a way as to make the participant look better than they actually are. The same threat to internal validity exists in participant responses because they are entirely by self-report.

There are also threats to external validity associated with this study. First, the participants were from a Pentecostal university, so their ideas about HSB were likely affected by their education at this university. For this reason, the results of this study may not hold true for other populations. Also, due to the limited sample size, it is difficult to generalize any results to the larger population with confidence.

Study 2

The results of the first study were not totally consistent with the original model I sought to examine, which was the mainstream Pentecostal doctrine. While differences in perceptions were evident, I wanted to examine a possible explanation for some of the data. As a result, I ran a second study to seek another possible explanation in the form of expectations. Past research has shown a clear link between expectation and performance in various studies (Erez & Isen, 2002). Research has also indicated a link between expectancy and self-prediction and an increase in self-defeating behavior (Dickmann, Galinsky, & Tenbrunsel, 2003). As a result, I examined expectations for differences in the typical expectations for a Spirit-baptized Christian and a non-Spirit-baptized Christian. My hypothesis was that participants would have significantly higher expectations of the typical Spirit-baptized Christian versus a non-Spirit-baptized Christian. I also hypothesized that the expectation of the typical Spirit-baptized Christian would be significantly higher than their actual self- and peer-perceptions in Study 1 in terms of spiritual development and evangelism effectiveness.

Method

Participants

Participants were volunteers from a small Midwestern university. The age range of participants was from 18 to 23 years. The sample included 9 men and 41 women. 24 participants were freshmen, 14 were sophomores, 6 were juniors, and 6 were seniors.

Materials

The materials consisted of an informed consent form, a demographics form, and two measures. The demographics form asked for information about college classification, age, ethnicity, gender, and religious affiliation. The two measures were modified versions of the peer-report measures from Study 1. The first was the Evangelism Effectiveness Scale and the second was the Spiritual Assessment Inventory. A more detailed description of these measures may be found above in the materials section of Study 1.

Procedure

Participants were asked to come to specified locations at assigned times to complete the materials. First, participants were given an informed consent form. Once these were collected, the materials were passed out. After filling out the materials packet, they returned the packet to the researcher and were allowed to sign up for course credit in any courses which may offer credit for participation.

Results

First, I examined the possible effect of extraneous variables. Previous participation was not related to any of the measures, with the exception of the grandiosity subscale ($p = .013$). Because of this, I did not report any other correlations with the grandiosity subscale. I also examined the effect of the

participants' status in terms of Spirit Baptism and found no significant relationships, indicating that the participants own Spirit Baptism was unlikely to be a factor in their ratings of the experimental prompt. Gender, which was a significant predictor in Study 1, was also not related to any of the measures.

I then examined the effect of the experimental prompt on the answers given to the subscales. There was a strong effect on the acceptance subscale, the realistic acceptance subscale, and the Evangelism Effectiveness Scale ($p < .001$). I also ran a MANOVA analysis with all of the dependant measures and the experimental group. The model was statistically significant ($p < .001$), accounting for 30.5% of the variance (using Wilks' Lambda).

Finally, I examined the differences between what the participants expectations were in the experimental study and the perceived performance data in Study 1. Because the data were not from the same individual, I was unable to calculate the statistical differences between expectation and perceived performance, but a simple visual inspection shows quite stark differences. These mean differences are highlighted in Table 4.

Discussion

My main hypothesis that participants would have significantly higher expectations of the typical Spirit-baptized Christian versus a non-Spirit-baptized Christian was supported. My secondary hypothesis regarding the differences between expectations and performance also appears to be supported.

Demographic factors in this study were not significantly related to the measures used. It is therefore able to determine that the experimental prompt affected the way the participant rated the typical person on the measures. Also, the difference was mostly accounted for by the significantly more negative ratings given to the typical non-Spirit-filled person. Thus, it appears that there is a bias against non-Spirit-filled people within this sample.

The university from which the sample was drawn, and its parent denomination, both have strong emphases on the empowerment that Spirit baptism is to bring. Also, their teaching centers mostly on the idea of evangelism effectiveness. For these reasons, it is not at all surprising that the largest difference was found on the EES in terms of expectations. It is also not surprising that students from this university would expect significantly lower spiritual development and evangelism effectiveness from non-Spirit filled people.

General Discussion

The results of Study 1 clearly show that there is a demonstrable relationship between Spirit baptism and empowerment, at least in some respects. Even clearer than this relationship, however, is the fact that what people are expecting Spirit-baptism to accomplish and what it is actually related to are quite different. The students expected evangelism to be most impacted, when it is actually not significantly related to Spirit-baptism. Perhaps this result might explain some of the higher disappointment scores among the Spirit-baptized participants.

The experience of Holy Spirit Baptism is having an effect on the lives of those who receive it. However, it would be easy for this difference to be lost on the recipient given the overemphasis on evangelism effectiveness. Those teaching on the subject with the university and its parent denomination ought to take a second look at what the experience truly changes in the recipient. If they truly feel that evangelism should be affected, then something about their doctrine and the lives of those adhering to it is simply not matching up. It is my contention, however, that this is not the case. There is simply an imbalance in the proclamation of the church on this issue which might lead to feelings of disappointment with God as result.

Future research should address the issue of empowerment from more angles and look at different constructs related to empowerment. Clearly, there is a relationship to be seen. However, my study used only an evangelism effectiveness measure and spiritual development measure (which truly focuses more on spiritual well-being). There is a myriad of potential spirituality and religiosity measures one might use in future research. The experience of Spirit Baptism is playing a role in millions of lives, and as such, needs to be thoroughly investigated by the field of psychology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Church of God in Christ, Inc. (n.d.). *The Doctrines of the Church of God in Christ*. Retrieved March 20, 2006 from <http://www.cogic.org/dctrn.htm>.

Craker, W. D. (1976). The Holy Spirit and human personality. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 4, 269-279.

Decker, E. E. (2002). The Holy Spirit in counseling: A review of Christian counseling journal articles. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 21, 21-28.

Dickmann, K. A., Tebrunsel, A. E., & Galinsky, A. D. (2003). From self-prediction to self-defeat: Behavioral forecasting, self-fulfilling prophecies, and the effect of competitive expectations. *Journal of Personality and Psychology*, 85, 672-683.

Dodds, L. A. (1999). The role of the Holy Spirit in personality growth and change. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 19, 129-139.

Erez, A., & Isen, A. M. (2002). The influence of positive affect on the components of expectancy motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 1055-1067.

Fee, J. L., & Ingram, J. A. (2004). Correlation of the Holy Spirit questionnaire with the spiritual well-being scale and the spiritual assesment inventory. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 32, 104-114.

General Council of the Assemblies of God (2000, August 11). *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit: The initial experience and continuing evidences of the Spirit-filled life*. Retrieved February 27, 2006, from http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position_Papers/pp_4185_spirit-filled_life.cfm.

Hall, T. W. & Edwards, K. J. (2002). The spiritual assessment inventory: A theistic model and measure for assessing spiritual development. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41, 341-357.

Holy Bible: New American Standard Version. (1995). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing Company.

Ingram, J. A. (1996). Psychological aspects of the filling of the Holy Spirit: A preliminary model of post-redemptive personality functioning. *Journal of Psychology & Christianity*, 24, 104-113.

Kilian, M. K. (2005). The relationship between unipolar depression and religiosity: Towards a multidimensional assessment of religious functioning. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 65(10-B), 5046.

- Koenig, H. G., George, L. K., Meador, K. G., & Blazer, D. G. (1994). Religious affiliation and psychiatric disorder among Protestant baby boomers. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 45*, 586-596.
- Maton, K. I., & Rappaport, J. (1984). Empowerment in a religious setting: A multivariate investigation. *Prevention in Human Services, 3*, 37-72.
- Marks, L., Nesteruk, O., Swanson, M., Garrison, B., & Davis, T. (2005). Religion and health among African Americans: A qualitative examination. *Research on Aging, 27*, 447-474.
- McGraw, M. A. (2005). How Christian spiritual practices and charismata influence perceptions of workplace outcomes and the ability to attain a sense of purpose and become self-actualizing. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 66(5-B)*, 2866.
- Paek, E. S. K. (2004). The role of religiosity in emotional intelligence: An empirical study of Christians. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 65(3-B)*, 1599.
- Poloma, M. M., & Pendleton, B. F. (1989). Religious experiences, evangelism, and growth within the Assemblies of God. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 28*, 415-431.
- Saroglou, V., Pichon, I., & Trompette, L. (2005). Prosocial behavior and religion: New evidence based on projective measures and peer ratings. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 44*, 323-348.
- Trice, P. D. (2003). Pentecostal beliefs concerning the causes and treatments of depression. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 64(3-B)*, 1510.
- Walters, O. S. (1971). Psychodynamics and the Holy Spirit. *Journal of Religion and Health, 10*, 246-255.
- Whitcomb, J. F. (2003). Religiosity and other selected variables as predictors of current and retrospective depression scores. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 63(10-A)*, 3488.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Measures by Self-report

| | Have Received Baptism | | Have Not Received Baptism | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------|
| | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| EES | 64.66 | 13.89 | 61.47 | 12.75 |
| SAI - | | | | |
| Acceptance | 3.75 | .63 | 3.44 | .85 |
| Disappointment | 2.75 | .89 | 2.63 | .80 |
| Realistic Acceptance | 4.23 | .6 | 3.83 | .87 |
| Instability | 2.26 | .76 | 2.13 | .58 |
| Impression Management | 2.89 | .69 | 2.72 | .85 |
| Grandiosity | 1.67 | .52 | 1.53 | .54 |

Note. EES is the Evangelism Effectiveness scale. SAI is the Spiritual Assessment Inventory.

Table 2*Means and Standard Deviations of Measures by Peer's Report*

| | Have Received Baptism | | Have Not Received Baptism | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------|
| | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| EES | 68.33 | 17.31 | 68.16 | 15.37 |
| SAI subscales- | | | | |
| <i>Acceptance</i> | 3.89 | .64 | 3.84 | .69 |
| <i>Disappointment</i> | 2.34 | .91 | 2.66 | .98 |
| <i>Realistic Acceptance</i> | 4.17 | .67 | 4.14 | .66 |
| <i>Instability</i> | 1.86 | .77 | 1.83 | .61 |
| <i>Grandiosity</i> | 2.22 | .84 | 2.12 | .63 |

Note. EES is the Evangelism Effectiveness scale. SAI is the Spiritual Assessment Inventory.

Table 3

Summary of Regression Analysis for the Acceptance Subscale by Self-report

| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | β | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|--------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|
| Class | -.150 | .060 | -.224 | -2.497 | .014 |
| Gender | .372 | .139 | .240 | 2.679 | .009 |
| HSB | .320 | .151 | .189 | 2.127 | .036 |

Note. Class refers to the college class standing of the participant in two groups: Underclassmen (freshmen and sophomores) and Upperclassmen (juniors and seniors). HSB refers to whether or not the participant had experience the Baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Table 4

Summary of Mean Differences between Expectations and Perceived Performance

| | Expectations | | Perceived Performance | | Difference | |
|-----------------|--------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|------------|---------|
| | HSB | Non-HSB | HSB | Non-HSB | HSB | Non-HSB |
| EES | 74.67 | 51.57 | 66.72 | 64.82 | 7.95 | -13.25 |
| SAI- | | | | | | |
| <i>Scale A</i> | 3.92 | 2.93 | 3.82 | 3.64 | 0.10 | -0.71 |
| <i>Scale D</i> | 3.17 | 3.70 | 2.55 | 2.65 | 0.62 | 1.05 |
| <i>Scale RA</i> | 4.27 | 3.16 | 4.2 | 3.98 | 0.07 | -0.82 |
| <i>Scale I</i> | 2.33 | 2.43 | 2.06 | 1.98 | 0.27 | 0.45 |
| <i>Scale G</i> | 2.16 | 1.60 | 1.87 | 1.83 | 0.29 | -0.23 |

Note. Perceived Performance reflects the average of self- and peer-perceptions. EES is the Evangelism Effectiveness Scale. SAI is the Spiritual Assessment Inventory with 5 subscales: Scale A is Acceptance, D is Disappointment, RA is Realistic Acceptance, I is Instability, and G is Grandiosity.