


DOI: 10.22363/2313-1683-2025-22-4-635-654

EDN: OSMBZX

UDC 159.9

Research article

Predictors and Correlates of Spiritual Well-Being: The Role of Schwartz's Basic Individual Values

Ivan A. Bakushkin^{1,2}, Regina V. Ershova¹¹ RUDN University, Moscow, Russian Federation² Department of Missionary Work and Youth Affairs of the Kolomna Diocese, Kolomna, Russian Federation ioann_85@mail.ru

Abstract. Spiritual well-being is an important facet of mental health, but its motivational foundations in basic personal values remain poorly understood. The purpose of this study was to examine associations between spiritual well-being and basic individual values identified by S.H. Schwartz on a large Russian-speaking sample. To this end, a cross-sectional online survey conducted in 2024, including 959 persons (females = 79.4%, $M_{age} = 38.6$, $SD = 14.0$). Spiritual well-being was assessed with the *Spiritual Well-Being Scale* (religious and existential subscales), and values were measured with the revised *Portrait Values Questionnaire* (PVQ-R2R). Spearman's correlation analysis and stepwise multivariate linear regression models were used to identify robust value correlates of total spiritual well-being and its components. The participants reported predominantly moderate-to-high spiritual well-being, with religious aspects predominating over existential ones. At the bivariate level, spiritual well-being was most strongly and consistently associated with community- and stability-oriented values (e.g., interpersonal conformity, security, tradition, and universalistic facets) and inversely associated with self-enhancement- and pleasure-oriented values (e.g., power, hedonism, and achievement). In multivariate models, interpersonal conformity emerged as the most stable positive predictor for all the components studied; additional unique negative effects for selected value facets (e.g., components of universalism and achievement) appeared after the shared variance among intercorrelated values had been accounted for. Overall, the findings suggest that spiritual well-being in this context is primarily anchored in relational harmony, prosocial orientation, and preservation motives rather than status- or pleasure-seeking priorities.

Key words: spiritual well-being scale, spiritual well-being, religious well-being, existential well-being, portrait value questionnaire, values, basic individual values

Introduction

Well-being is commonly defined as a favorable evaluation of one's life and functioning and is widely regarded as a key indicator of mental health (Ellison, 1983). Values, in turn, are relatively stable motivational constructs that express

© Bakushkin I.A., Ershova R.V., 2025

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

what individuals consider important and worth striving for and thus guide goal-setting, decision-making, and behavior (Schwartz, 2015). Because values organize life priorities and regulate long-term pursuits, they are a plausible psychological basis of well-being (Schwartz & Sortheix, 2018). Therefore, clarifying this connection is of both theoretical and applied importance.

Shalom H. Schwartz's theory of basic individual values offers a comprehensive account of motivational goals that guide behavior across cultures. Values are organized into a circumplex structure defined by four higher-order dimensions: Self-Transcendence versus Self-Enhancement and Conservation versus Openness to Change. Within this space, more specific value types (e.g., security, conformity, tradition, benevolence, universalism, power, achievement, and hedonism) represent distinct motivational emphases that are nonetheless systematically interrelated (Cieciuch et al., 2014; Schwartz & Cieciuch, 2022).

A vast literature links basic individual values to multiple indicators of well-being — subjective (Schwartz & Sortheix, 2018), emotional (Boer, 2017), hedonic, eudaimonic (Joshani & Ghaedi, 2009), and domain-specific forms of functioning (Bergin, 1991). Empirical research increasingly suggests that values related to growth, self-transcendence, and openness to change tend to promote eudaimonic functioning and psychological flourishing, whereas values emphasizing self-enhancement or anxiety-driven self-protection may be associated with lower well-being, depending on the context and available resources (Bojanowska & Piotrowski, 2021). Recent studies underscore that these associations are not homogeneous but are mediated by personality traits, socio-economic circumstances, and culture, and that values exert their influence especially when they are manifested in everyday behavior (Bojanowska & Kaczmarek, 2022a; Bojanowska & Urbańska, 2021). At the same time, the adaptiveness of specific value dimensions depends on the context. For example, research on motivational self-regulation shows that a focus on prevention tends to be consistent with conservation values and oppose openness to change, whereas a focus on promotion is more strongly associated with openness to change and negatively correlates with some conservation values (Wolfin & Sneddon, 2025).

Emerging intervention research further suggests that helping people translate personally significant values into concrete actions can reliably improve both hedonic and eudaimonic well-being by increasing self-insight, coherence, and meaningful engagement in life (Bojanowska et al., 2022c; Russo-Netzer & Atad, 2024).

Within this broader field, spiritual well-being occupies a distinctive place. In psychology it is typically conceptualized as an individual's experienced sense of meaning and purpose, together with a felt connection to something transcendent or greater than the self. Building on the seminal work that distinguished religious and existential dimensions of spiritual well-being (Ellison, 1983), subsequent research has confirmed its multidimensionality and its role as a central component of overall health and adaptation in diverse groups, including patients with severe illness, older adults, teachers, and organ donors (Gunes et al., 2025; Heidari et al., 2022; Khodarahimi et al., 2021; Liaquat et al., 2013). Spiritual well-being has been shown to correlate with hope, resilience in the face of suffering, and reduced psychological distress, and to function as a resource that supports coping, identity, and meaning-making across cultures (Al-Thani, 2025; Carson et al., 1988; Villani et al., 2019).

Empirical studies examining values and religiosity or spirituality together reveal systematic patterns. Across many cultural contexts, religious involvement and spiritual commitment are positively associated with Conservation values (security, conformity, tradition) and Self-transcendence values (benevolence, some facets of universalism), and negatively associated with Self-enhancement and hedonistic values (Saroglou et al., 2004). These patterns reflect the well-being literature and suggest that religious and spiritual orientations are often consistent with other-focused and stability-oriented motives and conflict with competitive, dominance-oriented, or unrestricted pleasure-seeking orientations (Bojanowska & Piotrowski, 2021; Krishnan & Rahim, 2014).

Despite this growing evidence, the specific associations between spiritual well-being and basic human values remain poorly understood. Existing studies on values and well-being have primarily focused on hedonic and eudaimonic indicators — such as life satisfaction, emotional balance, and psychological flourishing — rather than on spiritual aspects of well-being (Bojanowska & Piotrowski, 2021, Joshanloo & Ghaedi, 2009). However, theoretical accounts of eudaimonia and existential functioning suggest that striving for value-congruent, self-transcendent, and meaning-oriented goals should be especially relevant for spiritual well-being, which centrally encompasses issues of life purpose, coherence, and one’s relationship to transcendent reality (Bojanowska & Piotrowski, 2021; You & Lim, 2019).

Against this background, *the present study* examines spiritual well-being through the lens of Schwartz’s theory of basic individual values (Schwartz, 2006, 2015). Schwartz’s universal typology, which includes ten value categories — security, conformity, tradition, benevolence, universalism, self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, and power — offers a theoretically grounded framework for differentiating value orientations that can either promote or hinder spiritual flourishing. By focusing on spiritual, rather than solely on general subjective or psychological, well-being, this work seeks to clarify the value foundations of spiritual well-being and to contribute to the integration of value theory with contemporary understandings of spirituality and health (Al-Thani, 2025; Ellison, 1983).

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between spiritual well-being and basic individual values, as conceptualized in S.H. Schwartz’s value theory.

Accordingly, the study addresses the following *research question*:

How are different basic value orientations related to overall spiritual well-being and its specific dimensions?

Methods

Research Design and Procedure

This study investigated relationships between spiritual well-being and basic individual values, consistent with previous studies linking spirituality and value orientations to psychological functioning. The study employed a cross-sectional analytical design comparable to recent research on spiritual well-being and psychological outcomes. The data were collected online in 2024 using a structured

self-report questionnaire. Invitations containing a description of the study and a link to the survey were distributed via VKontakte and Telegram on pages and channels targeted at university students, Orthodox Christian communities, and thematic interest groups.

The study protocol complied with ethical standards for psychological research on human participants, including voluntary participation, anonymity, and the right to withdraw without penalty. Informed consent was obtained electronically before completion of the survey.

Participants

A total of 959 respondents completed all the key measures and were included in the analyses (females = 761 (79.4%) males = 198 (20.6%), mean age = 38.6 ± 14 years). Of the participants, 341 (35.6%) were unmarried, 500 (52.1%) were married, and 118 (12.3%) were divorced; 577 (60.2%) had children; 129 (13.5%) had completed secondary education, 203 (21.2%) had secondary vocational education, 45 (4.7%) had incomplete higher education, and 582 (60.7%) had higher education degrees. In terms of religious affiliation, the majority of the participants (87.5%) identified themselves as Christian ($n = 839$). Additional groups included: followers of the Slavic Native Faith ($n = 4$); atheists ($n = 2$); spiritual but unaffiliated (believers in God but not professing any particular religion, $n = 41$); non-religious (not professing any religion, $n = 5$); and others ($n = 15$). This diversity reflects the use of a non-denominational measure of spiritual well-being that has been applied to heterogeneous religious samples.

Measures

Spiritual Well-Being. Spiritual well-being was assessed using the 20-item *Spiritual Well-Being Scale* (SWBS) developed by Paloutzian and Ellison (1982) to differentiate religious and existential dimensions of spiritual well-being. The version used here was adapted into Russian by Bakushkin and Ershova (2025); confirmatory factor analysis supported its two-factor structure in the present context (CFI = 0.88). The items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale from 1 = *Strongly agree* to 6 = *Strongly disagree*, after appropriate reverse scoring where required.

The SWBS yields:

- The *Religious Well-Being Scale* (RWBS), including 10 items, ranging from 0 to 60, indexing the perceived quality of a person's relationship with God (the transcendent dimension). Scores of 10–20 indicate dissatisfaction or tension in the relationship with God, 21–49 reflect moderate religious well-being, and 50–60 represent high religious well-being;

- The *Existential Well-Being Scale* (EWBS), including 10 items, ranging from 0 to 60, indexing perceived life meaning, purpose, and satisfaction independent of explicit reference to a higher power (the immanent dimension). Scores of 10–20 indicate low life satisfaction and an unclear life purpose, 21–49 moderate satisfaction and purpose, and 50–60 high satisfaction and a clear sense of purpose.

A *total spiritual well-being score* (the sum of RWBS and EWBS; ranging from 0 to 120) was also computed. Consistent with previous SWBS studies, total

scores of 20–40 were interpreted as low, 41–99 as moderate, and 100–120 as high spiritual well-being. The SWBS is non-denominational and has been widely used in religious, interfaith, and non-religious populations to capture both religious and existential aspects of spirituality.

Basic individual values. The basic individual values were measured using the revised *Portrait Values Questionnaire, PVQ-R2R* (PVQ-57), based on Schwartz's refined theory of 19 basic human values (Schwartz et al., 2012). The questionnaire consisted of 57 items, with three items representing each value type. The respondents indicated how similar the described person was to themselves on a 6-point scale, ranging from 1 (not at all like me) to 6 (very much like me). The following 19 value dimensions were assessed: Self-Direction: Thought (SDT), Self-Direction: Action (SDA), Stimulation (ST), Hedonism (HE), Achievement (AC), Power: Dominance (POD), Power: Resources (POR), Face (FAC), Security: Personal (SEP), Security: Societal (SES), Tradition (TR), Conformity: Rules (COR), Conformity: Interpersonal (COI), Humility (HUM), Universalism: Concern (UNC), Universalism: Nature (UNN), Universalism: Tolerance (UNT), Benevolence: Caring (BEC), Benevolence: Dependability (BED). The adapted version of the PVQ-R2R demonstrated acceptable overall fit in the present sample ($CFI = 0.903$), consistent with the data on the cross-cultural validity of the refined values model.

Statistical Analysis

All the analyses were conducted in R, version 4.5.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing). *Descriptive statistics* were presented as absolute and relative frequencies for categorical variables, as mean (\pm standard deviation) and median (1st and 3rd quartiles) for continuous variables with symmetric distribution, and as median (1st and 3rd quartiles) otherwise. *Bivariate associations*: associations between quantitative variables were assessed using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient with corresponding 95% confidence intervals. *Multivariable modeling*: a multivariate linear regression model was conducted to identify the most robust set of predictors. The predictor variables were selected via a bidirectional stepwise algorithm based on adjusted R^2 . The initial model for the stepwise procedure was the univariate model demonstrating the highest explanatory power (R^2). The key assumptions of the final linear regression model, including homoscedasticity, independence of residuals, and absence of multicollinearity (assessed using the Variance Inflation Factors, $VIF < 5$), were verified and met. All the tests were two-tailed, and statistical significance was set at ($p < 0.05$).

Results

Spiritual Well-Being Scale

The *Religious Well-Being Scale* (RWBS), reflecting the perceived relationship with God, showed a mean of 49.8 ($SD = 11.9$), with a median of 54 ($Q1 = 47$, $Q3 = 58$). High levels of religious well-being were reported by 68.6% of the participants; 26.6% reported moderate levels and 4.8% reported low levels.

The *Existential Well-Being Scale* (EWBS), reflecting life satisfaction and sense of purpose, showed a mean of 47.0 ($SD = 8.1$), with a median of 48 ($Q1 = 42$, $Q3 = 53$). Moderate existential well-being was the most common (56.4%), while 43.1% of the respondents reported high levels and 0.5% reported low levels.

The *Overall Spiritual Well-Being Scale* (SWBS), calculated from the total score, had a mean of 96.8 ($SD = 16.7$), with a median of 100 ($Q1 = 89$, $Q3 = 109$). High spiritual well-being was observed in 52.5% of the respondents, 47.2% reported moderate levels and 0.3% reported low levels. The descriptive statistics for the SWBS and its subscales are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for the main indicators of the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (N = 959)

Indicators	M (\pm SD)	Median (Q1 Q3)
Spiritual well-being (SWB)	96.8 (\pm 16.7)	100 (89 109)
Religious well-being (RWB)	49.8 (\pm 11.9)	54 (47 58)
Existential well-being (EWB)	47 (\pm 8.1)	48 (42 53)

Table 2 presents the distribution of basic individual values (PVQ-R2R). The respondents' value profile was characterized by a strong emphasis on Self-Transcendence and Conservation, with a comparatively less emphasis on Self-Enhancement and Openness to Change. At the higher-order level, Conservation (C) and Self-Transcendence (ST) showed the highest mean scores, followed by Openness to Change (OC), while Self-Affirmation (A) was the least common.

The most common values (means ≥ 5) were: Universalism: Concern (UNC), Universalism: Nature (UNN), Security: Personal (SEP), Conformity: Interpersonal (COR). Taken together, these scores indicated a pronounced commitment to the well-being of all people and nature, a strong need for personal safety and stability, and a marked tendency to avoid harming or upsetting near and dear ones. The second cluster of relatively important values (means = 4.5–4.9) included: Security: Societal (SES), Universalism: Tolerance (UNT), Conservation (C), Self-Direction: Action (SDA), Self-Direction: Thought (SDT), Tradition (TR), Face (FAC). These patterns suggested a joint prioritization of societal stability and tolerance, along with a qualified endorsement of independent thought and action, respect for traditions, and concern for maintaining one's social image.

The moderately important values (means = 4.0–4.4) were: Humility (HUM), Benevolence: Caring (BEC), Conformity: Rules (COR), Benevolence: Dependability (BED), Openness to Change (OC, composite), Benevolence values were clearly present but somewhat less central than universalism, indicating a somewhat stronger focus on the societal well-being than on exclusive concern for near and dear ones. Overall openness to change was moderate, partly limited by lower scores on stimulation and hedonism.

The least important values (means < 3.5) were: Power: Resources (POR), Power: Dominance (POD), Achievement (AC), Stimulation (ST), Hedonism (HE). These results indicated that social power, dominance, personal success as defined by social standards, and pleasure- or excitement-seeking were relatively unimportant motivators for this group.

Taken together, the findings indicated that the respondents prioritized collective welfare, security, and preservation over power, achievement, and hedonistic or stimulation-oriented pursuits.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics for Schwartz's basic individual values (Portrait Value Questionnaire, PVQ-R2R) (N = 959)

Values	M (\pm SD)	Median (Q1 Q3)
Self-Direction: Thought (SDT)	4.5 (\pm 1)	4.7 (4.0 5.3)
Self-Direction: Action (SDA)	4.6 (\pm 0.9)	4.7 (4.0 5.3)
Stimulation (ST)	3.5 (\pm 0.9)	3.7 (3.0 4.3)
Hedonism (HE)	3.5 (\pm 1.2)	3.7 (2.7 4.3)
Achievement (AC)	3.4 (\pm 1.2)	3.3 (2.7 4.3)
Power: Dominance (POD)	2.6 (\pm 1.2)	2.3 (1.7 3.3)
Power: Resources (POR)	2.5 (\pm 0.1)	2.3 (1.7 3.3)
Face (FAC)	4.4 (\pm 1.1)	4.7 (3.7 5.3)
Security: Personal (SEP)	5.1 (\pm 1.0)	5.3 (4.7 6.0)
Security: Societal (SES)	4.8 (\pm 0.9)	5 (4.3 5.7)
Tradition (TR)	4.5 (\pm 1.1)	4.7 (3.7 5.3)
Conformity: Rules (COR)	4.4 (\pm 1.1)	4.3 (3.7 5.3)
Conformity: Interpersonal (COI)	5.0 (\pm 1.0)	5.3 (4.3 6.0)
Humility (HUM)	4.3 (\pm 1.0)	4.3 (3.7 5.0)
Universalism: Concern (UNC)	5.2 (\pm 0.9)	5.3 (4.7 6.0)
Universalism: Nature (UNN)	5.2 (\pm 0.9)	5.3 (4.7 6.0)
Universalism: Tolerance (UNT)	4.7 (\pm 0.9)	5.0 (4.0 5.3)
Benevolence: Caring (BEC)	4.3 (\pm 1.1)	4.3 (3.7 5.0)
Benevolence: Dependability (BED)	4.2 (\pm 1.0)	4.3 (3.3 5.0)
Openness to Change (OC)	4.0 (\pm 0.7)	4.0 (3.5 4.5)
Self-Affirmation (A)	3.3 (\pm 0.9)	3.2 (2.7 3.8)
Conservation (C)	4.7 (\pm 0.7)	4.7 (4.2 5.1)
Self-Transcendence (ST)	4.6 (\pm 0.7)	4.7 (4.2 5.2)

Table 3 presents the Spearman correlations between the SWBS components (Religious Well-Being, RWB; Existential Well-Being, EWB; total Spiritual Well-Being, SWB) and the 19 PVQ-R2R value scales.

The *Religious Well-Being Scale* (RWBS) correlated positively with several PVQ-R2R value dimensions. The strongest positive correlations (0.50–0.30) were observed for Conformity: Interpersonal (COI), Self-Transcendence (ST), Conservation (C), Personal Security (SEP), and Tradition (TR). Moderate positive correlations (0.35–0.25) emerged with all the three universalistic facets (UNC, UNN, UNT) and Humility (HUM). Weaker but significant positive associations (0.30–0.10) were found with Benevolence: Caring (BEC), Benevolence: Dependability (BED), and Self-Direction: Action (SDA).

In contrast, the RWBS showed strong negative correlations (–0.35 to –0.30) with Power: Dominance (POD), Hedonism (HE), and Self-Affirmation (A), and moderate negative associations (–0.25 to –0.20) with Achievement (AC) and Power: Resources (POR). Small negative correlations were also observed with Openness to Change (OC) and Stimulation (ST).

The *Existential Well-Being Scale* (EWBS) showed a similar but generally weaker pattern. The strongest positive correlations (0.30–0.25) were associated

with Conformity: Interpersonal (COR), Tradition (TR), and Self-Transcendence (ST). Moderate positive correlations (0.28–0.18) were observed for universalistic facets (UNC, UNN, UNT) and Conservation (C). Weaker positive links (0.20–0.10) were found with Benevolence: Caring (BED), Benevolence: Dependability (BED), Personal Security (SEP), Societal Security (SES), and Self-Direction: Action (SDA).

Negative correlations for EWB were moderately strong (–0.22 to –0.16) with Power: Dominance (POD), Power: Resources (POR), and Self-Affirmation (A), and weak (–0.10) with Face (FAC) and Hedonism (HE). Achievement (AC) showed no significant association with EWB.

The pattern for overall Spiritual Well-Being (SWB) largely reflected the combination of its two subcomponents. The strongest positive correlates (0.50–0.30) included Conformity: Interpersonal (COR), Self-Transcendence (ST), Universalism: Nature (UNN), Conservation (C), Personal Security (SEP), and Tradition (TR). Moderate positive associations (0.29–0.25) were observed with Benevolence: Caring (BED), Universalism: Concern (UNC), Universalism: Tolerance (UNT), Conformity: Rules (COR), and Humility (HUM). Weaker positive correlations (0.20–0.10) were found with Benevolence: Dependability (BED), Societal Security (SES), and Self-Direction: Action (SDA).

Higher importance placed on self-enhancement and pleasure-oriented values was associated with lower levels of SWB. The strongest negative correlations (–0.34 to –0.29) were observed for Power: Dominance (POD) and Self-Affirmation (A), followed by moderate negative correlations (–0.25 to –0.19) with Hedonism (HE), Power: Resources (POR), and Achievement (AC).

Taken together, these correlations indicated that SWB in this sample was most strongly anchored in communal, prosocial, and stability-oriented values (Self-Transcendence and Conservation) and inversely related to self-focused, status- and pleasure-oriented values (Self-Enhancement). Values emphasizing openness, novelty, and autonomy showed weak or non-significant associations with spiritual well-being, with the exception of small negative correlations with religious well-being.

Table 4 presents the multivariate regression model for Religious Well-Being (RWB) estimated using stepwise predictor selection and evaluated by adjusted R^2 . The comparison model included only Conformity: Interpersonal (COR) as a predictor; the final model retained COR, Security: Personal (SEP), Universalism: Concern (UNC), Tradition (TR), and Openness to Change (OC). In the final model, RWB was positively predicted by Conformity: Interpersonal ($\beta = 4.49$, 95% CI [3.75, 5.23], $p < 0.001$) and Security: Personal ($\beta = 0.82$, 95% CI [0.12, 1.52], $p = 0.022$). In contrast, Universalism: Concern ($\beta = -1.10$, 95% CI [–1.91, –0.29], $p = 0.008$) and Openness to Change ($\beta = -1.59$, 95% CI [–2.50, –0.68], $p < 0.001$) were significant negative predictors of RWB. Tradition (TR) remained in the final model but did not show a statistically significant unique effect on RWB (see Table 4 for full coefficients and model fit indices).

Table 3

Spearman's rank correlation coefficients with 95% confidence intervals between the main indicators of the *Spiritual Well-Being Scale* and Schwartz's basic individual values (PVQ-R2R) (N = 959)

Variables	Religious Well-being (RWB)	Existential Well-being (EWB)	Spiritual Well-being (SWB)
Self Direction: Thought (SDT)	0.04 [0.03; 0.1]	0.09 [0.03; 0.15]**	0.06 [0; 0.12]
Self Direction: Action (SDA)	0.12 [0.06; 0.18]***	0.1 [0.04; 0.16]**	0.11 [0.04; 0.17]***
Stimulation (ST)	0.08 [-0.14; -0.02]*	0.01 [0.05; 0.07]	0.06 [0.13; 0]
Hedonism (HE)	0.31 [0.36; 0.25]***	0.08 [0.15; 0.02]*	0.25 [0.31; 0.19]***
Achievement (AC)	0.23 [0.28; 0.16]***	0.06 [0.12; 0]	0.19 [0.25; 0.13]***
Power: Dominance (POD)	0.35 [0.4; 0.29]***	0.22 [0.28; 0.16]***	0.34 [0.39; 0.28]***
Power: Resources (POR)	0.23 [0.29; 0.17]***	0.16 [0.22; 0.1]***	0.23 [0.29; 0.17]***
Face (FAC)	0 [0.06; 0.06]	0.1 [0.16; 0.04]**	0.05 [0.11; 0.01]
Security: Personal (SEP)	0.33 [0.28; 0.39]***	0.2 [0.14; 0.26]***	0.32 [0.26; 0.38]***
Security: Societal (SES)	0.14 [0.08; 0.2]***	0.1 [0.03; 0.16]**	0.14 [0.07; 0.2]***
Tradition (TR)	0.29 [0.23; 0.34]***	0.27 [0.21; 0.32]***	0.31 [0.25; 0.36]***
Conformity: Rules (COR)	0.28 [0.22; 0.34]***	0.16 [0.1; 0.22]***	0.26 [0.2; 0.32]***
Conformity: Interpersonal (COI)	0.5 [0.45; 0.55]***	0.3 [0.24; 0.35]***	0.49 [0.44; 0.54]***
Humility (HUM)	0.27 [0.21; 0.33]***	0.15 [0.09; 0.21]***	0.25 [0.19; 0.3]***
Universalism: Concern (UNC)	0.28 [0.22; 0.34]***	0.2 [0.14; 0.26]***	0.28 [0.22; 0.34]***
Universalism: Nature (UNN)	0.35 [0.29; 0.4]***	0.28 [0.22; 0.34]***	0.35 [0.29; 0.4]***
Universalism: Tolerance (UNT)	0.29 [0.23; 0.35]***	0.18 [0.12; 0.24]***	0.27 [0.21; 0.33]***
Benevolence: Caring (BEC)	0.3 [0.24; 0.35]***	0.2 [0.14; 0.26]***	0.29 [0.23; 0.35]***
Benevolence: Dependability (BEB)	0.17 [0.11; 0.23]***	0.2 [0.14; 0.26]***	0.2 [0.14; 0.26]***
Openness to Change (OC)	0.1 [0.16; 0.04]**	0.03 [0.03; 0.1]	0.07 [0.13; 0]*
Self-Affirmation (A)	0.31 [0.37; 0.25]***	0.17 [0.23; 0.1]***	0.29 [0.35; 0.23]***
Conservation (C)	0.36 [0.3; 0.41]***	0.21 [0.15; 0.27]***	0.34 [0.28; 0.39]***
Self-Transcendence (ST)	0.38 [0.32; 0.43]***	0.28 [0.22; 0.34]***	0.37 [0.32; 0.43]***

* $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 4

Multivariate Predictors of the Religious Well-Being Subscale (N = 959)

Predictor	β	95% CI	p	VIF
Free member	17.60	–	–	–
Conformity: Interpersonal (COR)	4.49	3.75; 5.23	< 0.001	2.20
Security: Personal (SEP)	0.82	0.12; 1.52	0.022	1.84
Universalism: Concern (UNC)	1.10	1.91; 0.29	0.008	1.91
Tradition (TR)	0.56	1.14; 0.02	0.059	1.55
Openness to Change (OC)	1.59	2.5; 0.68	< 0.001	1.70

Table 5 presents the multivariate regression model for Existential Well-Being (EWB) derived using stepwise predictor selection and evaluated by adjusted R^2 . The comparison (null) model included Conformity: Interpersonal (COR), Tradition (TR), Face (FAC), Stimulation (ST), and Universalism: Tolerance (UNT) from the PVQ-R2R; the final model retained this set and yielded the following unique effects. Positive predictors of EWB: Conformity: Interpersonal (COR): $\beta = 0.89$, 95% CI [0.40, 1.39], $p < 0.001$; Tradition (TR): $\beta = 0.46$, 95% CI [0.04, 0.89], $p = 0.034$. Negative predictors of EWB: Face (FAC): $\beta = -1.00$, 95% CI [-1.37, -0.62], $p < 0.001$;

Universalism: Tolerance (UNT): $\beta = -0.67$, 95% CI $[-1.19, -0.14]$, $p = 0.013$. All the coefficients represent the adjusted associations of each value dimension with EWB, controlling for the other predictors in the model. Complete estimates and fit indices are provided in Table 5.

Table 5

Multivariate Predictors of Existential Well-Being Subscale (N = 959)

Predictor	β	95% CI	p	VIF
Free member	16.6	–	–	–
Conformity: Interpersonal (COR)	0.89	0.4; 1.39	< 0.001	1.70
Tradition (TR)	0.46	0.035; 0.89	0.034	1.47
Universalism: Tolerance (UNT)	0.67	1.19; 0.14	0.013	1.70
Face (FAC)	1.00	1.37; 0.62	< 0.001	1.27
Stimulation (ST)	0.42	0.86; 0.02	0.061	1.17

Table 6 presents the final multivariate regression model for Spiritual Well-Being (SWB), derived using stepwise predictor selection and evaluated by adjusted R^2 . The model retained five PVQ-R2R predictors: Conformity: Interpersonal (COR), Security: Personal (SEP), Universalism: Concern (UNC), Universalism: Tolerance (UNT), and Achievement (AC). COR emerged as the only significant positive predictor of SWB ($\beta = 5.39$, 95% CI $[4.36, 6.41]$, $p < 0.001$). In contrast, UNC ($\beta = -1.85$, 95% CI $[-3.00, -0.71]$, $p = 0.002$), UNT ($\beta = -1.31$, 95% CI $[-2.32, -0.30]$, $p = 0.011$), and AC ($\beta = -0.90$, 95% CI $[-1.61, -0.20]$, $p = 0.012$) showed significant negative associations with SWB. Security: Personal (SEP) did not exhibit a statistically significant unique effect in the multivariate model ($\beta = 0.74$, 95% CI $[-0.23, 1.72]$, $p = 0.136$).

Table 6

Multivariate Predictors of Spiritual Well-Being Scale (N = 959)

Predictor	β	95% CI	p	VIF
Free member	32.5	–	–	–
Conformity: Interpersonal (COR)	5.39	4.36; 6.41	< 0.001	2.13
Security: Personal (SEP)	0.74	0.23; 1.72	0.136	1.79
Universalism: Concern (UNC)	1.85	3; 0.71	0.002	1.93
Universalism: Tolerance (UNT)	1.31	2.32; 0.3	0.011	1.82
Achievement (AC)	0.90	1.61; 0.2	0.012	1.51

Discussion

The participants reported predominantly moderate to high spiritual well-being, with particularly high levels of Religious Well-Being (RWB) and somewhat lower, though still mostly moderate to high, levels of Existential Well-Being (EWB). This distribution is consistent with Ellison's original conceptualization of spiritual well-being as consisting of vertical (religious, God-related) and horizontal (existential, meaning-related) dimensions that may vary in level and correlates across populations (Ellison, 1983), as well as with the findings that religious forms of spiritual well-being can be widely maintained in religiously based contexts, whereas existential satisfaction is more dependent on broader psychosocial and contextual resources (Bulkley et al., 2013; Edmondson et al., 2008; Khiyali et al., 2023; McLouth

et al., 2021). A similar distinction between religious and existential components has been shown in clinical and community samples, where existential well-being is often more strongly associated with psychological outcomes such as quality of life and risk of depression than religious well-being *per se* (Edmondson et al., 2008; Florez et al., 2018; Maselko et al., 2009). Studies using instruments structurally related to the SWBS (e.g., FACIT-Sp, SAIL-SF) also highlight that meaning/peace is a particularly powerful correlate of quality of life and adaptation in medical and community samples (Bohlmeijer et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2011; Park et al., 2024; Sun et al., 2016).

Schwartz's value profile indicates a clear priority for Self-Transcendence (especially universalism) and Conservation (security, conformity, tradition), as well as a de-emphasis on Self-Enhancement (power, achievement) and stimulation/hedonism. This hierarchy is consistent with cross-cultural research on basic individual values, which shows reliable higher-order dimensions and the frequent co-endorsement of self-transcendence and conservation in more community-oriented or religious contexts (Broeck et al., 2015).

Correlational analyses have revealed that spiritual well-being (and its RWBS and EWBS components) is most strongly and consistently associated with community- and stability-oriented values: Conformity: Interpersonal, Conservation, Personal and Societal Security, Tradition, and universalistic facets. In contrast, Self-enhancement (Power, Achievement) and Hedonism were negatively related to Spiritual well-being. This profile is consistent with a growing literature distinguishing “healthy” values — self-transcendence and, in some contexts, conservation — from more self-focused, status-oriented values that often predict lower hedonic and eudaimonic well-being (Bojanowska & Kaczmarek, 2022a; Broeck et al., 2015). The pattern is also consistent with research that has identified spiritual well-being as a psychological resource associated with hope, resilience, and lower distress in diverse populations such as cancer patients, teachers, clergy, and trauma-exposed groups (Florez et al., 2018; Heidari et al., 2022; Khiyali et al., 2023; Lee & Fung, 2024; Liaquat et al., 2013).

Taken together, the present findings support the view that, in this context, spirituality is normatively embedded in a value system that emphasizes care for others, social harmony, and security, while conflicting with competitive, dominance-oriented, and pleasure-seeking motives (Ahrens et al., 2010; Carlucci et al., 2015; Wong-McDonald & Gorsuch, 2004).

Religious Well-Being has exhibited the strongest associations with Conservation values and specific self-transcendent facets. Conformity: Interpersonal (COR) emerges as the most robust positive correlate and the strongest unique predictor of RWB, closely followed by Security: Personal (SEP) in multivariate models controlling for overlapping value domains. This pattern suggests that experiencing a close, benevolent relationship with God is tightly associated with the value of relational harmony, avoiding harm to near and dear ones, and maintaining personal security and predictability. This is consistent with research on relational spirituality and humility as resources for eudaimonic well-being among religiously engaged groups (Ruffing et al., 2021).

These findings resonate with relational and trust-based models of religiosity and spiritual well-being, in which spiritual flourishing is based on strong attachment to a benevolent God and internalized moral relatedness rather than on autonomy or novelty seeking (Ellison, 1983; Wong-McDonald & Gorsuch, 2004). They also cohere with research indicating that intrinsic, internalized religious orientations rooted in a stable religious identity are positively associated with spiritual well-being among Christians (Shin, 2014). In this literature, narrative indicators of a deeply internalized religious identity and intrinsically motivated religious coping are consistently related to higher spiritual well-being and life satisfaction (Wong-McDonald & Gorsuch, 2004). The weaker and insignificant unique contribution of Tradition to RWB in multivariate regression, despite its positive bivariate association, likely reflects its shared variance with Conformity and Security. For many respondents, the value of Tradition may serve as a vague marker of the same normative, relationship-oriented religiosity that is more accurately reflected by Interpersonal Conformity and Personal Security.

Existential Well-Being (EWB) has demonstrated a generally similar, albeit somewhat weakened, pattern relative to RWB: positive correlations with Conformity: Interpersonal, Tradition, Preservation, Universalism, Benevolence, and Security, and negative correlations with Power and Hedonism. In the multivariate model, Interpersonal Conformity and Tradition remain significant positive predictors, while Face and Universalism: Tolerance show negative unique effects.

The prominence of Interpersonal Conformity across all the models suggests that a core experiential component of SWB in this population is the commitment not to harm or disrupt near and dear ones. This resonates with qualitative and quantitative evidence showing that in many cultural and religious contexts spirituality is manifested primarily through relational responsibilities — care for family, community, and vulnerable others — rather than solely through abstract belief systems (Alrashidi et al., 2022; Bulkley et al., 2013; Khiyali et al., 2023). It is also consistent with evidence that spiritual well-being and related constructs (e.g., spiritual intelligence) are strongly associated with prosocial orientations and relational functioning in health and care contexts (Ahrens et al., 2010; Alrashidi et al., 2022; Ramesh et al., 2021).

The negative unique associations of Achievement and certain universalistic facets with SWB in the regression models should not be interpreted as direct evidence that striving for competence or caring for all people diminishes spiritual well-being. Rather, these effects arise within a highly intercorrelated cluster of prosocial and conservation values. The positive bivariate correlations between Universalism and SWB largely reflect their shared variance with conformity and security in supporting a generally prosocial, unselfish lifestyle. Once these relational and protective components are controlled, the remaining variance in Universalism and Achievement may indicate relatively more individualistic, future-oriented, or performance-focused attitudes (e.g., broad social justice concerns, striving for personal success), which in this cultural context may counteract more local, role-bound, and norm-maintaining forms of spirituality. Similar suppressing or “repositioning” effects have been documented when closely related value scales are

simultaneously entered into predictive models of hedonic and eudaimonic well-being: self-transcendent and conservation values generally enhance well-being, but their unique effects may reverse sign after overlapping variance is partialled out (Bojanowska & Kaczmarek, 2022a; Bojanowska & Kaczmarek, 2022b). These findings highlight the importance of modeling higher-order value dimensions and using methods (e.g., structural equation modeling, relative weight analysis) that explicitly account for multicollinearity among PVQ-R2R scales when examining value–spirituality relations (Johnson, 2000; Mitchell & Alexandrova, 2021; Morris, 1981).

At the level of total Spiritual Well-Being (SWB), the correlational structure largely replicates the RWB and EWB patterns: strong positive relationships with Interpersonal Conformity, Self-Transcendence, Conservation, and Security, and negative associations with Power, Self-Affirmation, Achievement, and Hedonism. However, in the multivariate model, Conformity: Interpersonal emerges as the only significant positive predictor, while Achievement, Universalism: Concern, and Universalism: Tolerance show significant negative unique effects.

The prominence of Interpersonal Conformity across all the models suggests that a core experiential component of SWB in this population is the commitment not to harm or disrupt near and dear ones. This resonates with qualitative evidence suggesting that, in many cultural and religious settings, spirituality is manifested primarily through relational responsibilities — such as care for family and community — rather than solely through abstract belief systems (Irawati et al., 2023; Heidari et al., 2022).

The negative unique associations of Achievement and some universalistic facets with SWB should not be interpreted simply as indicating that striving for achievement or caring for all people reduces spirituality. Rather, these effects emerge within a highly intercorrelated cluster of prosocial and conservation values. Once the shared variance with Conformity and Security is partialled out, higher scores on Universalism and Achievement may indicate a relatively more individualistic, future-oriented, or performance-focused attitudes (e.g., striving for competence, broad social justice, or global concerns) which in this context may counteract more local, role-bound, and submissive aspects of religiously framed life. Similar suppressing or “repositioning” effects of Universalism and Achievement have been reported when closely related value scales are simultaneously entered into predictive models of well-being and adaptation (Broeck et al., 2015).

One of the more striking findings is that Universalism: Concern and Universalism: Tolerance, although positively correlated with SWB, become negative predictors in the presence of Interpersonal Conformity and Security. This apparent contradiction is likely due to multicollinearity among the prosocial and conservation values. Bivariate correlations reflect the shared variance between Universalism and Conformity/Security in support of a generally prosocial and unselfish lifestyle. However, multivariate coefficients indicate the unique variance of Universalism after the relational and protective components of Conformity and Security are accounted for.

The remaining variance in Universalism may then reflect a more cosmopolitan, justice-oriented, or critical attitude toward existing norms — an orientation that, in this particular religious context, may be less tightly integrated with conventional spirituality or even mildly tension-laden with norm-maintaining religiosity. Similar conceptual results have been obtained where EWB or SWB is more strongly predicted by internally integrated spirituality than by more abstract or socially critical beliefs (Edmondson et al., 2008; Fabricatore et al., 2000).

This interpretive nuance highlights the importance, for value–spirituality research, of modeling higher-order value dimensions and testing the robustness of results using methods that explicitly account for the shared variance (e.g., structural equation modeling) rather than relying solely on parallel regressions with numerous intercorrelated PVQ-R2R scales.

The findings are tempered by several *limitations*.

First, the cross-sectional design precludes causal inferences: values may shape spiritual well-being, but spiritual experiences and religious socialization may also gradually reshape value priorities. Longitudinal and experimental studies are needed to clarify directionality of these findings, consistent with recent research showing reciprocal relations between spirituality, self-related constructs, and well-being over time (Lee & Fung, 2024).

Second, the study is conducted in a specific religious and cultural context, where high RWBS and strong conservation values may be normative. Previous research using the *Spiritual Well-Being Scale* and related instruments suggests that both the structure of spiritual well-being and its correlates can vary by ethnicity, religiosity, and sociocultural environment (Ellison, 1983; Liu et al., 2022). Therefore, cross-cultural replications, including non-religious and religiously diverse samples, are needed to test the generalizability of the identified value–spirituality configurations.

Third, the extensive intercorrelations among PVQ-R2R value scales increase the likelihood of unstable regression estimates. Future research would benefit from (1) directly modeling higher-order value factors (e.g., Self-transcendence, Conservation, Self-enhancement, Openness to Change); (2) using structural equation modeling to separate measurement error from shared variance; and (3) exploring potential non-linear or interactive effects (e.g., whether the impact of achievement on spirituality depends on the level of benevolence or universalism).

Conclusions

Overall, the findings indicate that, in this sample, spiritual well-being — both religious and existential — is deeply rooted in communal, prosocial, and preservation-oriented values and is inversely related to self-enhancement and pleasure-oriented motivations. This configuration aligns well with theoretical accounts of spiritual well-being as a domain of well-being that integrates a sense of relationship with the transcendent, coherence of life meaning, and embeddedness in moral and relational frameworks (Ellison, 1983). By considering spiritual well-

being within the context of a specific motivational value structure, the study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how spirituality is lived and maintained, and where potential tensions with contemporary value emphases on achievement, status, and autonomy may arise.

References

- Ahrens, C.E., Abeling, S., Ahmad, S., & Hinman, J.A. (2010). Spirituality and well-being: The relationship between religious coping and recovery from sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(7), 1242–1263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509340533>
- Al-Thani, H. (2025). Religion and spiritual well-being: A qualitative exploration of perspectives of higher education faculty in Qatar and its challenge to western well-being paradigms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1549863. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1549863>
- Alrashidi, N., Alreshidi, M., Dator, W., Maestrado, R., Villareal, S., Buta, J., Pangket, P., Mostoles, R., Gonzales, A., Mina, E., & An, E.P. (2022). The mediating role of spiritual intelligence on well-being and life satisfaction among nurses in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic: A path analysis. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(12), 515. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12120515>
- Bakushkin, I.A., & Ershova, R.V. (2025). Russian-language adaptation of the questionnaire “Scale of spiritual Well-Being” (Spiritual Well-Being Scale). *Perspectives of Science and Education*, 74(2), 393–409. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2025.2.25>
- Bergin, A.E. (1991). Values and religious issues in psychotherapy and mental health. *American Psychologist*, 46(4), 394–403. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.46.4.394>
- Bohlmeijer, E., Frielingsdorf, L., Kraiss, J., Jager-Meezenbroek, E.D., Visser, A., & Klooster, P.T.T. (2023). Spirituality in the context of well-being. Evaluation of the psychometric properties and added value of the Spiritual Attitude and Involvement List Short Form (SAIL-SF). *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 24(3), 1169–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-023-00640-8>
- Boer, D. (2017). Values and affective well-being: How culture and environmental threat influence their association. In S. Roccas & L. Sagiv (Eds.), *Values and behavior: Taking a cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 191–218). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56352-7_9
- Bojanowska, A., & Kaczmarek, Ł.D. (2022a). How healthy and unhealthy values predict hedonic and eudaimonic well-being: Dissecting value-related beliefs and behaviours. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 23(1), 211–231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-021-00396-z>
- Bojanowska, A., & Kaczmarek, Ł.D. (2022b). Correction to: How healthy and unhealthy values predict hedonic and eudaimonic well-being: Dissecting value-related beliefs and behaviours. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 23(7), 3691–3691. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-022-00556-9>
- Bojanowska, A., Kaczmarek, Ł.D., Urbańska, B., & Puchalska, M. (2022c). Acting on values: A novel intervention enhancing hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 23(8), 3889–3908. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-022-00585-4>
- Bojanowska, A., & Piotrowski, K. (2021). Two levels of personality: Temperament and values and their effects on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Current Psychology*, 40(3), 1185–1193. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-0043-0>
- Bojanowska, A., & Urbańska, B. (2021). Individual values and well-being: The moderating role of personality traits. *International Journal of Psychology*, 56(5), 698–709. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12751>

- Broeck, A.V.D., Schreurs, B., Guenter, H., & van Emmerik, I.J.H. (2015). Skill utilization and well-being: A cross-level story of day-to-day fluctuations and personal intrinsic values. *Work & Stress*, 29(3), 306–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2015.1074955>
- Bulkley, J., McMullen, C.K., Hornbrook, M.C., Grant, M., Altschuler, A., Wendel, C.S., & Krouse, R.S. (2013). Spiritual well-being in long-term colorectal cancer survivors with ostomies. *Psycho-Oncology*, 22(11), 2513–2521. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.3318>
- Carlucci, L., Tommasi, M., Balsamo, M., Furnham, A., & Saggino, A. (2015). Religious fundamentalism and psychological well-being: An Italian study. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 43(1), 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009164711504300103>
- Carson, V., Soeken, K., & Grimm, P.M. (1988). Hope and its relationship to spiritual well-being. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 16(2), 159–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009164718801600205>
- Cieciuch, J., Davidov, E., Vecchione, M., Beierlein, C., & Schwartz, S. (2014). The cross-national invariance properties of a new scale to measure 19 basic human values: A test across eight countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 45(5), 764–776. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022114527348>
- Edmondson, D., Park, C.L., Blank, T.O., Fenster, J.R., & Mills, M.A. (2008). Deconstructing spiritual well-being: Existential well-being and HRQOL in cancer survivors. *Psycho-Oncology*, 17(2), 161–169. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.1197>
- Ellison, C.W. (1983). Spiritual well-being: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 11(4), 330–338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009164718301100406>
- Fabricatore, A.N., Handal, P.J., & Fenzel, L.M. (2000). Personal spirituality as a moderator of the relationship between stressors and subjective well-being. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 28(3), 221–228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009164710002800305>
- Florez, I.A., Allbaugh, L.J., Harris, C.E., Schwartz, A.C., & Kaslow, N.J. (2018). Suicidal ideation and hopelessness in PTSD: Spiritual well-being mediates outcomes over time. *Anxiety Stress & Coping*, 31(1), 46–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2017.1369260>
- Gunes, H., Bulbuloglu, S., & Sarıtaş, S. (2025). Investigation of life satisfaction and spiritual well-being of living liver donors in Turkey. *Current Psychology*, 44(7), 5654–5661. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-025-07605-5>
- Heidari, M., HoseinPour, M.A., Ardebili, M., & Yoosefee, S. (2022). The association of the spiritual health and psychological well-being of teachers with their organizational commitment. *BMC Psychology*, 10(1), 55. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-022-00768-x>
- Irawati, K., Indarwati, F., Haris, F., Lu, J., & Shih, Y. (2023). Religious practices and spiritual well-being of schizophrenia: Muslim perspective. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 16, 739–748. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S402582>
- Johnson, J.W. (2000). A heuristic method for estimating the relative weight of predictor variables in multiple regression. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 35(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327906MBR3501_1
- Joshanloo, M., & Ghaedi, G. (2009). Value priorities as predictors of hedonic and eudaimonic aspects of well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(4), 294–298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.03.016>
- Kim, Y., Carver, C.S., Spillers, R.L., Crammer, C., & Zhou, E.S. (2011). Individual and dyadic relations between spiritual well-being and quality of life among cancer survivors and their spousal caregivers. *Psycho-Oncology*, 20(7), 762–770. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.1778>
- Khiyali, Z., Naderi, Z., Vakil, M., Ghasemi, H., Dehghan, A., & Bijani, M. (2023). A study of COVID anxiety, spiritual well-being and resilience levels in patients with cancer undergoing chemotherapy during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study in the south of Iran. *BMC Psychology*, 11(1), 75. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-023-01126-1>

- Khodarahimi, S., Ghadampour, E., & Karami, A. (2021). The roles of spiritual well-being and tolerance of uncertainty in prediction of happiness in elderly. *Anales de Psicologia / Annals of Psychology*, 37(2), 371–377. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ANALESPPS.446871>
- Krishnan, M., & Rahim, S.A. (2014). Hubungkait komunikasi kesihatan dengan kesan hirarki isu kesihatan terhadap perubahan amalan gaya hidup sihat. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 30(1), 140–169. <https://doi.org/10.17576/jkmjc-2014-3001-08>
- Lee, H.-C., & Fung, J. (2024). A cross-lagged longitudinal model of the relationships between self-compassion, spiritual well-being, and burnout among Taiwanese clergy. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 53(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00916471241300156>
- Liaquat, S., Sultan, S., & Husain, I. (2013). New horizon of spiritual well-being and hope among cancer patients: A psychological aspect. *I-Manager's Journal of Educational Psychology*, 6(4), 30–35. <https://doi.org/10.26634/JPSY.6.4.2185>
- Liu, Q., Ho, K.-Y., Lam, K.-K.-W., Lam, W., Cheng, E.-H.-L., Ching, S.-S.-Y., Belay, G.M., & Wong, F.-K.-Y. (2022). Adaptation and psychometric evaluation of the Chinese version of the functional assessment of chronic illness therapy spiritual well-being scale among Chinese childhood cancer patients in China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1065854. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1065854>
- Maselko, J., Gilman, S.E., & Buka, S. (2009). Religious service attendance and spiritual well-being are differentially associated with risk of major depression. *Psychological Medicine*, 39(6), 1009–1017. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291708004418>
- McLouth, L.E., Ford, C.G., Pustejovsky, J.E., Park, C.L., Sherman, A.C., Trevino, K., & Salsman, J.M. (2021). A systematic review and meta-analysis of effects of psychosocial interventions on spiritual well-being in adults with cancer. *Psycho-Oncology*, 30(2), 147–158. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.5562>
- Mitchell, P., & Alexandrova, A. (2021) Well-being and pluralism. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 22(6), 2411–2433. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-020-00323-8>
- Morris, J.D. (1981). Updating the criterion for regression predictor variable selection. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 41(3), 777–780. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316448104100316>
- Paloutzian, R.F., & Ellison, C.W. (1982). Loneliness, spiritual well-being and the quality of life. In L.A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy* (pp. 224–237). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Park, C.L., Magin, Z.E., Bellizzi, K.M., & Sanft, T. (2024). Trajectories of cancer survivors' spiritual well-being through the transition from treatment to early survivorship. *Psycho-Oncology*, 33(12), e70040. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.70040>
- Ramesh, S., Besharat, M.A., & Nough, H. (2021) Spiritual well-being and coronary artery diseases severity: Mediating effects of anger rumination and worry. *Health Education Journal*, 80(5), 501–512. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0017896920976697>
- Ruffing, E.G., Oleson, D., Tomlinson, J., Park, S.H., & Sandage, S.J. (2021). Humility and relational spirituality as predictors of well-being among Christian seminary students. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 49(4), 419–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091647121988968>
- Russo-Netzer, P., & Atad, O.I. (2024). Activating values intervention: an integrative pathway to well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1375237. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1375237>
- Saroglou, V., Delpierre, V., & Dernelle, R. (2004). Values and religiosity: A meta-analysis of studies using Schwartz's Model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 721–734. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2003.10.005>

- Schwartz, S.-H. (2006). Les valeurs de base de la personne: Théorie, mesures et applications. *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 47(4), 929–968. <https://doi.org/10.3917/rfs.474.0929>
- Schwartz, S.H. (2015). Basic individual values: Sources and consequences. In D. Sander and T. Brosch (Eds.), *Handbook of Value* (pp. 63–84). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198716600.003.0004>
- Schwartz, S.H., Butenko, T.P., Sedova, D.S., & Lipatova, A.S. (2012). A refined theory of basic individual values: application in Russia. *Psychology. Journal of the Higher School of Economics*, 9(2), 43–70. (In Russ.).
- Schwartz, S.H., & Sortheix, F.M. (2018). Values and subjective well-being. In E. Diener, S. Oishi, & L.Tay (Eds.), *Handbook of well-being* (pp.833–847). Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers.
- Schwartz, S.H., & Cieciuch, J. (2022). Measuring the refined theory of individual values in 49 cultural groups: Psychometrics of the revised portrait value questionnaire. *Assessment*, 29(5), 1005–1019. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191121998760>
- Shin, K. (2014). 보육교사의 종교적 안녕과 실존적 안녕이교사의 직무 만족과 삶 만족에 미치는 효과. *한국보육학회지*, 14(4), 87–104. <https://doi.org/G704-SER000008863.2014.14.4.005>
- Sun, V., Kim, J.Y., Irish, T.L., Borneman, T., Sidhu, R.K., Klein, L., & Ferrell, B. (2016). Palliative care and spiritual well-being in lung cancer patients and family caregivers. *Psycho-Oncology*, 25(12), 1448–1455. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.3987>
- Villani, D., Sorgente, A., Iannello, P., & Antonietti, A. (2019). The role of spirituality and religiosity in subjective well-being of individuals with different religious status. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1525. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01525>
- You, S., & Lim, S. (2019). Religious orientation and subjective well-being: The mediating role of meaning in life. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 47(1), 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091647118795180>
- Woltin, K.-A., & Sneddon, J. (2025). Associations between personal values and regulatory focus: A partial replication for basic values and an extension to refined values. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 55(4), 661–679. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.3157>
- Wong-Mcdonald, A., & Gorsuch, R.L. (2004). A multivariate theory of God concept, religious motivation, locus of control, coping, and spiritual well-being. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 32(4), 318–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009164710403200404>

Article history:

Received 30 September, 2025

Revised 25 October, 2025

Accepted 28 October, 2025

For citation:

Bakushkin, I.A., & Ershova, R.V. (2025). Predictors and correlates of spiritual well-being: The role of Schwartz's basic individual values. *RUDN Journal of Psychology and Pedagogics*, 22(4), 635–654. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2313-1683-2025-22-4-635-654> EDN: OSMBZX

Authors' contribution:

Ivan A. Bakushkin — concept and design of the research, data collection and processing, text writing and editing. Regina V. Ershova — concept and design of the research, methodology, research management, text writing and editing.

Conflicts of interest:

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Bio notes:

Ivan A. Bakushkin, Postgraduate Student at the Department of Psychology and Pedagogics, Faculty of Philology, RUDN University (6 Miklukho-Maklaya St, Moscow, 117198, Russian Federation), Chairman of the Department for Missionary Work and Youth Affairs of the Kolomna Diocese (24A Lazarev St, Kolomna, 140400, Russian Federation). ORCID: 0000-0003-1485-5512; eLibrary SPIN-code: 8640-5865. E-mail: ioann_85@mail.ru

Regina V. Ershova, D.Sc. in Psychology, Professor, Department of Psychology and Pedagogics, Faculty of Philology, RUDN University (6 Miklukho-Maklaya St, 117198 Moscow, Russian Federation). ORCID: 0000-0002-5054-1177; Scopus Author ID: 57205234611; eLibrary SPIN-code: 5277-4559. E-mail: erchovareg@mail.ru

DOI: 10.22363/2313-1683-2025-22-4-635-654

EDN: OSMBZX

УДК 159.9

Исследовательская статья

Предикторы и корреляты духовного благополучия: роль базовых индивидуальных ценностей Шварца

И.А. Бакушкин^{1,2}✉, Р.В. Ершова¹✉

¹ Российский университет дружбы народов, Москва, Российская Федерация

² Отдел по миссионерской работе и делам молодежи Коломенской епархии, Коломна, Российская Федерация
✉ioann_85@mail.ru

Аннотация. Духовное благополучие является важным аспектом психического здоровья, однако его мотивационные основы и базовые личностные ценности остаются недостаточно изученными. В данном исследовании на большой русскоязычной выборке изучались связи между духовным благополучием и базовыми индивидуальными ценностями, выделенными Ш. Шварцом. В онлайн-исследовании, проведенном в 2024 г., приняло участие 959 участников (79,4% женщин; $M_{\text{возраст}} = 38,6$, $SD = 14,0$). Духовное благополучие измерялось с помощью «Шкалы духовного благополучия» (включает религиозную и экзистенциальную субшкалы), а индивидуальные ценности диагностировались пересмотренным «Портретным ценностным опросником» (PVQ-R2R). Для выявления устойчивых корреляций между индивидуальными ценностями и общим духовным благополучием и его компонентами использовались ранговый корреляционный анализ Спирмена и пошаговые модели множественной линейной регрессии. У большинства участников выявлен преимущественно умеренный или высокий уровень духовного благополучия, при этом религиозное благополучие, как правило, выражено выше экзистенциального. На бивариативном уровне духовное благополучие наиболее сильно положительно связано с межличностным конформизмом, безопасностью, традициями и аспектами универсализма и отрицательно – с ценностями самоутверждения, власти, гедонизма, достижений. В многомерных моделях межличностный конформизм выступил наиболее стабильным позитивным предиктором для всех изучаемых компонентов духовного благополучия. В целом полученные результаты позволяют предположить, что

духовное благополучие в ценностном контексте в первую очередь связано с гармонией в отношениях, просоциальной ориентацией и мотивами сохранения, а не с приоритетами, связанными со стремлением к статусу или удовольствиям.

Ключевые слова: шкала духовного благополучия, духовное благополучие, религиозное благополучие, экзистенциальное благополучие, портретный ценностный опросник, ценности, базовые индивидуальные ценности

История статьи:

Поступила в редакцию 30 сентября 2025 г.

Доработана после рецензирования 25 октября 2025 г.

Принята к печати 28 октября 2025 г.

Для цитирования:

Bakushkin I.A., Ershova R.V. Predictors and correlates of spiritual well-being: The role of Schwartz's basic individual values // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Психология и педагогика. 2025. Т. 22. № 4. С. 635–654. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2313-1683-2025-22-4-635-654> EDN: OSMBZX

Вклад авторов:

И.А. Бакушкин – концепция и дизайн исследования, сбор и обработка данных, написание и редактирование текста. *Р.В. Ершова* – концепция и дизайн исследования, методология, руководство исследованием, написание и редактирование текста.

Заявление о конфликте интересов:

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Сведения об авторах:

Бакушкин Иван Анатольевич, аспирант кафедры психологии и педагогики филологического факультета, Российский университет дружбы народов (Российская Федерация, 117198, Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, д. 6), председатель Отдела по миссионерской работе и делам молодежи Коломенской епархии (Российская Федерация, 140400, Коломна, ул. Лазарева, д. 24А). ORCID: 0000-0003-1485-5512; eLibrary SPIN-код: 8640-5865. E-mail: ioann_85@mail.ru

Ершова Регина Вячеславовна, доктор психологических наук, профессор кафедры психологии и педагогики филологического факультета, Российский университет дружбы народов (Российская Федерация, 117198, Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, д. 6). ORCID: 0000-0002-5054-1177; Scopus ID: 57205234611; eLibrary SPIN-код: 5277-4559. E-mail: erchovareg@mail.ru