THE DYNAMICS OF RELIGIOSITY AND SPIRITUALITY IN KENYAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Dr. Stephen I. Akaranga
Senior Lecturer,
Department of Philosophy and Religious
University of Nairobi
P.O. BOX 30197 00100
NAIROBI- Kenya
Email: drifedha@yahoo.com Cell phone: 0723716790

Prof. Jude J. Ongong'a
Professor, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies,
Kenyatta University P.O. BOX 43844 00100
NAIROBI- Kenya
Email: jude.ongonga@yahoo.com Cell phone: 0726569561

Abstract

This paper examines the distinction between religiosity and spirituality which is not a new phenomenon among religious communities. It is one of the outcomes of the New Age spirituality. And, for the majority of people, being religious is equivalent to being spiritual, unfortunately the two phenomena are world apart. The relationship and distinction between religiosity and spirituality is a great challenge to the University students. Many of them are easily influenced by their peers, literature and the ideologies imparted to them by their Professors. Religiosity comprises a set of rules which guide one's life. This is why religious people underscore the rule of law, are interested in the written word and emphasize the righteousness of the law. Spirituality however, is a matter of the heart emanating from the supreme power. The paper examines factors which influence the dilemma of these phenomena and finally suggests reconciliation between the two in Kenyan Public Universities.

Key words: Religion, Religiosity, Spiritual, Spirituality, Modernity, Post modernity.

1.0   Introduction

Kenyan secular Universities are among the public institutions of higher learning that still allow religious studies to be researched and taught in the campuses. Otherwise in several Universities in the last and this centuries, sociology, psychology, history and philosophy departments have moved religious studies towards the margins of their subject (Hinnells, 2010:5). Those influenced by history may view religion negatively because of the role it has played in human life. At times religions have been dangerous - "because more people have been tortured and killed for religious reasons than for any other motive. Persecution, the torture and killing of heretics and people of other religions have been major themes running through much of world history" (Hinnells J.R. 2010:5). Often, students who are not studying religions in the institutions of higher learning are prone to tease and ask those who take Religious Studies: "Why should a student study religion if one does not want to be a Pastor or Sunday school teacher?"

Lecturers who are atheistically inclined may criticize religion and question the criterion or justification for having a whole Department of Religious Studies. The financial Department may further wonder and ask why financial and human resources should be invested in such a self contradictory discipline like religion. While others may hate religion simply because it challenges and reminds them of their own feeling of guilt since it is difficult to live according to the ideals of religions. This explains why religion is such a difficult social phenomenon to describe. At one moment, it may be the source and vehicle of civilization but at another, the instrument of destruction of such achievements. It is therefore difficult to deny that religion has wielded power over humanity and world history. This is why Hinnells (2010) is right when he questions and wonders - whether one can understand any culture and history- political or social without understanding the relevant religions. At a personal level, religions can be very useful, morally supportive, a source of societal identity and harmony not to mention its role as an instrument of hope and self confidence. In this regard, all the seven secular Kenyan Universities; University of Nairobi, Moi University, Kenyatta University, Egerton University, Jomo Kenyatta University, Maseno University and Masinde Muliro University and their affiliated Campuses are on the right tract in allowing themselves to invest in the departments of Religious Studies. In so doing, they demonstrate their concern to give a wholistic education to all their students.

This is why at the beginning of each academic year, these Universities feel obliged to include interdenominational service in their orientation programme. The students are introduced not only to the importance of religion *qua* religion, but to the need of being spiritual**.** Because, even though one needs religion to be familiar with spirituality; spirituality does not need religions for its survival. More often, religiosity may be mistaken by the majority of believers for spirituality. However, there is a world of difference between the two as we intend to explain in this paper.

2.0   Religiosity and Spirituality: Meaning, Characteristics and Differences

Students who join public Universities come from various parts of Kenya with different socio-cultural, political, economic and religious affiliations. Some of them were perhaps baptized as babies while others may have accepted their religious faith at the primary or secondary school levels. Accordingly, their insight may not be very much different from that of their parents and associates outside the University setup. That is, they too may not appreciate the distinction between religiosity and spirituality. This is because the difference between religiosity and spirituality as an academic concern in the discussion of religions as a social phenomenon is fairly a new intellectual concern.

Today however, it has aroused great interests in the midst of influence of postmodernity and New Age spirituality alongside religious mobility**.** The term religion is difficult to define and considering the long discussion and or explanation of its etymological meaning, such concern is definitely outside the confines of this paper. Nevertheless, for the purpose of our argument we shall adopt Max Muller's explanation based on the translation of the Latin term *religio*, that religion is "reverence for God or the gods, careful pondering of the divine things, piety", (which Cicero further derived to mean 'diligence' (Afton N. Kapuscinski et. al 2010:191-205)**.** We may perhaps here suggest that a possible solution to go around the problem of defining the term religion is to adopt a phenomenological meaning as explained by James L. Cox (2010:12-13).

Cox, quoting from Hall T.W. et.al (1985:11) says that according to these authors, any definition of religion should consider two terms, specificity and inclusiveness. Because, the common problem in describing religion is how to be specific and inclusive owing to plurality of religious traditions. For them therefore, "*religion is varied, symbolic expression of and appropriate response to that which people deliberately affirm as being of unrestricted value for them*". And as far as our memory can take us back, anything valuable that requires response must have regulations and means to facilitate the said response. This is why the abstract term "religiosity" is associated with expressions of belief common to a given culture or community. Religiosity may thus mean the codified, institutionalized, and ritualized expressions of people's communal connections to the ultimate (Kelly, E.W. 1995).

But how do we identify one who claims to be religious? Among the scholars who have addressed the question, Marie Cornwal et al. (1986: 227) quoting from other works have developed a conceptual model and components to explain the concepts and indicators of religious commitment to answer our question above. In their study of the Mormon religiosity, they proposed three general components as; religious belief, religious commitment and religious behavior apart from two modes of religious involvement at personal and institutional mode. In religion, it is important to distinguish between religious belief, religious feelings and religious works or practices. Religious belief involves knowledge of the tradition of one's faith, that is, ideological dimension. This is necessary in enabling the believers to explain their religion, its orthodoxy and tradition. But a believer must also have a feeling towards given religious beings, objects or institutions. Most people tend to take their religion for granted and when challenged to describe the contents of such a tradition it creates problems. For example, more often

people argue for African Religious Heritage but very few people of them are in a position to explain and support the claims. Finally, a religious person may not only be content by having faith and cognitive dimensions, he or she must also behave and be committed to that upon which they profess. The syncretistic and dualistic attitudes that often challenge African Christians are a case in point. It is said that most African Christians express their religious faith according to the prevailing circumstances.

Marie Cornwall et al (1986: 227) also rightly points out that religiosity consists of two modes or religious involvement; the personal mode and the institutional mode. The personal mode includes religious beliefs, feelings and behavior that facilitate ones individualized religious faith. And, institutional mode is equally made up of religious beliefs, feelings and behaviours related to formalized and institutionalized religion. To sum up and appreciate the process of being a religious person affiliated to a given religious orthodoxy and tradition the modes discussed above must be realized to operate in the following order within a believer of given religious affliation;
" that is in order to be committed to God, one must believe in Him, and commitment to God influences religious behaviour. On the other hand, in order to feel committed to a Church or organization, one must believe it to be a good and viable organization, and commitment to the organization influences participation and acceptance of the behavioural norms and expectations of the organizations" (Marie Cornwall et. al. 1986:228). Those who are religious hardly recognize that the faith they profess has a sequential interaction of particular components. And the process is measurable as is evidenced by John P. Alston (1975:165) in his article, *Review of the Polls: Three Measures of current levels of religiosity* that three measures of religiosity are defined…as subjective (self perceived strength of religious affiliation), behavioural (church attendance), and quasi-institutional (extent of respect given to religious leaders)". Earlier in this paper, we noted how religious people are interested in the written word and tend to emphasize the righteousness of the law rather than the spirit of Law (Mt. 23:2-6). Modes of measure above seem to suggest our observation.

When Kenyan students join the Universities, even back at home when they think of being religious, it is this external performance and obedience to the laid down rules and regulations that they interpret as obligatory for one to be religious. We may all remember how our parents were often upset when we did not wake up early in the morning to go for Sunday service and when we failed, ignored or did not respect our Sunday school teacher or Catechist let alone the Pastor! The reinforcement and emphasis of such rules are common examples of religiosity. It is the same practice that Prophet Amos equally condemned among the Hebrews in relation to their readiness to offer sacrifices to God without obedience and righteousness expected from them by Yahweh (Amos 5:21-24). Even today, students who join Universities and pride in having been brought up as committed followers of their religious faith may not be aware of entertaining religiosity instead of spirituality. They can attend choir practice, participate in Christian Union activities and fulfill their Sabbath and Sunday obligations without being genuinely spiritual. For many people, religiosity and spirituality are heavily

intertwined, and it has been suggested that spirituality may actually characterize a sixth personality dimension, (Piedmont, 1999), quoted by Brittany C. Hernandez (2011). Indeed, this explains why religiosity may open up a path for spirituality but the latter may not necessarily need the former for its survival as pointed out above. In fact, many people may label themselves spiritual because they have the belief in some power greater but they may not bring themselves to accept and trust in a set of religious dogma or teaching.

Etymologically, the term spiritual is derived from a Latin noun-*spiritus* meaning breath of life that is, the life animating force represented by such terms like, breath, wind and courage. This according to D.N. Elkins in his article, *Toward a Humanistic Phenomenological Spirituality*, (1988) is a way of being and experiencing that comes about through awareness of a transcendent dimension and is characterized by certain identifiable values in regard to self, others, nature**,** life and whatever one considers being the ultimate**.** Like religion, there is no one common definition of the term spirituality accepted by scholars. McCormick (1994) defines spirituality as an inner experience an individual has, that can be evidenced by his or her behavior. Neck and Milliman (1994:9) on the other hand have defined spirituality as, "expressing our desires to find meaning and purpose in our lives and is a process of living out one's set of deeply held personal values". But it is the description of Mitroff and Denton (1999) that brings out the common meaning of spirituality as, "the basic feeling of being connected with one's complete self, others, and the entire universe". This to us is the most universal meanings of the term spirituality that in one way or another includes the common concept attached not only to monotheistic religions but to all other world religions. That is, the nurturing thoughts, emotions, words and actions that are in harmony with a belief that everything in the cosmos is mutually dependent .It is this awareness of spirituality that explains the unitary characteristics of the universe.

In the same way that the meaning of spirituality is bogging down scholars, so is also the distinction between spirituality and religion. We may not join the controversy at this level except to make reference to MacDonald (2000) quoted by T. Winters Moore (2008) who has indentified five dimensions of spitituality as; 1. beliefs, attitudes and perceptions 2. transcendental experiences; 3. sense of meaning for existence, 4. belief in the paranormal and 5. religious behavior and practice. It is these dimensions that are used to augment and refute the distinction between religion and spirituality. Our position in this paper is that spirituality and religiosity are different.

This position is further corroborated by Delbert Teachout's article –"*Religion and Spirituality* (2011:1) where he has given three important factors of spirituality as: our relation with our own self, our relationship with others and our relationship with God. Considering what we have pointed out at the beginning of this paper, we feel a distinction can be made between religion and spirituality, more so when we speak of religiosity in the sense of postmodernity influence. It is therefore a capacity, proneness or willingness unique to all human beings. Although both spirituality and religiosity may be understood as terms associated with the human efforts in search of the absolute, differences between the two expressions can hardly be denied. Because, from our

explanation above, religion tends to underscore external approach whereas spirituality on the other hand is a search for God or absolute but within oneself.

It is neither a thing nor a state, but a process. A process quite distinct from piety, which in fact, is, but merely obeying the religious rules and answering fixed religious questions; questions with preconceived intentions for political or societal control and harmony. Spirituality is a process in an individual which attempts to seek for connections necessary for facilitating an explanation to us who and what we are! It is a quest for the understanding of the connection of aspects of reality. It is the personal, subjective dimension of religion, especially that which pertains to liberation or salvation. One of the teachings of spirituality is to look within and find what one seeks within oneself. Because spirituality refers to feelings, individual thoughts, experiences and personal behavior related to the soul or the need for the search for the absolute or ultimate reality. Our distinction between religiosity and spirituality may surprise the majority of University students who all along have been made to understand and use the terms religion and spirituality interchangeably, without realizing different aspects of human experience.

3.0   Theories of Religiosity and Spirituality

A number of theories or determinant factors have been used to explain religiosity alongside spirituality. It is important to repeat here the distinction we have made between religiosity and spirituality. The term religiosity in this context is not merely an abstract noun of the word religion. It is used here somewhat with an element of criticism as something misleading, tinged with emotions and tied to predetermined rules and regulations. Because, as we have pointed out, religion is an institutionalized process, more structured and more traditional and encompasses cultural history of a people. We do not deny the importance and role it plays in human life, except to use the term and give meaning and interpretation common among the postmodern adherents. Spirituality on the other hand is the search to know our true selves, and to discover the real nature of our consciousness.

Among the theories that explain religiosity, the secularization and related hypotheses (Rachel M. Mc Cleary et.al. 2003) is more outstanding because of its association with modernization theory which tends to place greater emphasis on economic development apart from changes in social and public institutions (vide Bell, D. 1973).

This theory explains how economic development may lead individuals to be less religious and end up being reluctant to attend church services and finally question some fundamental teachings of religion. It is common among some economically viable people to despise religious teachings because they may think they have arrived and view religion as an unnecessary social phenomenon. Questions about one God, life after death, hell and heaven may easily be raised by the rich. It does not mean however, that by asking such questions the individuals are atheists. No. Because, even when they ask such questions, they will continue to attend church ceremonies in order to identify with fellow Christian communities. They may continue to read the Bible and pay their tithe.

But such individuals may involve themselves with the mere attendance of liturgical functions thus falling in the category of religiosity.

The secularization hypothesis "also predicts that economic development causes organized religion to play a lesser role in political decision-making and in social and legal processes more generally" (Rachel M. Mc Cleary et.al. 2003:2). In Kenya, this part of the theory may not fully be practical. Although Kenyan Churches are economically independent, often they have been involved in political decisions. We can still remember their role when Kenyans were agitating for the realization and acquisition of the present new constitution.

Perhaps the most significant part of secularization hypotheses for our purpose is the impact of education and assumed distinction commonly made between urbanite and rural students in the campuses. This is so, because when students at the Universities begin to access various kinds of literature, some of which may be described as secularist or atheistic materials, they become critical and tend to question their religious faith. For the first time, they may question parts of the doctrines or dogmas of the Christian Church based on authority of the Scriptures, some of which can hardly be scientifically tested or proved.

The atheistic opinions or writings of Sigmund Freud or David Hume may challenge and persuade some students to doubt their Christian orthodoxy and tradition. As we have already pointed out, at the University, there is often apparent tension between those students who may be referred to as rural folks and the urban self esteem group! The urbanites often assume some sort of intellectual superiority over the rural lot. When this social status phenomenon is interpreted along religious faith, the common conclusion is that those from the country side would be more inclined to respect their religious faith whereas those from the urban centres may not wholly entertain the same conviction. Both may continue paying attention to religious activities but at different levels of theological convictions. The apparent doubt and negation may not necessarily as yet make them irreligious. A number of students we interviewed confessed or rather admitted that despite their different opinions about religion; they cannot simply divorce or isolate themselves from joining religious activities. It is difficult to criticize religion among the majority of fellow students. This is why a great number tend to participate in one or another religious activity, but with a personal interpretation.

The challenge posed by education to students at the University according to our finding is

Four-fold. First, there is a group which prefers to be completely involved in the external activities of religion but without the acknowledgement of personal rigorous demands and self interrogation of spirituality. This group definitely fits the description and meaning of religiosity. They are doing all that is necessary to satisfy the traditional description of a religious and spiritual person - the concern with keeping the regulations without spiritual interpretations. Second, are those who say very little about religion but are able to attend any liturgical function at their disposal but without being affiliated to any particular denomination. Today they may worship with Seventh Day Adventists, next week they may be part of the congregation of the Catholic group. When asked for the rationale for such movements, the answer is: 'God is the same'. It may be hypothesized that such

students are still searching to find a satisfactory "religious home" because they are not comfortable with their original faith tradition. If not, they may be interpreting liturgical ceremonies as moments for socialization where they meet, are noticed and accepted by their friends or colleagues. They may go on this way for a while before finding a place to call a "home" - a religious group for affiliation. Third, is a group of few individuals who do not criticize religious faith or inquire about it but they do not attend any such services. When we asked some of them for an explanation of their attitude, they said they have no problem with religion except that there is no time for religious clubs or activities. This group of students may be referred to as passive or anonymous Christians. Finally, is a unique group of students who stand out and say openly that they believe in God and are spiritual but do not need organized religious tradition to prove their position. We must admit that the numbers of students who take this position are very minimal. In fact, some of them do not want to be open about their position. But when they have an opportunity they deny the role of religion as the only vehicle for spirituality. They are, without saying it, influenced by the present trend of postmodern spirituality described as 'spiritual but not religious! They have designed their own method of understanding the divine and the transcendent. In North America, these type of people are referred to as SBNR –Spiritual but not religious. The few students we spoke to about this trend were not even aware of the abbreviation SBNR. All they underscored was that they can pray on their own when they want, be ethical and avoid what they learnt to be immoral practices; except acknowledging the importance of organized and institutionalized phenomenon called religion.

To many this practice may be interpreted as secular spirituality because it emphasizes humanistic ideas and values including such qualities as love, compassion, patience, tolerance, forgiveness, contentment, responsibility, harmony and concern for others. But these aspects of life and human experience go beyond a purely materialistic view of the world without necessarily accepting belief in a supernatural reality or divine. Such of course is one of the characteristics of great concern to New Age spirituality which sometimes seems to be contradictory.

Rachel M. McCleary and Robert J. Barro (2003) have also proposed a second theory, the religious competition and the religious market model which is a part of secularization hypothesis to explain religiosity. Unfortunately, this theory does not seem to fit well in a University situation. It states in part, "if competition existed among churches, much of this competition would take the form of debunking the religious beliefs practiced by others. If the beliefs were based primarily on superstition and ignorance, then the argument is that these beliefs could not withstand the competition" (2003:7). It may nevertheless, be a challenge to some Chaplains in the University set up. There are indeed some levels of competitions in the campuses if not at a minimal level. Such competitions are visible in the organization of the choir and how the chaplain prepares and presents his or her liturgy. Students, especially the new ones would be attracted to a service and feel comfortable where a chaplain seems to know how to conduct the service in an appealing manner. The economic part of this is that the tithe would be increased. Alternatively, when the service is dull and the pastor seems unprepared, some of his/ her flock would move to another group to find the expected satisfaction. Worse still is when

there is too much emphasis on financial contribution, this may prevent or limit church attendance and some of the students may simply choose to remain religious but without attending services. This would definitely create a path for religiosity. With this background discussion, we may now turn to our data collection and methods we used to obtain the results.

4.0   Data and Methods

Our data was derived from questionnaires administered on the dynamics of religiosity and spirituality in Kenyan Public Universities. Initially we intended to interview seven hundred respondents from all the seven public Universities. However, owing to differences in semester timetables where students were busy revising and preparing for end of semester examinations it was not feasible to reach out to the other five public Universities outside Nairobi. Instead, we expanded our sample to five hundred, two hundred and fifty each from both Nairobi and Kenyatta Universities. Stratified random sampling method was used determine the number of respondents for the research. Thirty questionnaires were administered to lecturers, fifteen from each institution apart from oral interviews with four chaplains, two from each University respectively. Open and closed ended questionnaires were distributed to selected undergraduate and post graduate students**.**

The questions were prepared in such a way as to provide an opportunity and freedom to respondents to be able to answer both open and structured questions. The questionnaires were also designed so as to give the respondents a chance and freedom to express their own opinions and understanding of religiosity and spirituality. The closed ended questions facilitated responses on personal data, covering age, gender and year of study at the University. A total of two hundred and ninety women against two hundred and ten men participated in the study. Among the items included in the questionnaires were: Do you belong to any religion/ Church or denomination? All those who responded to this question said that they were affiliated to one religion or another. Contrary to the claim that the Universities are a breeding ground for self acclaimed atheists. In fact, all those who responded to the questionnaires admitted that they did not only belong to a given religious tradition but were also members of various religious clubs within the campuses**.** The next main question sought to investigate the individual and collective advantages of various clubs within the Universities. Those students who answered the question explained how useful these clubs are, not only for their spiritual development but also to enhance their association with those whom they would not otherwise interact with because of the diversity in their academic programmes. Apart from socialization, the students equally revealed that these clubs enhance orientation to new students in the University because of the friendliness of the members of these clubs.

Our third question seems to have been more popular with the respondents. It sought to establish the factors which explain the popularity and significance of religious clubs in the campuses. The significance was evidenced by the following positive responses such

as ; prevention of negative peer influence upon fellow students especially among the first years, enabling the new students to accept and find their space within the Universities' set up and even for providing academic advice and assistance.

These three questions are a part of the several questionnaires we administered to the respondents at the Universities. The rest of which included: What is the difference between religiosity and spirituality? Do all students participate in religious activities and ceremonies? Are all students associated to a religion or denomination? Do students persist in membership in a given religious club throughout their study period at the University? Does economic viability impact one's religious faith while at the University? And finally, do academic programmes interfere or challenge one's religious faith or conviction? The responses and reactions from these questions are presented and analyzed in tables 1 and 2.

5.0. Conclusion and Discussion

Our paper set out to investigate the dynamics of religiosity and spirituality among the students at the Universities of Nairobi and Kenyatta; granted originally we had intended to include all the seven secular Universities. That arrangement failed because of the Universities examination schedules and inadequate time for the actualization of other logistics. The main question of the study was to examine whether the contemporary meaning and interpretations of the terms religiosity and spirituality are evident in the said Universities. And if so, which secularization hypotheses or theories and factors influence religiosity and spirituality and how these reflected among students in the two campuses.

Owing however, to present discussion and apparent opposition against the establishment of the departments of Religious Studies in secular Universities, we first attempted to explain the source of animosity against religions in secular institutions of higher learning. It is true; we admitted that religions are social paradoxes which have impacted world history both positively and negatively. They can be a source of civilization but can also be instruments of destruction of what has been achieved. The role and significance of religion in a human society as was acknowledged by the 19th and 20th century social scientists can hardly be denied. And because religions are inextricably bound up with culture we can hardly appreciate and understand a people without their religions.

Religions are difficult social phenomena to objectively define. More often when we attempt to define a religion we may be exclusive, describing it according to our own context, or we may be victims of compartmentalization let alone vagueness. This is why James L. Cox (2010), suggests that we attempt to define a religion from a given school of thought to point out the aspect or meaning we want to bring out in our description the problem of finding a common meaning of religion is also applicable to spirituality. In the past, most people took spirituality to be inextricably linked to religion. Today, this assumption is rarely meaningful to many scholars. As we pointed out in the beginning of this paper, religiosity and spirituality are world apart! For example, E. Brandt (1996:4)

points out that spirituality are exclusive of the rites and rituals of religion; rather the goals of spirituality transcend religion because they promote a greater awareness of universal values, helping an individual live and work better more joyfully". Quoted by T.W. Winters Moore (2008:82). The same author has made reference to Garcia-Zamor et. al. (2003:5) who have strongly pointed out that "spirituality, is definitely not about religion" (vide Winter T. 2008: 82). Of course there are scholars who are not ready to accept the distinction between religion and spirituality. This reluctance is healthy because in academics, we rarely expect uniformity among researchers of a given topic. It is not a surprise therefore when Hicks in his article – Spiritual and Religious Diversity in the Worship Place Implications for Leadership, (2002) insists that spirituality and religion are mutually exclusive and cannot be separated (vide Winters T. 2008:82). Our position in this paper is for separation. It is supported by Delbert Teachout (2011:1) acknowledgement of the distinction between religion and spirituality. He says, "I observed the difference first hand. Some men begun to practice religious behaviours but had no spirituality. Other men found spirituality and new life. The first group could not understand how to incorporate their religious beliefs into their spirituality".

In an effort to find out the situation among the students of Nairobi and Kenyatta Universities, we prepared and administered five hundred questionnaires to both students and lecturers apart from our oral discussion with four chaplains. The reality and existence of religion in these campuses cannot be doubted. At the University of Nairobi, we even observed some Muslim students having their afternoon prayers in the lawns of great court. This is an important observation that verifies not only freedom of worship in these secular Universities but it is also a reassurance that students do not shy away from their religious orthodoxy and tradition.

The impact of secularization however is not absent in the campuses. It follows the path of education, economic viability and the tendency to give a subjective interpretation of religious doctrines. The reasons why these practices are not commonly visible is because the religious clubs are fairly strong and as such theistic impact controls the general set up of the University community. We were n evertheless, able to identify four groups of students in relation to the dynamics of religiosity and spirituality in the campuses. A common phenomenon among these four groups is lack of clear distinction between religiosity and spirituality. As we have repeatedly indicated, even in the campuses most students still find it difficult to separate religion from spirituality, even though some of them actually act and behave in a manner that verifies the distinction as we will soon indicate.

From the analysis of our questionnaires, the first group of students is generally religious. This is expected because we have just pointed out that the presence of religion in the campuses outstandingly noticeable. This group is made up of those who lead in religious activities, participate religiously in liturgical celebrations, yet their personal life does not seem to add up to spirituality in the present sense of the term. They can thus be interpreted as being so much concerned with the outward performance obeying the rules and regulations as required by their religious tradition but lack spirituality (cf. Delbert

Teachout 2011:11). The second group we encountered through the questionnaires consists of those students who move from one religious club or ceremony to another. As we have said, they are not registered and confirmed member of a particular religious affiliation or denomination. But they feel free to alternate their worship according to prevailing circumstances. The third group is made up of those students who do not criticize religion or question belief in one God and his saving promise. But if they are invited to attend a religious session, they would readily excuse themselves and feign reasons for attending. These" I have no time group!" We have said may be referred to as anonymous or passive Christians, they are neither in the group of religiosity nor spirituality. They have not lost their faith; they only do not associate with other faithful during the expected religious ceremonies. The fourth group consists of a very minimal number of students and they cut across the four year period. They do not have time for religion or for religious ceremony. However, because they are aware of the popularity of religion in the campuses they tend not to be vocal except informally when opportunity for atheistic arguments presents itself. Our conclusion is that some of the students in these two Universities represent the phenomenon of contemporary religious faith; something akin to those in the North even though the terminologies and distinction used and made there have not become common. For example, in the North, especially in North America the terms religiosity and spirituality have taken on new meanings and significance. The expression "spiritual but not religious "SBNR is a common expression of postmodern spirituality. And we suspect it will soon be a part of vocabularies in the campuses.

References

Afton N. Kapuscinski and Kevin Masters (2010)."The Current Status of Measures of Spirituality:
    A Critical Review of Scale Development". *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, American Journal of Psychological Association 2 (4: 191-205.

Brandt E. (1996). *Corporate Pioneers Explore Spirituality*, HR Magazine, 41(4) 82-87.
Bell, D. (1973). *The Coming of Post Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*, New York: Basic Books.

Cox James L.(2010).*An Introduction to the Phenomenology of Religion,* London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Elkins D.N. (1988)."Toward a Humanistic-Phenomenological Spirituality**:** Definition, Description, and Measurement". *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* FALL 28: 5-18.
Garcia Zamor and Jean Claude (2003). "Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance"   in *Public Administration Review*, 63(3) 355-363.

Hall T.W. et. al.(1985).*Religion: An Introduction* ,San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Heelas Paul (1998). *Modernity and Postmodernity,* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hernandez Brittany C. (2011). *The Religiosity and Spirituality Scale for Youth: Development and Initial Validation*, (PhD Unpublished thesis, Louisiana State University.

Hinnells John R. ed.(2010). *The Routledge Companion to the Study of Religion,* 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

John P. Alston (1975). "Review of the Poles: Three Measures of Current levels of Religiosity",*Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 14:165-168.

Kalchuri Bhau, Meher Prabhu, Lord Meher (1986). *The Biography of the Avatar of the Age Meher Baba,* Vol. 8 Manifestation, inc.:22987.

Kelly, E.W. (1985). *Spirituality and Religion in Counselling and Psychotherapy: Diversity in theory and practice.* Alexandria: V.A. American Counseling Association.

Marie Cronwal et al. (1986)."The Dimensions of Religiosity: A Conceptual Model with an Empirical Test". *Review of Religious Research, Vol. 27, No.3*.

Mc Cormick D.W.(1994)."Spirituality and Management". *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 9 (6):5-8.

Mitroff I.I and Denton E.A.(1999)."A Study of Spirituality in the Work place", *Sloan Management Review*, 40(4):83-92.

Moojan Momen (1999).*The Phenomenon of Religion.* Oxford: One World.

Neck, C. P and Milliman, J. F. (1994)."Thought Self-Leadership: Finding Spiritual
      Fulfillment in Organizational life". *Journal of Managerial Psychology,
      9*(6)*,* 9-16.

Piedmont R.L.(1989).   "Does Spirituality Represent the Sixth Factor of Personality?
       Spiritual Transcendence and the five Model", *Journal of Personality*,
      67 985-1013.

Rachel M. McCleary and Robert J. Barro (2003). *Religion and Political Economy in an
      International Panel,* (Harvard: Harvard University.

Robert A. Segal (2010   ). "Theories of Religion". John R. Hinnells ed., *The Routledge
      Companion of Religion,* 2nd ed., London: Routledge.

Teachout Delbert (2011)."Religion and Spirituality", *Spirituality for Today*, Jan, 2011,
      Vol.15, Issue 6.

Winter T. Moore (2008) "Individual Differences and Workplace Spirituality, the
      Homogenization of the Corporate Culture", *Journal of Management and
      Marketing Research*, 1(Dec): 79-83.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I- LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1

NUMBER AND CATEGORIES OF RESPONDENTS

Items	Total	Percentage
Respondents interviewed	500	100%
Female students interviewed	290	58%
Male students interviewed	210	42%

TABLE 2

FACTORS OF RELIGIOSITY AND SPIRITUALITY IN KENYATTA AND NAIROBI UNIVERSITIES

Question Items	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Affiliation to Religion/denomination	**480**	**96%**
Church Attendance	478	95.6%
Significance of Religious Clubs	458	91.6%
Distinction between Religiosity and Spirituality	240	48%
Participation in Religious Activities/Ceremonies	382	76.4%
Continuity of Membership in Religious Clubs	372	74.4%
Academic Programmes versus Religious Conviction	376	75.2%

APPENDIX II

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONAIRE IS INTENDED TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS ON THE DYNAMICS OF RELIGIOSITY AND SPIRITUALITY IN KENYAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

To facilitate this exercise, the terms religiosity and spirituality are defined as follows:

(a) Religiosity sets the rules for behavior of the individual. It creates ways and means through laws to control believers and leaves no room for individual growth since the rules must be followed even when they seem outdated in modem world. Thus religions are not spiritual once they become commercial and dictatorial.

(b) Spirituality is the ability to question and seek the truth around us and not to follow the crowd for its own sake in the name of religion. It is the inborn sense we have of spirit within. It enables one to want to think, act and do good for the sake of good. Individuals exercise their right through life on a basis of personal responsibility.

1. Please tick (√) the appropriate answer in the space provided.

 a) How old are you? (18-24) ( ) (25-30) ( ) Over 31 ( )

 b) Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )   .

 c) In which c) In which College/Schooll/ FacuJty are you ....

   d) Your present year of study 1 st ( ) 2nd ( ) 3rd ( )   4th ( )   Post graduate ( )

2. Are you interested in Religion? Yes ( ) No ( )

   a)   If your answer above is Yes, to which religion/denomination/affiliation do you belong? --

b)Is this your parentis religion? Yes ( )   No ( )

Were you baptized as a baby Yes ( )   No ( )

3. Did you join religion of your own choice? Yes ( ) No ( )

4. Why did you choose this religion?

       a. It was my parents decision Yes ( ) No ( )

       b. It was my own choice Yes ( )   No ( )

       c. It was influenced by a friend Yes ( )   No ( )

       d. My present future spouse influenced me Yes ( ) Yes ( )

6. Does your University organize religiously initiated clubs? Yes ( ) No ( )

If your answer above is Yes which of the following clubs are at your University?

i.	Christian Fellowship	Yes ( )	No ( )
11.	Christian Union	Yes ( )	No ( )
iii	Church Choir	Yes ( )	No ( )
iv.	Bible Study Group	Yes ( )	No ( )

16

v.	Mass Servers Club	Yes ( )	No ( )
VI.	Peer Counselors	Yes ( )	No ( )
vii.	Young Christian Society	Yes ( )	No ( )
viii.	Parish Council	Yes ( )	No ( )

7. Name the religious club to which you belong _____

8. Are these clubs useful/necessary in a secular University? Yes ( )   No   ( )

Please give some reasons to support your answer.

i) …………………………………………………………………………………………………..

ii) …………………………………………………………………………………………………..

iii)…………………………………………………………………………………………………..

iv) …………………………………………………………………………………………………..

9. Do campus religious organizations anticipate intellectual challenges? Yes ( ) No ( )

Please mention at least three areas of such challenges.

i) …………………………………………………………………………………………………..

ii) …………………………………………………………………………………………………..

iii)…………………………………………………………………………………………………..

10. Does emphasis on religious tolerance minimize anti-religious hostility on campus?

 Yes ( )   No ( )

II. Are there professors / lecturers who deliberately influence students away from any kind of belief in God? Yes ( )   No ( )

12. Do you agree with the theory that Christ wants a personal relationship with believers and not religion? Yes ( ) No ( )

13. Does campus life-style lead more to being religious? Yes ( )   No ( )

14. Is being religious equivalent to keeping the laws and regulations? Yes ( ) No ( )

15. Being religious means praying and reading the bible daily and paying tithe even if one loves himself/ herself and money? Yes ( )   No ( )

16. Quoting the words or actions of some man of God to justify one's action is a religious action/religiosity? Yes ( )   No ( )

17. Being religious is, but interest in the written words and the righteousness of the law? Yes ( ) No ( )

18. That , according to the New Testament the Pharisees were religious? Yes ( ) No ( )

19.That freedom at the campus may lead one to being religious? Yes ( ) No ( )

20. Is being religious identical to being spiritual? Yes ( ) No ( )

21. Being spiritual is a matter of inner heart and is Godliness. Yes ( )   No ( )

22. Being spiritual is equivalent to personal holiness/purity. Yes ( )   No ( )

23.Spirituality is not seeking self approval from others. Yes ( ) No ( )

24. According to the New Testament the Pharisees were religious but not spiritual.

Yes ( ) No ( )

 Give reasons

i)---

ii) ---

iii) --

25. The life and freedom at the campus may lead a student to being religious and not spiritual

   Yes ( )   No ( )

Please give reasons?
 ----

26. Religion is outward looking but spirituality is inward looking. Yes ( ) No ( )

26. Spirituality encourages personal spiritual growth and sanctification. Yes ( ) No ( )

27. How often do you attend religious services at the Campus?
   i)   At least once a week ( )
   ii)   At least once a month ( )
   iii) On most important religious holidays ( )
   iv) Rarely ever ( )
   v)   Never ( )

29. Would you support the theory that Religion should not be included in secular Universities'

programmes? Yes ( ) No ( )

 Please give reasons.

 i)--

ii)--

iii)--