Ohio Communication Journal
Volume 55 – February 2017, pp. 54-63

Spiritual Intelligence, Moral Intensity, and the Intention to Help a Stranger Who Initiates Communication: A Study of Millennial College Students

Yang Lin
Kathleen D. Clark
Virginia Maher

Communication with strangers is a unique process of social interaction. Prior research has suggested millennial college students put spirituality into practice through an ethic of caring and a sense of interconnectedness. The current study investigates how this active spirituality might be evident in a situation where a stranger requests help. Three hundred and thirty nine participants between the ages of 18-35 completed questionnaires including the Spiritual Intelligence Self-Report Inventory and a moral intensity scale, as well as a scenario in which they were asked to evaluate the likelihood they would respond to help an elderly stranger who speaks with heavily foreign accented English. Results show the higher the level of spiritual intelligence and the higher the level of "perceived harm" to the stranger, the higher the likelihood of acting to help, controlling for gender and age. The findings suggest that spirituality indirectly influences initial interactions with strangers.

Strangers are individuals "… of different groups and are unknown to us" (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003, p. 24). *Communicating with strangers* has been identified as a distinct situation for social interaction which involves individuals who are different regarding their personal values, beliefs, life styles, communication behaviors, and other cultural elements (Gudykunst, 2005; Gudykunst & Kim, 1984; 2003). For many individuals, interactions with strangers "… tend to involve the highest degree of strangeness and the lowest degree of familiarity" (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003, p. 24). Studies have suggested that individuals encounter unique challenges in their communication with strangers, particularly during initial interactions with them (Duronto, Nishida, & Nakyama, 2005; Gudykunst, 2005; Lin & Rancer, 2003; Neuliep, 2012; Neuliep & Ryan, 1998). This research has found that individuals' uncertainty and anxiety regarding the anticipated interactions with cultural strangers are positively related to their avoidance of such interactions.

In addition, Gudykunst and Kim (1984) have concluded that worldview has "… a direct impact on our communication with strangers" (p. 42), and is certainly a communication factor that warrants a closer examination. Samovar, Porter, McDaniel, and Roy (2013) also indicated that a reasonable predictor for individuals' behaviors and motivations is a culture's worldview, much of which can be grouped into traditional religion, secular humanism, and spirituality. Since an important form of worldview is human spirituality, which for many individuals is the foundation of values, beliefs, and morality that influence their behaviors, clearly spirituality can be expected to play a unique role in individuals' initial interactions with culturally different strangers.

According to Pew Research Center (2010), the millennial generation is defined as "those born after 1980 and the first generation to come of age in the new millennium" (para. 1). Many members of the millennial generation embrace values consistent with religious teaching and beliefs, such as goodness, kindness, and tolerance, but are skeptical about the Bible and church traditions, rules, and behaviors (barna.org, 2007). In a report based on a longitudinal study focusing on the spirituality of undergraduate students, Astin observed that spirituality has to do with the students' search for meaning and purpose, values development, and self-understanding (Pew Research Center, 2008). He also noted that since spirituality is primarily an interior quality, most spirituality measures have to do with values, attitudes, and beliefs. As American society has become increasingly diverse and mobile in the 21st century, members of the millennial generation generally, and millennial college students in particular, are more likely to engage in direct social interaction with cultural strangers in their everyday lives. Considering this generational shift, how does the spirituality, particularly moral reasoning, of members of the millennial generation influence the way they handle the situation of communicating with a stranger?

Therefore, centered on Gudykunst and Kim's (1984, 2003) conceptualization of communication with strangers, the purpose of this research is to investigate how spiritual factors influence the reasoning and decision

Yang Lin (PhD, University of Oklahoma) is a professor, **Kathleen D. Clark** (PhD, The Ohio State University) is an associate professor, and **Virginia Maher** (MA, University of Akron) is a lecturer in the School of Communication, University of Akron, Ohio. Correspondence to: Yang Lin, School of Communication, The University of Akron, KO 108, Akron, OH 44325-1003. Email: ylin1@uakron.edu.

making of members of the millennial generation regarding whether or not to help a stranger. Specifically, this study examines the factors influencing millennial college students' moral reasoning as they decide whether or not to help an individual who seems culturally different from them and initiates communication.

Literature review

Spirituality and spiritual intelligence

In their extensive research of the spirituality of millennials, Astin, Astin and Lindholm (2011) identified three dimensions of spirituality in practice as: interconnectedness, caring *for* other people (e.g. participating in community service, donating money to charities, and helping friends with personal problems), and caring *about* other people (e.g. feelings expressed in wanting to help those who are troubled and to alleviate suffering). They believe spirituality gives us our sense of meaning; who we are, where we come from, and why we are here. Spirituality also refers to an interdependent sense of connectedness with each other and the world around us. The characteristic of spirituality put into practice by helping others is supported by Helminiak (2001) who suggested that spirituality entails living our commitment to a set of meanings and values in everyday acts. Leak (2006) noted that social interest is linked with positive spiritual attributes, such as authenticity, a sense of universality and connectedness with others, striving to meet daily goals that are self-transcendent rather than self-focused, and having a center of value in things that transcend the self.

Identifying the characteristics of spirituality in practice has also been the focus of research into spirituality as a form of intelligence. Zohar (2005) contended that a distinctly spiritual intelligence is the ability to access higher meanings, values, abiding purposes, and unconscious aspects of the self and to embed these meanings, values, and purposes in living a richer and more creative life. Signs of high spiritual intelligence include an ability to think out of the box, an attitude of humility, and access to energies that come from something beyond the ego. Emmons (2000) identified various components of spiritual intelligence, including the ability to utilize spiritual resources to solve everyday problems and the capacity to be virtuous by engaging in effective action. Zohar and Marshall (2000) discussed spiritual intelligence as a source of ethical behavior. Building on such components, King and DeCicco (2009) developed their scale of spiritual intelligence. They believe spiritual intelligence originates in the mind of an individual and expresses itself both inwardly and outwardly, and, therefore, may be observed through both mental dispositions and physical actions.

Astin, et al. (2011) explained how an ethic of caring for others can be observed behaviorally in charitable involvement and other research confirms a connection between ethics, charitable involvement, and prosocial behavior in young adults (barna.org, 2013, 2007, 2005; Baumsteiger, Chenneville & McGuire, 2013; Brodbeck, et al., 2011; Kocabyik & Kluaksizoglu, 2014; Leak, 2006; Paciello, Fida, Tamontano, Cole, & Cerniglia, 2013; Paulin, Ferguson, Schattke, & Jost, 2015). However, much of this research emphasized more indirect ways of helping, such as contributing money to charitable causes or expressing concern for the environment, leaving unanswered the question of how an ethic of caring for others plays out in direct encounters with another person in need of assistance. Such findings raise a question about the degree of influence spirituality in the form of spiritual intelligence has upon the actual practice by millennials of an ethic of caring for or about another person. More specifically, if confronted by someone in need of help, will millennials be likely to help that person?

Moral intensity

One such factor may be found in how members of the millennial generation reason about their actions, particularly when it comes to their ethical or moral reasoning. Researchers concerned about ethical behavior and moral reasoning have studied factors that influence individuals' decisions about moral dilemmas and found the construct of perceived moral intensity helps identify when people are more or less likely to act ethically (Barnett, 2001; Jones, 1991; Singhapakdi, Vitell, & Franke, 1999). Jones (1991) suggested that if a person perceives a high level of moral intensity in a situation requiring a decision to act, that person will more likely recognize a moral component, undertake ethical reasoning, form moral intentions, and act ethically. Barnett (2001) echoed this reasoning, arguing that moral intensity relates exclusively to the way a decision maker perceives characteristics of a moral issue or dilemma. He explained that people are likely to wonder about how serious the potential consequences of an action are or how society evaluates the morality of an action before deciding whether they will

take action. Jones (1991) identified six components of moral intensity: magnitude of consequences (the degree of harm a particular action is likely to cause victims of the action); social consensus (the degree of social agreement that a proposed act is evil or good); probability of effect (the likelihood an action will take place and create harmful effects); temporal immediacy (the length of time between the present and the onset of consequences of an act); proximity (the degree of nearness or closeness the decision maker has for those affected by the issue or action in question); and, concentration of effect (the number of individuals influenced by an act).

Singhapakdi et al. (1999) suggested that intentions and behaviors come from individuals' perceptions of a moral issue rather than actual characteristics of the issue. They found perceived moral intensity was related to intentions to act unethically in a situation. Barnett (2001) presented third and fourth year undergraduate students with actions requiring consideration of ethics in two hypothetical business situations to test the four dimensions of perceived moral intensity. He found that social consensus was most important, that how society felt about issues affected respondents' ethical decision making, the only dimension that affected whether an action had an ethical component. He speculated that individuals may first need to identify an ethical component in an issue before they begin to take other dimensions of moral intensity into account. Yet another finding by Barnett implied that students were more likely to judge an action as ethical when they perceived the potential victim was similar to themselves or judge an action less harshly when they perceived it as being like a choice they had made in a similar situation. He concluded that an indirect effect on ethical judgments may be the primary influence of moral intensity on ethical behavioral intentions.

Related research in bystander intervention by Fritzsche, Finkelstein and Penner (2000) held as a central tenet that an individual weighs the costs of helping or not before deciding to intervene or not intervene to help someone in need. In their research, respondents considered several scenarios concerning helping someone in a non-emergency situation. An arousal: cost-reward model predicted that helping should increase as costs of helping decrease and the costs of not helping increase. Their findings supported this model, with the greatest amount of helping offered in response to the scenario with the lowest cost of helping and the highest costs of not helping. Like the findings from perceived moral intensity research, once again individuals stop to consider whether or not to help, and weigh factors such as cost-rewards to self and other, or the moral intensity of an action, before deciding whether or not they will act to help.

Compared with earlier generations, members of the millennial generation are less religious, more spiritual, and more tolerant (barna.org, 2013; Pew Research Center, 2015). Researchers have been intrigued with how this increased spirituality and tolerance might be observed in action. Baumsteiger, et al. (2013) found some support for links between moral reasoning and spirituality, leading to one specific line of inquiry which asks: how might millennial students' spirituality influence their decision to act, struggle with an ethical dilemma, and overcome the discomfort and anxiety of the unfamiliar to help a stranger? Might millennials' spirituality in the form of spiritual intelligence influence the hesitation indicated by the perceived moral intensity? One way to explore such a situation would be to consider an initial interaction, where the uncertainty of encountering a stranger is exacerbated by unfamiliar communicative behaviors. Therefore, we asked the following two questions:

RQ1: What is the relationship between spiritual intelligence and moral intensity among millennial college students?

RQ2: How do spiritual intelligence and moral intensity influence the intention to help a stranger who initiates communication?

Method

Participants and Data Collection

Participants in this study were students at a large Midwestern university in the United States. The study was approved by the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB), and an informed consent message was shared with students. All participants took part voluntarily. This study was part of a large scale survey which consisted of questions and statements concerning a variety of concepts/variables. Paper-and-pencil questionnaires were administered in classrooms.

Among the 376 questionnaires that were returned, 17 provided responses to less than 30% of the content of the questionnaire and three were from students younger than 18. As a result, these 20 questionnaires were not used for further analysis. In addition, since this study focused on members of the millennial generation in America (i.e. individuals who were born in 1980 or later), 17 questionnaires returned by participants who were older than 35 years of age were excluded from further analysis. The 339 participants consisted of 179 males and 160 females with ages ranging from 18 to 34 ($M = 20.25$, $SD = 3.12$). Ethnicities included: White (Caucasian) (68.4%), Hispanic American (Latino) (1.5%), African American (Black) (22.1%), Asian American (3.2%), and Other (4.4%). One participant didn't indicate ethnicity. Participants were from these academic areas: Social Sciences/Education/Humanities (37.2%), Natural Sciences/Engineering/Health Sciences (41.3%), Business (16.8%), Undecided (3.2%), and Other (1.2%). One didn't indicate a major. Participants included: 52.8 % freshman, 18.6% sophomores, 8.8% juniors, 16.5% seniors, and 3.3% were graduate students or other.

Measures

Spiritual Intelligence. The Spiritual Intelligence Self-Report Inventory (SISRI) (King & DeCicco, 2009) was adapted to assess individuals' level of spirituality. The SISRI consists of 24 items in four dimensions. The first dimension, "Critical Existential Thinking" (CET), includes seven items. One of the items of CET, for instance, states, "I have often questioned or pondered the nature of reality" (King & DeCicco, 2009, p. 84). The second dimension, "Personal Meaning Production" (PMP), has five items. One of these items states, "I am able to define a purpose or reason for my life" (p. 84). The third dimension, "Transcendental Awareness" (TA), consists of seven items. One of these items states, "I am highly aware of the nonmaterial aspects of life" (p. 84). The fourth and last dimension, "Conscious State Expansion" (CSE), has five items. One of these items states, "I am able to enter higher states of consciousness or awareness" (p. 84). Responses were solicited using a 5-point scale ranging from "0" ("Not at all true of me") to "4" ("Completely true of me"). Reliability assessments of these four sub-scales for the SISRI suggested a high level of measure consistency; the Cronbach's alphas are .78 for CET ($M = 24.52$, $SD = 5.68$), .79 for PMP ($M = 17.68$, $SD = 3.40$), .71 for TA ($M = 23.67$, $SD = 4.64$), and .86 for CSE ($M = 15.28$, $SD = 4.74$). A total Spiritual Intelligence score is the sum of these four subscale scores. The final combined score would suggest the higher the score, the more spiritual a participant.

Moral intensity. The measure of moral intensity was a scale of six items adapted from Singhapakdi, Vitell, and Kraft (1996). For example, two of these items state, "The overall harm (if any) done as a result of my providing no assistance to them would be very small;" "Most people would agree that not providing any assistance to them by me is wrong" (p. 33). This measure asked the participants to respond to each item using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = agree completely, 7 = disagree completely). Previous research suggests there are two dimensions with this measure: "perceived potential harms" and "perceived social pressure" (Singhapakdi, et al., 1996, p. 250). A perception of harm meant the individual was considering the action in light of the potential consequences to the other person of being helped or not, and a perception of social pressure meant the individual was considering the action in terms of how society or someone close to them might view the morality of the considered helping action (Singhapakdi, et al., 1996; Yang & Wu, 2009). Therefore, a confirmatory factor analysis was performed on these six items. The results show an excellent fit to the data as the fit indices were the following: $\chi 2\ (8) = 7.64$, $p = .47$; CMIN/DF = .96; GFI = .99; RMSEA = 0.00. The results thus confirmed two dimensions of moral intensity. The first dimension, perception of harm, consists of four items (Cronbach's alpha = .70, $M = 15.19$, $SD = 4.55$), while the second, perception of social pressure, includes two items (Cronbach's alpha = .69, $M = 5.89$, $SD = 3.20$).

Intention to act. A hypothetical situation, potentially familiar to college students, was presented to the participants in order to assess how they might reason to take action (or not) to help a stranger in a situation for which they have control over the course of action to take. In the hypothetical situation participants were asked to imagine the following: "[O]n a cold winter's day after class, you are walking to the remote lot where your car is parked. You look at your watch and see that if you leave in the next ten minutes, most likely you'll be on time to work. Then, an older couple approaches you and in heavily foreign accented English the man begins to talk to you. It sounds like he is asking you how to get to the Student Union, which is some distance away, out of sight." The scenario was created to mirror a likely real life situation in which both age ("older") and language ("heavily foreign accented English") were used to intensify the sense of strangeness and unfamiliarity for the participants.

Intention to provide assistance was measured by Likert-type items which asked participants to indicate the possibility that they would take an action in the described situation. A total of six possible actions were given to the

participants, and the types of these actions varied from not taking helpful action to helpful action at some inconvenience to oneself to seeking to get someone else to help the strangers. The possible responses ranged from "1" ("Very unlikely") to "5" ("Very likely"). A bivariate correlation analysis for the participants' responses indicates only two of the six action statements exhibited a significant and moderate correlation (r = .47, p < .01), and all remaining correlations among these action statements were either insignificant or very weak (r < .30). Thus, a composite score of these two action statements (items) (M = 3.36, SD = 1.72) was used to measure participants' intention. One of these two possible action statements was: "You say, "I'm sorry but I'm late," and you get in your car and drive away," and the other one was, "You say, "I'm sorry, but I don't understand what you are saying," and you get in your car and drive away." The composite score of this measure suggests the higher the score, the lower the likelihood a participant would act to help.

Results

To answer Research Questions 1 and 2, a mediation regression analysis was conducted by using PROCESS, a macro program for SPSS (Hayes, 2013). In this analysis, spiritual intelligence was entered as the independent variable; "perceived harm" and "perceived social pressure" were entered as mediators; and intention to act to help was entered as the outcome variable. In addition, since the primary purpose of this study was to examine spirituality and its relation to such variables as moral intensity (two dimensions) and intention to act to help, both gender (men coded as "1" and women coded as "0") and age were entered as covariates for controlling their effects on other variables. The bivariate correlations among these variables are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1

Bivariate Correlations Among Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Spirituality	---	.18**	-.02	-.12**
2. Perceived potential harm		---	-.12**	-.19**
3. Perceived social pressure			---	.14*
4. Intentions				---

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01.

Regarding the two dimensions of moral intensity, as shown in Table 2, a combination of the three variables has a significant impact on "perceived harm," F (3, 335) = 5.27, p < .01, R square = .05. Specifically, gender (b = -1.08, p < .05) and spiritual intelligence (b = 11.98, p < .01), contributed to the statistical significance of the relationship. That is, the higher the level of spiritual intelligence, the higher the level of "perceived harm", controlling for gender and age. Second, as shown in Table 3, a combination of the three variables has not demonstrated a significant impact on "perceived social pressure," F (3, 335) = 2.05, p = .11 (n.s.).

Finally, as displayed in Table 4 the five variables together significantly predicted intention, F (5, 333) = 4.52, p < .001, R square = .06. Specifically, "perceived harm" (b = -.06, p < .01) contributed significantly to the prediction of intentions. That is, the higher the level of "perceived harm", the higher the likelihood of acting to help, controlling for gender and age.

Table 2

Unstandardized Regression Coefficients and t-statistics in Mediation Analysis with "Perceived harm" as Mediator

Predictor	Coeff	SE	t-value
Gender	-1.08	.49	-2.22*
Age	.03	.08	.43
Spirituality	11.98	2.12	3.33**

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$. Model: $R^2 = .05$**

Table 3

Unstandardized Regression Coefficients and t-statistics in Mediation Analysis with "Perceived social pressure" as a Mediator

Predictor	Coeff	SE	t-value
Gender	.39	.35	1.10
Age	-.12	.06	-2.15
Spirituality	-.01	.01	-.39

Table 4

Unstandardized Regression Coefficients and t-statistics in Mediation Analysis Predicting Intentions

Predictor	Coeff	SE	t-value
Gender	.16	.18	.85
Age	-.03	.03	-1.17
Spirituality	-.01	.01	-1.71
Perceived harm	-.06	.02	-2.92**
Perceived social pressure	.06	.03	1.95

Note. ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. Model: $R^2 = .06$***

Discussion

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationships between spiritual intelligence and moral intensity among millennial college students as well as how these factors relate to the intention to offer assistance to a stranger. First, regarding RQ1, the findings show that the inner characteristic of spiritual intelligence is related to the two dimensions of moral intensity differently. The results suggest that (1) students who had higher scores for spiritual intelligence tended to have higher moral intensity scores for "perceived harm;" and (2) there is no significant relationship between student scores for spiritual intelligence and those for the moral intensity score "perceived social pressure." One possible explanation for these differences is that problem solving using spiritual intelligence will reflect an individual's deeply held beliefs and values, rather than social norms. Since spiritual intelligence is about personal beliefs and worldviews, it may not be related to "perceived social pressure" which is concerned with social judgments based on the ethical standards commonly accepted by society.

Another explanation may lie in the generational differences in the student population. The previous moral intensity research studying students was published no later than 2000. We can assume the students were members of Generation X, born between 1965 and 1980. The Barna Group (barna.org, 2005), reporting on their nationwide survey of the generational differences in morals between Boomers and Busters (Generation X), note that a generational difference exists in morality. Unlike Boomers,

> [N]early half of Busters said that ethics and morals are based on "what is right for the person," compared with just one-quarter of pre-Busters. This mindset helps to explain why Busters are more likely to embrace a pragmatic, individualized form of moral decision making (barna.org, 2005).

The findings of the current study seem to be consistent with the pattern of generational difference regarding morality suggested by other research.

Second, regarding RQ2, the findings indicate that the "perceived harm" dimension of moral intensity, not the "perceived social pressure" dimension, significantly affects the intention to act to help. Given the findings for RQ1, it is evident that the influence of individuals' spiritual intelligence on the intention to act to help is indirect, mitigated by the "perceived harm." In other words, the higher the level of spiritual intelligence and the more harmful the consequences perceived in the scenario, the more likely individuals are to act to help. One explanation for this relationship is that a characteristic of spirituality in millennials beyond an ethic of caring for or caring about is the importance of interconnectedness, "a sense of connectedness to all beings" (Astin, Astin & Lindholm, 2011, p. 63), including "accepting others as they are" (p. 67). It may be that while social pressure to do the right thing is not motivating for a member of the millennial generation, the sense of being connected to another person who is in trouble and needs help may overcome the hesitation prompted by the strangeness of the other. Notably, this finding is different from those reported in previous research (e.g., Barnett, 2001) in which perceived social consensus was identified as the most important dimension of moral intensity influencing individuals' intention to act. Barnett (2001) speculates that students' ethical decision making in his study was "affected by their perceptions of how society felt about the issues" (p. 1053).

Another possible explanation for the discrepancy is that the ethical dilemma presented in this study is for an action in one brief interaction with a stranger after which one presumes there will be no further consequences, unlike some of the social and business scenarios used in previous research where there is the presumption that relationships may already be established or may be ongoing, or that there will be some documentation of the action such that there may be future consequences. In the scenario in this study there would be no further personal ramifications to the person doing the reasoning and acting than his or her own sense of ethics; the millennial individual with higher Spiritual Intelligence scores may experience uncomfortable dissonance if he or she does not act to help.

Limitations and future research

A limitation is the convenience sample drawn from students in a public university in a Midwestern state which is usually considered a conservative state with regard to the majority of its individual residents' cultural value orientations. A different sample of millennial college students, for example, from a private college/university or

from a more liberal value-oriented state, might have different spiritual characteristics and respond differently to the situation where a stranger needs help.

The explanations for discrepancies in findings discussed above suggest that future research might compare generational differences in the relationships among variables. Additional research is needed to confirm and clarify the finding that spiritual intelligence does not have a direct connection to intention to act to help a stranger who communicates in a culturally different way, but is indirectly influential over various factors involved in reasoning, such as moral intensity.

Another limitation is related to the hypothetical situation created for "communicating with strangers." In the situation, the assumed strangeness existing between individuals was largely based on differences of "age" and "foreign accented language." Future research can incorporate other personal and cultural characteristics such as ethnicity to help develop a sense of strangeness between the individuals.

Specifically, while previous research indicated other characteristics of communicators, such as intercultural communication apprehension, ethnocentrism, and intercultural willingness to communicate affect both individuals' intention to communicate and their actual communication with those strangers during their initial interactions (Lin & Rancer, 2003; Neuliep, 2012; Neuliep & Ryan, 1998), the findings of the current study suggest that individuals' spirituality also has an impact on the initial interaction with a stranger. To this end, these findings further our understanding of how worldview can play a significant role in the process of communicating with strangers.

References

Astin, A. W., Astin, H. S., & Lindholm, J. A. (2011). *Cultivating the spirit: How college can enhance students' inner lives.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.

Barna.org (2005). A new generation of adults bends moral and sexual roles to their liking. Retrieved from https://www.barna.org/barna-update/culture/144-a-new-generation-of-adults-bends-moral-and-sexual-roles-to-their-liking/

Barna.org (2007). Barna finds four mega-themes in recent research. Retrieved from https://www.barna.org/barna-update/culture/89-barna-finds-four-mega-themes-in-recent-research

Barna.org (2013). Three spiritual journeys of millennials. Retrieved from https://www.barna.org/barna-update/culture/89-barna-finds-four-mega-themes-in-recent-research

Barnett, T. (2001). Dimensions of moral intensity and ethical decision making: An empirical study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*(5), 1038-1057.

Baumsteiger, R., Chenneville, T., & McGuire, J. F. (2013). The roles of religiosity and spirituality in moral reasoning. *Ethics & Behavior, 23*(4), 266-277. doi:10.1080/10508422.2013.782814.

Brodbeck, K., Peng, A., Christl, T., Zehnder, S., Kappler, C., & Morgenthaler, C. (2011). Adolescents' values and value based reasoning in intercultural dilemma situations. *Journal of Empirical Theology, 24,* 157-179. doi:10.1163/157092511X603974.

Duronto, P. M., Nishida, T., & Nakyama, S. (2005). Uncertainty, anxiety, and avoidance in communication with strangers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*, 549-560.

Emmons, R. A. (2000). Is spirituality an intelligence? Motivation, cognition, and psychology of ultimate concern. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 10*(1), 3-26.

Fritzsche, B. A., Finkelstein, M. A., & Penner, L. A. (2000). To help or not to help: Capturing individuals' decision policies. *Social Behavior and Personality, 28*(6), 561-578. doi:10.2224/sbp.2000.28.6.561.

Gudykunst, W. B. (2005). An anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory of effective communication. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 281-322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1984). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication*. NY: Random House.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (2003). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (4th ed.). NY: McGraw-Hill.

Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach.* New York, NY: Guildford Press.

Helminiak, D. A. (2001). Treating spiritual issues in secular psychotherapy. *Counseling and Values, 45*, 163-187.

Jones, T. M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. *Academy of Management Review, 16,* 366-395.

King, D. B., & DeCicco, T. L. (2009). A viable model and self-report measure of spiritual intelligence. *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies, 28*, 68-85.

Kocabyik, O. O. & Kluaksizoglu, A. (2014). A qualitative survey examining the moral identities of young adults. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 14(*3), 851-858.

Leak, G. K. (2006). An empirical assessment of the relationship between social interest and spirituality. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 62*(1), 59-69.

Lin, Y., & Rancer, A. S. (2003). Ethnocentrism, intercultural communication apprehension, intercultural willingness-to-communicate, and intentions to participate in an intercultural dialogue program: Testing a proposed model. *Communication Research Reports, 20*, 62-72.

Neuliep, J. W. (2012). The relationship among intercultural communication apprehension, ethnocentrism, uncertainty reduction, and communication satisfaction during initial intercultural interaction: an extension of anxiety and uncertainty management (AUM) theory. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 41*(2), 1-16.

Neuliep, J. W., & Ryan, D. J. (1998). The influence of intercultural communication apprehension and socio-communicative orientation on uncertainty reduction during initial cross-cultural interaction. *Communication Quarterly, 46*, 88-99.

Paciello, M., Fida, R., Tamontano, C., Cole, E., & Cerniglia, L. (2013). Moral dilemma in adolescence: The role of values, prosocial moral reasoning and moral disengagement in helping decision making. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 10*(2), 190-205. doi:10.1080/17405629.2012.759099

Paulin, M., Ferguson, R. J., Schattke, K., & Jost, N. (2015). Millennials, social media, prosocial emotions, and charitable causes: The paradox of gender differences. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 26*(4), 335-353. doi:10.1080/10495142.2014.965069

Pew Research Center (2015). Q&A: A look at what's driving the changes seen in our Religious Landscape study. Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/05/27/qa-a-look-at-whats-driving-the-changes-seen-in-our-Religious-Landscape-Study

Pew Research Center (2008). UCLA study: Students become more spiritual in college. Retrieved from http://www.pewforum.org/2008/02/14/ucla-study-students-become-more-spiritual-in-college

Pew Research Center (2010). Religion among the millennials. Retrieved from http://www.pewforum.org/2010/02/17/religion-among-the-millennials/

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., McDaniel, E. R, & Roy, C. S. (2013). *Communication between cultures* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth.

Singhapakdi, A., Vitell, S. J., & Franke, G. R. (1999). Antecedents, consequences, and mediating effects of perceived moral intensity and personal moral philosophies. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Sciences, 27*(1), 19-36.

Singhapakdi, A., Vitell, S. J., & Kraft, K. L. (1996). Moral intensity and ethical decision making of marketing professionals. *Journal of Business Research, 36,* 245-256.

Yang, H. L., & Wu, W. P. (2009). The effect of moral intensity on ethical decision making in accounting. *Journal of Moral Education, 38*(3), 335-351.

Zohar, D. (2005). Spiritually intelligent leadership. *Leader to Leader, 2005*(38), 45-51.

Zohar, D., & Marshall, I. (2000). *Spiritual intelligence: The ultimate intelligence.* New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.