

Summary of Research Findings
Spiritual Evolution Assessment Scale™ (SEAS)
Dr. Dorothy I. Riddle, CMC
seas@servicegrowth.com
July 21, 2006

Background

In recent years a number of non-theist spirituality measures have been developed (as distinct from religious measures) in an attempt to operationalize the concept of “spirituality.” They have in common the intent of measuring spirituality as a non-ordinary state of consciousness, providing a static rather than a dynamic measure. These measures typically have been developed using captive populations – either university student populations or patients in health care settings.

From a developmental perspective, there are several limitations to this research approach. First, existing spirituality measures have been constructed to provide a score or snapshot in time rather than to measure ongoing change over time. Second, existing spirituality measures have been intended for use by researchers or to provide descriptive data in fields such as transpersonal psychology rather than being structured more practically for individual or organizational guidance. Third, most of the validation work has been done with persons (such as university students) who, in developmental terms, generally represent the “young” end of a spiritual development continuum. From an esoteric astrology perspective, they have not yet reached their first Saturn return.

The Spiritual Evolution Assessment Scale™ (SEAS) was developed in order to provide a measure of personal connectedness with the One Life that was detailed enough regarding both awareness and application that it could be used by individuals to guide their own spiritual development and by training organizations to assess the needs of students engaged in spiritual study. Its design was grounded in two assumptions that are shared across a range of spiritual disciplines: (a) a continuity of consciousness over more than one lifetime; and (b) spiritual evolution as an ever-widening range of awareness, from self-focus to a more universal focus.

Several methodological issues were borne in mind in the SEAS’ development:

- a) The underlying constructs needed to be common to as many spiritual traditions as possible.
- b) The underlying developmental model needed to reflect positively the range of developmental stages that persons typically move through in regard to spiritual orientation.
- c) Taking the scale should be an educational process in itself by assisting the person to focus on a range of spiritual issues.
- d) Response options needed to represent a range of positive choices, each linked to a different perspective on spiritual development.
- e) Scale items should represent measures of both knowledge/awareness and application of that knowledge.

- f) The language of the scale needed to be as neutral regarding spiritual traditions and as “plain language” as possible.

Description of the Sample

In contrast to the development of most spirituality scales, the SEAS was developed using a sample of persons outside of the captive populations of universities or health care facilities. In the field test sample of 417 participants, 76.9 percent were female, with no significant difference in total score by gender ($F=0.06$ 0.08; $df=1,414$; $p=0.81$). There was also no significant difference in total score by age ($F=0.37$; $df=2,410$; $p=0.69$), with the majority of field testers being between 28 and 59 years old (see Table 1).

Table 1: Field Testers by Age Group

Age Group	Percent of Total
Under 28 years old	1.9%
28-59 years old	65.6%
60+ years old	32.5%
Total respondents	100.0%

The field testers were recruited through networks of English-speaking persons engaged in various disciplines of spiritual practice. The initial 68 field testers were from Australia, Brazil, Canada, northern Europe, New Zealand, the U.K., and the U.S.A. Through referrals networks, the set of field testers represented 22 countries, in terms of current residence, with just over half being from the U.S.A. (see Table 2).

Table 2: Field Testers by Geographic Area of Origin and Current Residence

Geographic Area	Country of Origin	Country of Current Residence
U.S.A.	54.8%	55.6%
Canada	16.3%	19.4%
U.K., Scotland, Ireland	11.6%	10.2%
Europe/Israel/Southern Africa	6.8%	7.3%
Australia, New Zealand	4.3%	5.8%
Latin American countries	1.9%	1.7%
Asia/Africa/Middle East	4.3%	-
Total respondents	100.0%	100.0%

In terms of religious or spiritual identification, a wide range of backgrounds and practices were identified, although almost three-quarters had been raised as Christian (see Table 3). It is relevant that the initial field testers were identified through networks of persons studying in esoteric traditions.

Table 3: Field Testers by Religious/Spiritual Affiliation

Religious Affiliation	Childhood Affiliation	Current Affiliation
Agnostic, atheist, no affiliation	10.4%	38.0%
Christian Science, Religious Science	4.9%	19.6%

Religious Affiliation	Childhood Affiliation	Current Affiliation
Christian	74.5%	12.7%
Esoteric, Ageless Wisdom	0.2%	11.8%
Buddhist, Baha'i, Taoist, Hindu	0.7%	7.1%
Wiccan, feminist, pagan, shaman	0.5%	4.4%
Jewish	8.3%	3.9%
Combination	-	2.5%
Muslim	0.5%	-
Total respondents	100.0%	100.0%

Regarding background in spiritual literature or in mediation practice, 20.5 percent of the field testers reported being students of a spiritual school, 14.9 percent were studying or meditating regularly with colleagues, 7.9 percent were studying with a specific teacher or spiritual coach, and 56.7 percent reported studying primarily on their own. Over 63 percent of field testers had been studying spiritual literature for over 10 years, and almost half had been practicing regular meditation (or prayer) for over 10 years (see Table 4). Of those new to spiritual study, 80.0 percent were studying on their own ($\chi^2=31.95$; $df=12$; $p=0.001$).

Table 4: Field Testers by Years of Study or Meditation Practice

Years	Study of Spiritual Literature	Meditation Practice
< 1 year or not at all	13.2%	22.7%
1-5 years	11.1%	15.0%
6-10 years	11.8%	13.5%
11-19 years	16.4%	18.1%
20+ years	47.5%	30.7%
Total respondents	100.0%	100.0%

Development of the Field Test Version

The field test version of the SEAS consisted of items developed from the study and review of a wide range of spiritual literature and were designed to measure aspects of spiritual development such as an understanding of spiritual reality, how change happens, how we develop spiritual awareness and spiritual skills, and the relationship between our spiritual beliefs and how we interact with others. The structure of the items was that of a stem statement with four options for completion. Of the 117 items developed, 60 were intended as Knowledge questions to test understanding of basic concepts and 57 were intended as Application questions to see how well those concepts could be translated into everyday activities.

The original items and underlying structure were reviewed by seven content specialists for content validity. Those content specialists were chosen for (a) their knowledge of spiritual/esoteric literature; (b) their acknowledged expertise in terms of their leadership roles within different segments of the spiritual community; and (c) their ability to conceptualize models. They were asked to comment on the underlying model of the SEAS, the comprehensiveness of coverage, the appropriateness of the items, and the accuracy of the

response levels represented. Items and response options were modified based on the feedback of the content validators. Overall, the feedback indicated that the SEAS was well-designed as a measure of spiritual development.

Additional questions were asked in the field test version, including demographics, current spiritual practice with regard to meditation and study, and religious or spiritual identification. Two additional well-researched scales were administered in conjunction with the SEAS to address the following challenges:

- a) Most people hold beliefs about what a “spiritually advanced” person is like, which can make it difficult to ensure that persons are providing a reasonably accurate picture of their actual beliefs and practices. Scale items were reviewed prior to field testing by a “plain language” editor to remove terminology that might make a particular response option seem “more spiritual;” however, the potential remained for persons to respond based on perceived social desirability. Therefore, the short form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (SocDes) was included.
- b) The process of spiritual development is a private one and so it is difficult to valid a scale’s ability to differentiate accurately between those at the beginning stage in their spiritual development from those who are more advanced. This issue was addressed in two ways. Among the field test sample was a group of 28 persons (known as the validation sub-sample) engaged in a spiritual study program who provided data on their level in the study program, thus allowing for data analysis by study level. The other method was to include the Cognitive Orientation Towards Spirituality subscale of the Expressions of Spirituality Inventory (COS-ESI), a previously validated scale designed to measure five expressive modalities of spirituality.

Before finalizing the field test instrument, the response options for each of the 117 SEAS items were randomized in order of presentation, and the 117 items were also placed in a randomized sequence. The demographic questions, COS-ESI items, and SocDes items were then added.

The Field Testing Process

Field testing was conducted via e-mail over a period of three months, with field testers asked to register their intention by e-mailing a central e-mail address. At the beginning of field testing, 68 persons had registered and were sent scales. Each field tester was asked to pass on the information to at least five other persons. In total, 667 scales were sent out over a period of three months, with a 62.5 percent response rate. Of those participating, 77.2 percent indicated an interest in being able to re-take the SEAS once it was finalized.

On average, it took respondents 52 minutes to complete the SEAS, with a median of 45 minutes and a SD of 25 minutes. The shortest response time was 10 minutes, and the longest was 180 minutes. While 43.2 percent reported that the scale was too long, 47.1 percent stated that it was just the right length for the subject matter. Responses to what would be the ideal time ranged from 10 minutes (4.0%) to 90 minutes (0.7%), with the median at 30 minutes (37.7%). There was a significant relationship between how long it took participants to complete the SEAS and their assessment of the appropriateness of the length ($F=13.38$; $df=2,391$; $p<0.001$), with a mean

of 51.1 minutes for those who indicated that it was just the right amount of time, a mean of 35.1 minutes for those who found it shorter than expected, and a mean of 57.6 minutes for those who reported that it was too long.

Of the 271 respondents who supplied comments on the scale, 42.8 percent indicated that taking the scale was very helpful to them, 20.7 percent found it interesting, and 36.5 percent were critical of the concepts and terminology of the scale. Mean SEAS scores were significantly higher (53.7 versus 51.9) for field testers that commented positively on the usefulness of the scale than for those making negative comments ($F=5.47$; $df=2,268$; $p=0.005$).

Initial Data Analysis and Transformation

For the total 117 items, out of a possible score of 100, the mean score was 52.89, with a standard deviation (SD) of 4.08. Scores ranged from a minimum of 38.22 to a maximum of 62.68. No ceiling effect was evident, indicating that the SEAS was capable of measuring growth beyond that of the field testers' current scores.

Of the completed scales received, only 280 of the respondents had answered all 117 SEAS items; however, there were no particular questions that were left unanswered consistently and the highest number of persons leaving an item unanswered was 16. When descriptive data on the items were examined, 54 items were eliminated for which there was not a full range of response (i.e., no one selected certain response options) and that did not differentiate among the respondents. Of the field testers, 370 were found to have completed the 26 Core Items (those items significantly weighted for all respondents), and the results presented below are based on various subsets of those data.

To obtain the scores for analysis, the response options were coded as "1" through "4," then "1" was subtracted from all scores to convert the scale to "0" through "3", responses were summed, and then the totals were multiplied by 100/3 to produce a scale of response totals ranging from 0 to 100. For purposes of analysis, respondents' scores were divided into three different types of subdivisions (see Table 5). The third subdivision into quartiles was used to estimate the two samples where the number of respondents was too small for factor analysis. Quartile 1 was used to estimate Category A, and Quartile 4 was used to estimate Group 5.

Table 5: Subdivisions of Respondents' Total Scores

Subgroup	Definition	N	Range of Scores
Categories of Response			
A	Average score less than "2"	20	0 to 33.3
B	Average score from "2" to just under "2.5"	97	33.4 to 50.0
C	Average score from "2.5" to just under "3"	166	50.1 to 66.7
D	Average score from "3" to "4"	87	66.8 to 100
Standardized Groups			
1	Less than mean minus 1.5 SD	31	0 to 36.98
2	Mean minus 0.5 to 1.5 SD	86	36.98 to 50.15
3	Mean minus 0.5 SD to mean plus 0.5 SD	123	50.14 to 63.30
4	Mean plus 0.5 to 1.5 SD	111	63.30 to 76.46

Subgroup	Definition	N	Range of Scores
5	Over mean plus 1.5 SD	19	76.46 to 100
<i>Quartiles (computed using the full sample of 417 cases)</i>			
1	First 25% of scores	101	0 to 45.9
2	Second 25% of scores	102	46.0 to 55.9
3	Third 25% of scores	106	56.0 to 65.9
4	Fourth 25% of scores	108	66.0 to 100

[Note: the frequencies in each quartile using only the 370 completers are: 80, 88, 98, 104.]

Results of Data Analysis: Core Items

Factor analysis using principal components to extract factors, followed by varimax rotation, was carried out. The resulting rotated component matrix of the 63 items revealed a set of 26 Core Items with an underlying structure of three factors: (a) understanding of spiritual reality, (b) one's own spiritual development, and (c) one's relationships with others. The descriptive statistics for the Core Items are given in Table 6.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Core Items

Factor	% variance explained	Cronbach's alpha	Items		
			Correlations with overall score	Loadings	N
Understand reality	11.53%	0.720	.31 to .66	.34 to .64	12
Own development	8.99%	0.557	.23 to .54	.34 to .59	9
Relation with others	7.64%	0.377	.20 to .37	.39 to .60	5
Total	28.15%	0.752	.20 to .66	.34 to .64	26

The three factors for the Core Items yielded an overall reliability coefficient of 0.752, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, based on the average covariance among the factor items. From the perspective of internal reliability, this coefficient indicates that the Core Items are a reliable measure of the underlying factor structure. Each item loaded .34 or higher on its factor and has an item to total score Pearson correlation coefficient significant at $p < 0.01$.

Validation sub-sample. In terms of the purpose of the scale, the most important issue for analysis was whether or not the SEAS could differentiate reliably among persons known to be at different levels of spiritual study and development. Using the validation sub-sample, the SEAS was able to differentiate among the four groups ($F=10.65$; $df=3,24$; $p < 0.001$), with the distribution shown in Table 7. It is important to note that, for Level 4, two standard deviations above the mean represents a score of 90.25. Thus, the SEAS could be used to measure growth beyond the highest score obtained by field testers.

Table 7: Mean SEAS Score on Core Items for Validation Sub-Sample

Level of Study	Percent of Sub-Sample	Mean on Core Items	SD
1	10.7%	52.14	10.44
2	42.9%	60.53	6.36
3	32.1%	71.72	8.86

4	14.3%	78.53	5.86
Total sub-sample	100.0%	65.80	10.97

Validation with ESI. With regard to the Cognitive Orientation Towards Spirituality subscale of the Expressions of Spirituality Inventory (COS-ESI), the mean score for field testers out of a possible 24 was 21.72, with a SD of 3.27. Respondents were clustered at the Strongly Agree end of the scale with a median score of 23, though each of the response options was chosen by at least some of the participants (see Table 8). The overall correlation between the SEAS score on Core Items and the COS-ESI was 0.419, validating that the SEAS is also a reliable measure of spirituality. For this group of respondents, there was clearly a ceiling effect on the COS-ESI; however, the SEAS was able to differentiate among the group of field testers that appeared quite homogeneous on the COS-ESI.

Table 8: Percent of Respondents Selecting COS-ESI Response Options

Item	Strongly Disagree to Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
5: My life has benefited from my spirituality	6.1%	15.5%	78.4%
1: Spirituality is an important part of who I am as a person	5.0%	16.7%	78.3%
6: I believe that attention to one's spiritual growth is important	7.8%	17.0%	75.2%
2: Spirituality is an essential part of human existence	9.3%	17.2%	73.5%
3: I am more aware of my lifestyle choices because of my spirituality	9.0%	25.7%	65.3%
4: I try to consider all elements of a problem, including its spiritual aspects, before I make a decision	13.1%	36.4%	50.5%

Validation with the Marlowe-Crowne. The mean score of the field testers on the Marlowe-Crowne (SocDesc) was 4.42 out of a possible 10, with a SD of 2.01. There was a significant match on only two items: (a) “I would never let another be punished for my wrongdoings” where 90.3 percent chose the socially desirable response of agreeing with the item; and (b) “I don’t mind admitting it when I don’t know something” where 90.1 percent chose the socially desirable response. The correlation between the SEAS score on Core Items and the Marlowe-Crowne score was 0.092, indicating that field testers’ responses to the SEAS cannot be explained by selecting a socially desirable response. The overall correlation between the COS-ESI and SocDes was 0.070.

Descriptive statistics on the Core Items. Using the scores on the Core Items, the mean SEAS score for the 370 “completers” was 56.72, with a SD of 13.16 and a median of 57.69. Actual mean scores ranged from 16.67 to 85.90.

There was a statistically significant difference by country of origin ($F=2.87$; $df=7,362$; $p=0.006$), with field testers in Canada and the USA scoring lower than those in Latin America, Europe, or Australia/New Zealand (see Table 9). Similarly, there was a statistically significant difference

by country of residence ($F=4.67$; $df=6,363$; $p<0.001$). While the geographic difference could be attributed to there being significantly more field testers with little or no meditation experience in Canada and the U.S. ($\chi^2=39.67$; $df=24$; $p=0.023$), scores for Canadian and U.S. fielders with six years or more of spiritual study were still significantly lower than those from other regions ($F=2.18$; $df=6,307$; $p=0.045$).

Table 9: Mean SEAS Score on Core Items by Geographic Region

Geographic Area	Country of Origin	Country of Current Residence
Australia, New Zealand	61.8	63.9
Europe/Israel/South Africa	63.2	63.5
Latin American countries	67.2	61.7
U.K., Scotland, Ireland	58.1	60.8
U.S.A.	55.6	55.0
Canada	53.5	54.0
Asia/Africa/Middle East	57.9	-
Total respondents	56.7	56.7

Based on current religious/spiritual affiliation, there was also a statistically significant difference in average scores among the field testers (see Table 10), with those identified with the Christian church scoring the lowest ($F=6.44$; $df=7,362$; $p<0.001$). The most significant shift among the field testers was in persons raised in Christian traditions ($\chi^2=317.92$; $df=64$; $p<0.001$) who changed to non-religious (37.3%), Christian Science or Religious Science (21.7%), esoteric (12.0%), or Buddhist (6.2%); only 14.5 percent of those raised as Christians had remained identified as Christian.

Table 10: Mean SEAS Score on Core Items by Religious Affiliation

Religious Affiliation	Childhood Affiliation	Current Affiliation
Esoteric, Ageless Wisdom	76.9	66.3
Combination	-	60.4
Christian Science, Religious Science	57.4	57.2
Agnostic, atheist	56.4	56.8
Wiccan, feminist, pagan, shaman	43.6	55.1
Buddhist, Baha'i, Taoist, Hindu	36.8	50.7
Jewish	52.2	50.7
Christian	57.3	50.1
Islam	57.7	-
Total respondents	56.7	56.7

In terms of current spiritual practice, those who had studied ($F=26.23$; $df=4,364$; $p<0.001$) or meditated ($F=25.68$; $df=4,364$; $p<0.001$) for longer periods of time scored higher on the SEAS Core Items (see Table 11).

Table 11: Mean SEAS Score on Core Items by Years of Study and Meditation

	Study of Spiritual Literature	Meditation Practice
--	-------------------------------	---------------------

Years	Mean	SD		Mean	SD
< 1 yr or not at all	40.6	10.9		45.5	12.9
1-5 years	53.3	12.6		55.8	11.7
6-10 years	60.5	11.8		59.0	12.6
11-19 years	60.7	10.9		62.3	10.0
20+ years	59.1	11.9		60.6	11.3
Total respondents	56.7	13.2		56.7	13.2

Interestingly, the method of spiritual study used by field testers also made a difference ($F=10.68$; $df=3,357$; $p<0.001$), with those studying in a formal school curriculum scoring significantly higher than those studying with a teacher or on their own (see Table 12).

Table 12: Mean SEAS Score on Core Items by Method of Study

Method of Study	Mean	SD
In a school	63.2	11.0
With colleagues	59.7	12.4
With a teacher	57.1	12.6
On one's own	54.1	13.0

Results of Data Analysis: Subscales for Individual Feedback

The structure of the SEAS items provided four response options that could be described as representing the following perspectives on spiritual development:

- Category A:** Individuals experience the divine or the One Life as the entity responsible for change in our universe. Spiritual awareness is of having been saved and supported by a force greater than oneself. Spiritual practice is focused on obedience to that higher will.
- Category B:** Individuals experience themselves as having a soul whose awareness extends beyond this physical existence, bringing with it a sense of karmic responsibilities. Spiritual practice is focused on having emotional clarity and devoting oneself to the soul and its purpose.
- Category C:** Individuals experience themselves as participating in a sense of group soul. Spiritual awareness is of the impact of one's energy on the universal energy field. Spiritual practice is focused on mental discipline to take responsibility for one's feelings, thoughts, and actions.
- Category D:** Individuals experience themselves as connected to all other forms of life, organic and non-organic. Spiritual awareness is of being an active collaborator or co-creator in an evolving universe. Spiritual practice is focused on clarifying ethical choices to be made.

When the 63 items remaining after the initial elimination process were analyzed, four clear subgroups emerged (see Table 13) and it became clear that different items were relevant to the respondents in each of the four categories. On reflection, this is not surprising as, during our process of spiritual development, different issues become salient.

Table 13: Descriptive Statistics for the Four Response Categories

Category	Percent of Total	Mean SEAS Score	SD	N
A	5.4%	28.78	3.75	20
B	26.2%	43.34	4.60	97
C	44.9%	59.52	4.80	166
D	23.5%	72.71	3.92	87
Total respondents	100.0%	56.72	13.16	370

The results of the factor analyses for the four subscales indicate that the same three-factor structure exists as with the Core Items (see Table 14), with overall reliability coefficients, as measured by Cronbach’s alpha, for the four subscales of 0.45, 0.40, 0.30 and 0.35. The factor that explains the most variance for Group B in particular was “relations with others” rather than “understanding spiritual reality” and for Group D it was “one’s own spiritual development.” For Group C, all three factors were equally important.

Table 14: Results of Factor Analysis by Response Category Subgroups

Factor	% of Variance Explained				Range of Item Loadings			
	A*	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
Understand reality	12.55	14.26	10.75	11.31	.52-.55	.47-.68	.37-.58	.30-.70
Own development	11.58	12.59	10.06	12.74	.51-.69	.64-.65	.35-.61	.37-.65
Relation with others	13.39	15.40	10.87	10.30	.33-.72	.54-.74	.44-.64	.38-.64
Total	37.52	42.25	31.67	34.34	.33-.72	.47-.74	.35-.64	.30-.70

*Estimated from Quartile 1 data, with n=80 [pa pre Report 30, should be n=101?]

Data Analysis: Subscales to Measure Group Change

While the four-category structure described above is very relevant for describing individual spiritual development, group development can be more effectively explained using standardized categories created from the mean and standard deviation (see Table 15).

Table 15: Descriptive Statistics for the Five Standardized Groups

Group	Percent of Total	Mean SEAS Score	SD	N
1	8.4%	31.02	4.30	31
2	23.2%	44.39	3.73	86
3	33.2%	57.42	3.70	123
4	30.0%	68.92	3.39	111
5	5.2%	78.54	2.37	19
Total respondents	100.0%	56.72	13.16	370

The results of the factor analyses for the five subscales indicate that, once again, the same three-factor structure exists as with the Core Items (see Table 16) , with overall reliability coefficients, as measured by Cronbach’s alpha, for the five subscales of 0.58, 0.46, 0.43, 0.35, and 0.29. Group 2 in particular was focused on “relations with others” rather than “understanding spiritual reality” and Group 1 was focused primarily on “one’s own spiritual development.” For Group 5, as with Group C above, all three factors were equally important.

Table 16: Results of Factor Analysis by Scaled Subgroups

Factor	Percent of Variance Explained					Cronbach’s Alpha				
	1	2	3	4	5*	1	2	3	4	5
Understand reality	12.75	13.40	13.10	13.86	15.02	.46-.70	.50-.77	.51-.67	.49-.73	.45-.80
Own development	14.56	15.51	11.96	12.44	15.20	.37-.62	.47-.75	.38-.61	.47-.61	.46-.68
Relation with others	12.07	16.94	13.15	14.70	15.94	.33-.69	.55-.75	.35-.66	.32-.73	.54-.74
Total	39.38	45.85	38.22	41.00	46.17	.33-.70	.47-.77	.35-.67	.32-.73	.45-.80

*Estimated from Quartile 4 data, with n=104.

Summary

From the descriptive statistics for the respondents, it is clear that this study was successful in reaching field testers who were not from captive university or health facility locales. Thus, it is likely that the results of the study would be applicable to a wider range of persons than has been true in most of the research on spirituality instruments to date.

Results of the data analysis have produced a finalized scale of 63 items, of which 26 items comprise a valid and reliable instrument for measuring overall spiritual development. Within a reasonably homogeneous group of persons interested in spirituality, the SEAS can differentiate significantly among levels of spiritual development. The SEAS itself is quite robust and able to be useful also to persons even more “senior” than those in the field test (the range of scores was 16.7 to 85.9, out of 100 possible). The response patterns were too variable to come simply from trying to pick the most “spiritual” response.

Factor analysis confirmed an underlying structure of three separate factors that can be measured reliably: (a) awareness of spiritual reality, (b) our own spiritual development, and (c) how we interact with others. Further, there are reliable subscales within those 63 items that are each of particular relevance to persons at a particular level of spiritual development. Computer programming can be used to present the user of the SEAS with a customized version tailored to the person’s level of overall development.

In addition, from the demographic data it was evident that persons’ total SEAS scores were significantly higher the more years persons had engaged in meditation or in spiritual study. Those giving an esoteric religious affiliation scored significantly higher than those from traditional religious practices. The total SEAS score was significantly higher for those who reported studying in an esoteric school (with a formal curriculum of study) versus with a teacher or with colleagues or on their own. 57% of participants reported studying on their own. Finally, the longer participants had studied, the more likely they were to be involved in a school or studying with colleagues.