

Positive Psychology and Psychology of Religion and Spirituality—Going Beyond the WEIRD Sample

Adam Anczyk ^{1,*}, Halina Grzymala-Moszczyńska ¹  and Anna M. Maćkowiak ² 

¹ Faculty of Psychology, Ignatianum University in Kraków, Kopernika 26, 31-501 Cracow, Poland; halina.grzymala-moszczyńska@ignatianum.edu.pl

² College of Religious Studies, Mahidol University, Salaya, Phutthamonthon, Nakhon Pathom 73170, Thailand; anna.mac@mahidol.ac.th

* Correspondence: adam.anczyk@ignatianum.edu.pl

1. Introduction

The psychology of religion and spirituality and positive psychology are, of course, two distinct subdisciplines. Although they have developed and continue to develop largely independently, several “natural bridges” can be identified connecting these fields. Religious and spiritual practices can be powerful sources of positive experiences in human life. Experiences such as transcending one’s own boundaries, awe, and practices of gratitude and love are of interest to followers of many religious systems worldwide and are central to the work of positive psychologists. According to the theory of positive psychologist Barbara L. Fredrickson, positive emotions expand the repertoire of thoughts and actions, which allows for the building of lasting psychological and social resources (Fredrickson 2011). On the other hand, research on various religious and spiritual practices (e.g., those related to meditation or other ritual forms) in the field of psychology of religion demonstrates that these practices play a significant role in empowering believers and provide them with a sense of happiness and fulfillment (Radoń 2023). This kind of observation alone should lead to the conclusion that the psychology of religion and spirituality and positive psychology are natural allies.

The result of this thinking is the recently published, excellent book *Handbook of Positive Psychology, Religion, and Spirituality* (Davis et al. 2023), which competently, clearly, and thoroughly discusses the issues surrounding the intersection of both disciplines. The newly published *Cambridge Handbook of the International Psychology of Religion* (Ladd et al. 2026) responds to calls to broaden the field’s lens by offering a comprehensive global almanac consolidating psychology of religion research across diverse cultural contexts. Rich in insider perspectives, the handbook lays a systematic foundation for truly global collaboration and challenges Western centrism. This article, therefore, serves only as an outline of the richness of the issues the reader will encounter by familiarizing themselves with the aforementioned handbook, and serves as an editorial for the Special Issue of *Religions*. Our goal is to introduce this Special Issue by providing a brief outline of a problem plaguing both disciplines—the too-frequent narrowing of academic reflection to Western approaches and the resulting need to broaden our perspectives beyond “traditional” research environments (and therefore approaches). We will also highlight the role of religious studies—as an academic field that significantly supports both “psychologies,” but the interdisciplinary contact in this case is not very in-depth (Stausberg 2013). One method for establishing such transdisciplinary collaborations is through Special Issues of journals such as this one.



Received: 10 August 2026

Revised: 28 August 2026

Accepted: 1 September 2026

Published: 15 September 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.

Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and

conditions of the [Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

[Attribution \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.

2. Psychology of Religion and Spirituality and Positive Psychology

Positive psychology and the psychology of religion and spirituality are fields of both behavioral and cultural sciences that are increasingly intertwined in research on optimal human functioning and flourishing. While traditional, both theoretical and applied psychology often relied on a “clinical model” focused on repairing damage, positive psychology reorients the field toward identifying and strengthening human strengths and virtues. Historically, this type of conceptualization of the psychological system originated in humanistic psychology, led by notable authors such as Abraham Maslow and Gordon Allport, both also recognized as classics in the psychology of religion. The psychology of religion contributes a perspective to this field, if one can use Rudolf Otto’s term, *numinous* (Otto 1920), both through the study of organized, traditional forms of religion and religiosity and through a specific area of intersection—the psychology of spirituality. This is particularly evident when differentiating spirituality from religiosity. As illustrated by R. Piedmont’s theory, a recent study has shown that spirituality refers more to self-transcendence than religiosity (Piotrowski and Žemojtel-Piotrowska 2024), suggesting that spirituality is a trait that itself is of another quality. Therefore, in psychology today, we are facing a discussion not about whether we should distinguish these terms, but in which way.

If we consider the scope of positive psychology and compare it with even a few classic works in the psychology of religion, it turns out that there are many common and overlapping themes. One could even say that the relatively recent postulates of positive psychology have long been part of the research repertoire of psychologists of religion (Emmons and Paloutzian 2003). Positive psychology examines subjective positive experiences: happiness (however understood and conceptualized/contextualized, *eudaimonia*) and satisfaction (Czapiński 2017); comfort, hope, and resilience (Çetrez and DeMarinis 2017); or optimism (Czerw 2010). Generally, the three main themes of positive psychology could be grouped around notions of flourishing, happiness, and well-being, including religious/spiritual well-being (Surzykiewicz et al. 2025). It also examines individual traits—virtues—which brings this field closer to philosophy in its conceptualization, and in practice, to the religious dimension (Miller-Perrin and Mancuso 2015), and the psychology of spirituality. Positive psychology is also interested in positive behavior (action) and organized communities—thus successfully finding common ground with religious organizations, forms of worship, and prosocial activity (Besta et al. 2019); positive psychological interventions as a form of applied positive psychology are also a subject of inquiry (Kaczmarek 2016). Furthermore, meaning-making and the meaning of life are central concepts in both fields. Religious belief systems offer a framework of meaning, allowing people to interpret life events through the lens of religious experiences, and the sense that life has purpose is one of the strongest predictors of life satisfaction (Kim-Prieto 2014, p. 7). Hence, the intertwining research strands of both disciplines in examining these phenomena are clear. It is worth looking at the classics of the psychology of religion to highlight clear similarities in the field.

Historically, related themes can be found in William James, who was interested in religious geniuses and their experiences as exemplary for understanding religious experience in general (James 1958). Religious experiences are as diverse as the types of people who experience them, as demonstrated in this classic work in the psychology of religion, speaking of those with “healthy” and “sick” souls, thus typologizing experiences. Thus, to some extent, he also addressed values. He also addressed the need for meaning, pointing to religion, the need for rationality in the world (as opposed to chaos and chance) and eternal moral order, or perhaps a kind of eternal virtue. In this spirit, James could be boldly interpreted as a precursor of positive psychology (in its related aspect to the psychology of religion). Similarly, one can consider Gordon Allport’s theory and his approach to the organization of individual religiosity within personality and religious orientations, reading

it as if he were a positive psychologist. Individuals with an intrinsic religious orientation find their primary motivation in religion (the search for meaning and sense-making), while other needs harmonize with faith (finding happiness and fulfillment through internalizing religious content—that is, virtues). They “live by faith”; hence, themes in their lives that are important to a positive psychologist would be inextricably linked with religion (Allport 1965; Allport and Ross 1967). Similar conclusions about the convergence of the spheres of interest of positive psychologists and psychologists of religion can be drawn from reading the works of Abraham Maslow, particularly his work on peak experiences (Maslow 1978). A fully self-actualized individual experiences specific peak experiences in which there is a sense of unity and harmony, a disappearance of the boundaries between “self” and “other” and “self” and “world,” a sense of realizing one’s highest potential, accompanied by spontaneity, agency, creativity, and freedom. From this perspective, a mystical or spiritual experience would be a type of peak experience in which the individual reaches the peak of their flourishing. In the case of Maslow’s theory, we are dealing with a kind of “secularization of religious experience”—its naturalization and inclusion in a homogeneous cycle of experiences with other types of human experiences and, on the other hand, “sacralization of life”, because peak experiences are crucial in self-actualization and developing one’s full potential, in the opinion of the classic psychologist.

3. Going Beyond WEIRD: Indigenous Perspectives in Psychology of Religion and Spirituality and Positive Psychology

Positive psychology is a relatively young subfield of psychology, emerging at the end of the 20th century, and therefore boasts approximately 30–40 years of research (Czapiński 2004, pp. 7–9). In comparison, the psychology of religion itself, beginning with E. D. Starbuck’s classic publication *Psychology of Religion*, is a subdiscipline of psychology with a much older history and, therefore, longer legacy (Starbuck 1899). Both historical positions have their advantages and disadvantages. Positive psychology essentially entered the arena two decades before the so-called replication crisis (Anczyk et al. 2019) and the demands for a significant cultural expansion of research samples. In a sense, as a young discipline, it was perhaps better prepared for the demands of cross-cultural research than many other, more established subfields of psychology. Positive psychology has embraced the idea of moving beyond the Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD) sample, though not without difficulty.

The WEIRD concept, introduced by Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan in their seminal article (2010), demonstrated that most of the psychological knowledge was built on samples drawn primarily from Western industrialized countries, where research participants were overwhelmingly university undergraduates. The empirically narrow foundation of “the weirdest people in the world” (Henrich et al. 2010) is based on unrepresentative and frequent statistical outliers. As Apicella, Norenzayan, and Henrich (Apicella et al. 2020) noted in a decade-later reassessment, the WEIRD label was intended not as a dichotomous distinction between WEIRD and non-WEIRD societies, but rather as a rhetorical device to advocate for sample diversity and against the uncritical generalizations. The WEIRD concept’s impact on psychology has been profound; however, progress remains slow.

Since the publication of this widely noted article and the onset of the so-called replication crisis, psychology has faced a major reckoning regarding its sampling methods and experiment design. Statistically, individuals represent only a small minority of the global population, which makes generalizing these research findings to all of humanity highly problematic. To address this critical flaw, modern guidelines strongly recommend expanding participant pools to include diverse respondents from non-Western cultural backgrounds (Anczyk et al. 2019). Furthermore, researchers are now urged to use assess-

ment tools that are genuinely culturally localized rather than merely translated, ensuring that psychological science accurately reflects the true breadth of global human diversity. Going beyond the WEIRD population is one of the research and hermeneutical proposals formulated based on previous research and in accordance with the need to provide more accurate psychological data and counter the replication crisis in psychology, which in fact resulted in lowering the academic soundness of much psychological research. The cultural perspective is one of the possible perspectives functioning within the field, and we can consider it as somewhat peripheral in the past; now it is getting more and more attention in mainstream psychology. Psychology of religion is an example here; in 2019, the Editor-in-Chief of the oldest journal in the discipline, *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, clearly stated the need to incorporate more non-WEIRD research into psychology of religion, and research that goes far beyond Western religious and cultural contexts (Ladd 2019). There is a necessity for further empirical research, meta-analyses, and rigorous hermeneutical analysis to substantiate and critically assess numerous psychological claims and to test the relevance of cultural approaches in the broader context of mainstream, empirical, and experimental psychology.

The problem of the limited inclusivity of WEIRD psychology extends far beyond the selection of research samples; it reaches the very foundations of psychological theory itself. Bard et al. (2026) contrast the traditional WEIRD perspective with the WILD framework (Worldwide, In Situ, Local, Diverse), which advocates constructing theories—including theories of developmental psychology—on the basis of the actual diversity of cultural and ecological contexts in which human development occurs. With regard to attachment theory, the authors argue that the classical model was developed primarily from observations of Western families, where caregiving is centered on an exclusive mother–child relationship that emphasizes individual autonomy, direct emotional communication, and frequent face-to-face interactions. In many societies, however, infants are cared for from the earliest months of life by multiple caregivers, including extended family members, siblings, and other members of the community. In these settings, the primary developmental value is not individual autonomy but interdependence and integration into the social group. Consequently, behaviors that, from the perspective of Western attachment theory, might be interpreted as indicators of insecure attachment may instead represent adaptive responses to local ecological and social conditions. To evaluate such behaviors appropriately within their ecological context, new research instruments are required, rather than treating them as deviations from a supposedly universal (but in fact Western) model assessed with Western-developed measures. An illustrative example also comes from research (Siekiera and Białek 2024) on Yurakaré children in Bolivia. 22 children aged 23 months to 7 years were observed across 2419 coded observation intervals. The researchers used randomly selected observation periods and achieved substantial inter-rater agreement for child activity ($\kappa = 0.81$) and child-centered attention ($\kappa = 0.77$), with perfect agreement for location ($\kappa = 1.00$). Thus, the argument for attending to cultural context in this case does not rest exclusively on an interpretive reading of indigenous life; it is supported by systematic behavioral observations.

The observed developmental environment differed in important respects from the assumptions embedded in many conventional child-centered developmental paradigms. Yurakaré children were accompanied by siblings during 88.3% of the observed time and by peers during 43.3%; children were completely alone during only approximately 1% of observations; fully child-focused adult attention occurred in only 8.7% of situations. These observations suggest a developmental ecology in which children's learning and social participation are distributed across a mixed-age community rather than organized primarily around sustained, dyadic adult–child interaction. The pattern was also visible in

children's activities. Help and work together constituted 7.1% of observed activities, and 43% of these prosocial events were initiated spontaneously by the children themselves. The observations also documented children participating in mature activities such as fetching water, cooking, checking fishing nets, caring for younger siblings, and other household and community activities. These findings provide concrete empirical grounds for questioning whether developmental competence should always be operationalized primarily through child–adult interaction, verbal instruction, explicit negotiation, or individually initiated behavior.

The relevance of these findings to the WILD perspective is therefore methodological rather than merely ideological. The WILD proposal argues that developmental theories should be tested worldwide, in situ, locally, and across diverse forms of development rather than assuming that patterns identified in WEIRD contexts constitute the default developmental trajectory. These observations do not demonstrate that the Yurakaré developmental pattern is superior to Western patterns, nor do they demonstrate that Western attachment or shared-intentionality theories are invalid. Rather, they demonstrate something more modest but scientifically important: the organization of children's everyday social environments can differ substantially from the arrangements that have informed influential developmental theories, while children nevertheless participate effectively in social, communicative, cooperative, and culturally meaningful activities. This is precisely the type of empirical discrepancy that makes the examination of theoretical universality necessary. The study also illustrates why the issue is not reducible to simply adding more culturally diverse participants to existing experiments. The categories through which development is observed may themselves need reconsideration. Certain forms of developmental participation can become secondary or invisible when development is conceptualized primarily in terms of individual competencies assessed in decontextualized tasks.

The Yurakaré findings therefore provide a useful empirical bridge between the WILD and decolonial approaches. From a WILD perspective, the study demonstrates the value of investigating development *worldwide, in situ*, and in relation to *local* and *diverse* forms of social organization. From a decolonial perspective, it illustrates the epistemic consequences of allowing locally observable practices to generate psychological questions rather than treating existing Western theories as the primary source of those questions. Recent work on decolonial psychology similarly emphasizes the importance of recentering place-based and indigenous knowledge and questioning theoretical hierarchies that have historically privileged particular forms of psychological knowledge.

A similarly fundamental revision applies to Michael Tomasello's theory of shared intentionality. According to this theory, the primary mechanism underlying the development of joint attention, understanding of others' intentions, and later language abilities consists of proto-conversations between infants and caregivers characterized by rich face-to-face, facial, and verbal interactions. Yet in many societies, adult–infant interactions are predominantly proximal, relying on continuous physical closeness, infant carrying, tactile communication, and the child's participation in the everyday activities of the community. Direct eye contact and verbal exchanges between caregivers and infants play a much less prominent role, yet children nevertheless develop highly effective social competencies. Shared intentionality, therefore, does not emerge from a single Western model of early interaction but may develop through a variety of culturally embedded forms of participation in social life. These examples illustrate a broader implication of the WILD perspective: human development should not be viewed as the realization of a single universal developmental pathway but rather as a process through which comparable competencies can emerge via multiple, equally adaptive, culturally grounded developmental trajectories.

Positive psychology appears to be somewhat less Western-centric than general psychology, but still heavily skewed, according to a bibliometric analysis of randomized controlled trials in well-being research conducted between 1998 and 2017 (Hendriks et al. 2019). 78.2% of studies still originated from Western countries. Nevertheless, there is a promising shift towards “a strong and steady increase in publications from non-Western countries since 2012,” (p. 491) which dramatically improved the ratio of non-Western to Western RCTs, with countries such as China and Iran emerging as significant contributors (p. 494). This trajectory suggests that while positive psychology remains largely WEIRD-based, it is globalizing rapidly.

In the psychology of religion and spirituality, the demand for cultural diversity has been consistently present for nearly a decade (Ladd 2019). In psychology more broadly, these kinds of postulates are strongly associated with the so-called “indigenous paradigm” (Allwood and Berry 2006). This means psychologically studying different people in different contexts—and importantly, with a culturally sensitive methodological apparatus (Sundararajan 2015). Therefore, there is a need not only to simply go beyond WEIRD samples but also to drive a shift in methodological and theoretical thinking and conceptualization.

More broadly, these postulates point towards a still more fundamental demand—the decolonization of psychology itself. Decolonial psychology requires that, in conducting their research, psychologists incorporate the cultural context in which participants are embedded. This entails attending to their histories, cultural backgrounds, and the political conditions shaping their current circumstances and positions within structures of power. It further implies adopting a stance of cultural humility and recognizing that not only knowledge derived from the established canon of mainstream psychology is legitimate, but psychological inquiry must also include wisdom and practices emerging from indigenous approaches—the types of knowledge often positioned as “inferior” or “less developed”. Our standpoint does not by itself demonstrate the existence of “coloniality” in every developmental theory, nor do we intend to make such a generalized claim. Rather, it provides a concrete example of the epistemic problem that motivates decolonial analysis: when researchers begin with categories derived from one developmental ecology, important behaviors in another ecology may be overlooked, misclassified, or interpreted primarily as departures from the assumed norm.

Moreover, decolonial psychology involves acknowledging the necessity of integrating religion and spirituality into research on contemporary human functioning (Bryant-Davis 2023). It also calls for increased sensitivity to these issues in the education of future psychologists, including the incorporation of literature and perspectives originating beyond the Western cultural mainstream (Phiri et al. 2023). This decolonial reorientation of psychology is particularly significant for this Special Issue. Well-being is not culturally neutral; it is deeply embedded in cosmologies, relational frameworks, and spiritualities of particular people and cultures. When psychology makes room for indigenous epistemologies and non-Western spiritual traditions, it opens the possibility of understanding human flourishing in its full depth and variety.

A rarely mentioned yet significant ally of both positive psychology and psychology of religion and spirituality is religious studies, and it is seemingly a natural direction to turn when faced with such diverse research material. In the context of postulates within the field of psychology of religion, there are calls for the discipline of religious studies to be more integrated into the realm of psychological reflection (Anczyk et al. 2020), but it would be worthwhile also to demonstrate how positive psychology would benefit from this marriage. In addition to the postulate of going beyond the WEIRD samples—and comparative religious studies is clearly competent in achieving this goal—there is also a unique theoretical and methodological approach to religious phenomena offered here, as it was developed

precisely within the field of the academic study of religions. For example, the theoretical framework of a relational definition of religion would provide positive psychology with an interesting perspective. Classical scholars of religious studies, such as Cornelius Tiele, have adopted a basic, useful “working” definition of religion as the relationship between humanity and the sacred, that is, the object of faith and worship (Tiele 1979). This area intertwines various threads of religious life: behavior (worship, sacrifices, religious practices), ideas and images (religious doctrine), and the institutional dimension of religious and spiritual organizations. Within this conceptual framework, positive psychology of religion and spirituality could transcend the territory of “subjective” feelings, beliefs, attitudes, etc., and locate them in specific ritualistic, cultural, institutional, and, as Ursula King enumerates, “postmodern, feminist, spiritual” (King 2002) contexts. Contemporary religious studies tend to depart from postulates of creating generally applicable theories of religion, perhaps apart from certain trends in cognitive studies of religion (Martin and Wiebe 2012) or phenomenological revivals (Blum 2012). Instead, it strives to demonstrate that the sense of the sacred, the *sensus numinis* (Otto 1920), is strictly conditioned by cultural context. In this context, the combined reflections of psychologists of spirituality and positive psychologists on the nature of this phenomenon may prove equally interesting, as researchers (Socha 2010, 2014), as well as some contemporary cultural/spiritual movements (Anczyk 2014), postulate that spirituality is pan-religious, as a human response to existential situations and problems, and the practices and experiences associated with them. The aforementioned issues, enriched with a religious studies perspective, would undoubtedly be a promising field of research for psychologists, both those studying religion and spirituality and those studying phenomena related to the field of positive psychology.

4. Contributions

This Special Issue of *Religions* challenges the Western-centrism of positive psychology and the psychology of religion and spirituality by conducting research across diverse, culturally distinct settings, drawing largely on non-WEIRD samples and authored by researchers from the Global South, Global North, and Global East (Müller 2020).

Lanxin Jiang, Wenlong Mu, Mengyuan Shu, and Sheng Zeng investigate the relationship between religious belief and religiosity and internet addiction in China, using an instrumental-variables approach to address endogeneity. Their research complicates prior claims that religion protects against internet addiction, showing that religious belief and religiosity correlate with reduced addiction in standard regression models, but these effects become statistically nonsignificant once the authors control for endogeneity using instrumental variable methods.

Mark Thurston explores the practical application of spirituality and meaning-making within the university classroom in the United States. In sixteen years teaching a course aimed at developing students’ personal spirituality and sense of meaning, Thurston has built it around positive psychology and the science of well-being. The course centers on individual “search for meaning” through mindfulness practices, values clarification, reflective journaling, and dream interpretation.

Raed Zedan quantitatively examined how religious identity, ethnic identity, self-esteem, and self-mastery relate to positive life orientation and educational identity among Arab Palestinian Israeli students, who suffer from continuing discrimination and exclusion. The findings indicate that religious and ethnic identities provide a resilient foundation for self-esteem and educational identity in this minority facing multiple challenges. This research provides a vital indigenous perspective and advocates for strengthening religious and ethnic identities rather than suppressing or dismissing them.

Maryam Noor, Muhammad Jahanzeb Khan, Abidullah Khan, Irum Saba, and Hend Faye AL-shahrani developed and validated the Islamic Parenting Style Scale (IPSS) to address the absence of validated, Islamically grounded parenting scales for Muslim populations. By positioning their scale as an alternative to Western frameworks, the authors make an important contribution to decolonial psychology by offering a culturally sensitive tool that integrates values derived from the Qur'an and Hadith into the measurement of family dynamics in Pakistan.

Loren L. Toussaint, Amanda K. Thomas, Jon R. Webb, Colwick M. Wilson, David R. Williams, Sandra D. Reid, Sebastian Binyamin Skalski-Bednarz, Janusz Surzykiewicz, and Everett L. Worthington, Jr. used an online survey of 259 adults to explore the associations between religious commitment and self-condemnation in Trinidad and Tobago. The article draws on culturally relevant metaphors like “doh beat up” (don't beat yourself up) and “doh take it on” (don't worry about it). Their findings show that religious commitment is directly associated with lower shame and indirectly shapes both shame and guilt through self-forgiveness. This study strengthens non-WEIRD psychology not only due to its sample but also through collaboration among Caribbean, North American, and European researchers.

Maria Kanak and Halina Grzymała-Moszczyńska present the findings of seven years of fieldwork conducted among Syrian refugee women in Turkey. The article examines the emic concept of *sabr* as one of the central idioms of Islam that shapes resilience in the context of forced displacement. The authors argue that translating *sabr* simply as “patience” or conceptualizing *sabr* as a coping strategy within psychological models developed primarily from WEIRD populations is misleading. Unlike coping, which is generally understood as a response to stressors or adverse events, *sabr* represents a culturally and religiously embedded process of socialization that encompasses emotional, cognitive, and embodied dimensions. Through everyday religious practices, *sabr* prepares believers to endure and respond to adversity before it occurs, rather than functioning as a reactive response to distress. This proactive orientation distinguishes *sabr* from conventional psychological models of coping. It constitutes a lifelong practice of cultivating dispositions that enable individuals to confront experiences such as violence, hunger, uncertainty, displacement, and loss—conditions that characterize the lives of many refugees. The concept is deeply rooted in the Qur'an and is continuously reinforced through everyday religious discourse and ritual practice, making it a central cultural resource for resilience within Muslim communities.

T. J. Moore, Sam Richardson, and Loren Marks, in their article, explore the influence of religion and spirituality on the identities of Black men as husbands and fathers; they utilize a strengths-based approach to counter prevailing societal “deficit narratives” that often stereotype Black men as absent or disengaged. The study identifies four primary processes that facilitated this personal and spiritual growth: personal crises that led individuals to seek support from faith communities; experiences attributed to divine interventions that realigned personal priorities; engagement with sacred scripture, which served as a “road map” for family life and the recovery of traditional religious masculine roles, such as being the “spiritual head” of the household. The findings are interpreted through Ryff's six-factor model of eudaimonic well-being, mapping religious experiences onto constructs like purpose in life, personal growth, and positive relations with others. The authors conclude that religiosity provides a culturally resonant alternative framework for Black masculinity—one that promotes marital fidelity, fatherly involvement, and psychological flourishing. Faith communities are highlighted as resources for supporting resilient Black fatherhood and countering negative stereotypes.

Mohammad Iqbal Ahnaf, Jonathan Davis Smith, Leyla Adrianti Hermina, Fuji Riang Prastowo, and Anisa Eka Putri Kusmayani, in the final article of this Special Issue, examine how Indonesian Buddhist, Muslim, and Protestant Christian leaders describe the moral and spiritual causes of mental health problems. Situated in a highly religious Indonesian context where secular psychological approaches nonetheless dominate mental health care, the study maps a spectrum of perspectives ranging from purely spiritual explanations to models in which religious/spiritual and biopsychosocial causes are understood as co-arising. Drawing on a qualitative analysis of the writings and speeches of thirty influential religious leaders, the authors propose a conceptual model that links religion and spirituality to biophysical, psychological, and social dimensions of mental health, moral living, thinking, and behaving. This model extends biopsychosocial frameworks of mental health—largely built on North American and European data—to a Global South context.

5. Concluding Remarks

The articles collected in this volume demonstrate, on the one hand, the necessity of understanding seemingly universal psychological concepts within their specific contexts, the importance of developing research tools tailored to particular cultural settings, and, on the other hand, the promising opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration among scholars representing diverse approaches to the study of religion and spirituality in the broadest sense. We think that going beyond WEIRD is a necessity in further studies within the psychology of religion and spirituality, and that going a little bit WILD, as far as our research samples are concerned, may be a remedy for WEIRD-oriented psychology.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Allport, Gordon W. 1965. *The Individual and His Religion*. New York: MacMillan Company.
- Allport, Gordon W., and J. Michael Ross. 1967. Personal Religious Orientation and Prejudice. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 5: 432–43. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Allwood, Carl Martin, and John W. Berry. 2006. Origins and development of indigenous psychologies: An international analysis. *International Journal of Psychology* 41: 243–68. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Anczyk, Adam. 2014. *The Golden Sickle: An Introduction to Contemporary Druidry*. Katowice: Sacrum Publishing House.
- Anczyk, Adam, Halina Grzymała-Moszczyńska, Agnieszka Krzysztof-Świdorska, and Jacek Prusak. 2019. The Replication Crisis and Qualitative Research in the Psychology of Religion. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 29: 278–91. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Anczyk, Adam, Halina Grzymała-Moszczyńska, Agnieszka Krzysztof-Świdorska, and Jacek Prusak. 2020. Which psychology(ies) serves us best? Research perspectives on the psycho-cultural interface in the psychology of religion(s). *Archive for the Psychology of Religion* 42: 295–316. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Apicella, Coren, Ara Norenzayan, and Joseph Henrich. 2020. Beyond WEIRD: A review of the last decade and a look ahead to the global laboratory of the future. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 41: 319–29. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bard, Kim A., Heidi Keller, and David A. Leavens. 2026. Let's go WILD: Increasing inclusivity in theories of developmental psychology. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 49: e258. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Besta, Tomasz, Katarzyna Jaśko, Joanna Grzymała-Moszczyńska, and Paulina Górka. 2019. *Walcz, protestuj, zmieniaj świat. Psychologia aktywizmu*. Sopot: Smak Słowa.
- Blum, Jason. 2012. Retrieving Phenomenology of Religion as a Method for Religious Studies. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80: 1025–48. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bryant-Davis, Thema. 2023. Column: Psychologists must embrace decolonial psychology. *Monitor on Psychology* 54: 8.
- Czapiński, Janusz, ed. 2004. *Psychologia pozytywna. Nauka o szczęściu, zdrowiu, sile i cnotach człowieka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Czapiński, Janusz. 2017. *Psychologia szczęścia. Kto, kiedy, dlaczego kocha życie i co z tego wynika, czyli nowa odsłona teorii cebulowej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Czerw, Agnieszka. 2010. *Optymizm. Perspektywa psychologiczna*. Gdańsk: GWP.
- Çetrez, Öner A., and Valerie DeMarinis. 2017. A Psychosocial, Spiritual, and Physical Health Study among Assyrian-Syrian Refugees in Istanbul: Cultivating Resilience in the Midst of Hardship. *Middle East Journal of Refugee Studies* 2: 227–255. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Davis, Edward B., Everett L. Worthington, Jr., and Sarah A. Schnitker, eds. 2023. *Handbook of Positive Psychology, Religion, and Spirituality*. Cham: Springer Nature.
- Emmons, Robert A., and Raymond F. Paloutzian. 2003. The Psychology of Religion. *Annual Review of Psychology* 54: 377–402. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Fredrickson, Barbara Lee. 2011. *Pozytywność. Naukowe podejście do emocji, które pomaga zmienić jakość życia*. Poznań: Zysk i S-ka.
- Hendriks, Tom, Meg A Warren, Marijke Schotanus-Dijkstra, Aabidien Hassankhan, Tobi Graafsma, Ernst Bohlmeijer, and Joop de Jong. 2019. How WEIRD are positive psychology interventions? A bibliometric analysis of randomized controlled trials on the science of well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 14: 489–501. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Henrich, Joseph, Steven J. Heine, and Ara Norenzayan. 2010. The weirdest people in the world? *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 33: 61–83; discussion 83–135. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- James, William. 1958. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: New American Library.
- Kaczmarek, Łukasz Dominik. 2016. *Pozytywne interwencje psychologiczne. Dobrostan a zachowania intencjonalne*. Poznań: Zysk i S-ka.
- Kim-Prieto, Chu. 2014. Introduction: Positive psychology of religion across traditions and belief. In *Religion and Spirituality Across Cultures*. Edited by Chu Kim-Prieto. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 1–18.
- King, Ursula. 2002. Is there a future for religious studies as we know it? Some postmodern, feminist, and spiritual challenges. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 70: 365–88. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ladd, Kevin L. 2019. The Archive for the Psychology of Religion: Editorial principles, practices and practicalities. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion* 41: 3–11. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ladd, Kevin L., Jayanti Basu, Valerie DeMarinis, Üzeyir Ok, Wellington Zangari, and Meleah L. Ladd, eds. 2026. *The Cambridge Handbook of the International Psychology of Religion*, 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Martin, Luther H., and Donald Wiebe. 2012. Religious Studies as a Scientific Discipline: The Persistence of a Delusion. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80: 587–97. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Maslow, Abraham Harold. 1978. *Religions, Values and Peak-Experiences*. London: Penguin Books.
- Miller-Perrin, Cindy, and Elizabeth Krumrei Mancuso. 2015. *Faith from a Positive Psychology Perspective*. Dordrecht: Springer Science & Business Media. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Müller, Martin. 2020. In Search of the Global East: Thinking between North and South. *Geopolitics* 25: 734–55. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Otto, Rudolf. 1920. *Das Heilige. Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen*. Wrocław: Trewendt u. Granier.
- Phiri, Peter, Sana Sajid, and Gayathri Delanerolle. 2023. Decolonising the psychology curriculum: A perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology* 14: 1193241. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Piotrowski, Jarosław P., and Magdalena Żemojtel-Piotrowska. 2024. Relationship between numinous constructs and values. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 16: 133–41. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Radoń, Stanisław. 2023. *Medytacja. Pomiędzy teorią a praktyką*. Kraków: WAM.
- Siekiera, Natalia, and Arkadiusz Białek. 2024. From everyday participation to ways of life: Development of Yurakare children in Bolivia's Amazonian area. *Social Development* 33: e12732. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Socha, Paweł Marian. 2010. Duchowość jako przemiana. Nowa teoria duchowości i jej zastosowanie w badaniach. In *Religijność i duchowość. Dawne i nowe formy*. Kraków: Nomos, pp. 262–74.
- Socha, Paweł Marian. 2014. *Przemiana. W stronę teorii duchowości*. Kraków: Nomos.
- Starbuck, Edwin Diller. 1899. *The Psychology of Religion*. New York: Scribner.
- Stausberg, Michael. 2013. Textbooks in review: Introductions to the psychology of religion. *Religion* 43: 135–50. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Sundararajan, Louise. 2015. Indigenous psychology: Grounding science in culture, why and how? *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 45: 64–81. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Surzykiewicz, Janusz, Sebastian Binyamin Skalski-Bednarz, Małgorzata Niesiołędzka, and Karol Konaszewski. 2025. Adaptation and psychometric properties of the Polish version of the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWBS) by Paloutzian and Ellison. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Tiele, Cornelis. 1979. *Elements of the Science of Religion*. New York: AMS Press.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.