



Environmental Faith Commitment and Religious Attitudes: Reviewing Differences in College Student Perspectives

Ana Cacal¹, Teresita Dumlao¹, Carlota Aquino¹,
Alvin Joseph Caseja¹, and Rito Baring²

Columban College, Inc.¹
De La Salle University, Manila²
Correspondence: anacacal730@gmail.com

Abstract

Catholic education shares in the evangelizing mission of the Church through the faith formation of young students. The Framework for Student Faith Formation in Catholic Schools sees the need for faith to dialogue with life issues like ecology often articulated in developmental views. Religious communities and the academe are only beginning to make sense of the impact of ecological crises lately. Hence, there is a need to bring ecological discussions that account for college-level appreciation of the environment from a faith perspective. The study sought how students differ in perspectives according to age, gender preference, religious affiliation, and academic program based on perceived Environmental Faith Commitments (EFC) among selected students in a tertiary school in Central Luzon. Secondly, it wants to know how their perceptions differ for religious attitudes in terms of age, gender preference, religious affiliation, and college academic programs. This descriptive quantitative survey will have college students selected through random sampling from various academic programs in a Catholic tertiary school. To analyze data, we checked first for internal consistency of EFC and FSAR by checking for the inter-item correlations of the items and correlations between EFC and FSAR. One-Way ANOVA was used to determine the effects of age, gender, religious affiliation, and academic program towards perceived faith-inspired environmental responses (EFC), and religious attitudes. The results offer insights into the characteristics of college students' perceptions of faith to the environment. Further, the implications of the results were discussed concerning current efforts of the school to adopt gender and ecologically-sensitive academic programs.

Keywords: Catholic Education, Ecological Awareness, Environmental Faith Commitment (EFC), Faith Formation, Religious Attitudes

INTRODUCTION

Catholic education plays a vital role in the Church's mission of evangelization, focusing on the faith formation of young students. It is essential that this faith formation also addresses contemporary life issues, including ecological concerns, which have become increasingly pressing. The Framework for Student Faith Formation in Catholic Schools underscores the importance of integrating faith with ecological awareness, reflecting the developmental perspectives on environmental issues. Both religious communities and academic institutions are starting to recognize the significant impact of ecological crises and the necessity of incorporating ecological education from a faith-based standpoint.

The educational mission of Catholic schools necessitate that Catholic educational institutions profile their students to know their mindset towards burning issues affecting the world today. That way, education can make adjustments in curriculum and programs for the benefit of young learners. This study builds on previous research by Clemente (2015) and Tindowen (2016), who highlighted the importance of maintaining Catholic identity in educational institutions and the critical aspects of Catholicity that should be present in these schools.

Catholic schools have a crucial role in shaping students' ecological sensitivity and fostering the right attitudes toward religion. By embedding ecological discussions within the context of faith, Catholic educational institutions can nurture environmentally conscious and spiritually grounded individuals. This integration is not only vital for the holistic development of students but also aligns with the broader mission of Catholic education to form individuals who are committed to social justice and the common good.

Through this research, we aim to understand better the interplay between faith, ecological sensitivity, and religious attitudes among college students. With the need to understand students' attitudes, the study wanted to know how students differ in perspectives according to age, gender preference, religious affiliation, and academic program based on perceived Environmental Faith Commitments (EFC) among selected college students in central Luzon. Secondly, it sought how their perceptions differ for religious attitudes in terms of age, gender preference, religious affiliation, and college academic programs. The findings hope to inform the development of gender-sensitive and ecologically-aware academic programs within Catholic schools, contributing to the Church's mission of promoting an integral human formation rooted in Christ.

METHODOLOGY

There is no exact consensus as to what defines pro-environmental behavior (Kothe et al., 2019). Similarly, no single environmental behavior or commitment is directly associated to faith convictions. Hence, we operationalize Environmental Faith Commitments (EFC) to include environmental behavior and disposition attributed to faith. The other measure we used is the three-dimensional measure on religion (Baring et al. 2018). First, we examined the internal consistency of the items for EFC and FSAR through correlation and Cronbach alpha. Then we analyzed the data using one-way ANOVA to check for the differences of mean scores for EFC and religious attitudes (FSAR) in terms of: age group, academic program, religious affiliation and

gender.

The researchers want to know whether variables such as age, gender preference, religious affiliation, and academic program influence college students’ perceived faith commitments toward the environment (EFC) using a sample in Central Luzon. Additionally, the study examined how these variables might affect students’ religious attitudes. This descriptive quantitative survey has randomly selected college students from various programs, including the College of Arts and Sciences, Education, Computer Science, Business Administration, Nursing, Engineering and Architecture.

To analyze data, we checked first for internal consistency of EFC and FSAR by checking for the inter-item correlations of the items and correlations between EFC and FSAR. One-Way ANOVA was used to determine the effects of age, gender, religious affiliation, and academic program towards perceived faith-inspired environmental responses (EFC), and religious attitudes. The results will provide valuable insights into the characteristics of college students’ perceptions of faith related to environmental stewardship.

RESULTS & FINDINGS

Participant Profile

A total of 351 college students participated in the survey we conducted for this study. The age distribution of participants ranged from 18 years old and below, 19-20 years old, and 21 years old and above with 21 students not declaring their ages. Majority (57.8 %) indicated female as their gender preference while 229 (65%) respondents indicated their academic program. In terms of religion, most of the participants indicated they are Roman Catholic (64.7%).

Table 1. Profile of Informants (N = 351)

		Frequency	Percent (%)
Age Group	18 and below	107	30.5
	19 – 20 yrs.	108	30.8
	21 and above	115	32.8
	Total	330	94.0
	Missing	21	6.0
Gender	Male	132	37.6
	Female	203	57.8
	Others	2	.6
	Total	337	96.0
	System	14	4.0
Academic Program	Humanities	6	1.7
	Business	61	17.4
	Engineering	55	15.7
	4.00	229	65.2

Religion	Roman Catholic	227	64.7
	Protestant/Christian	89	25.4
	Others	16	4.6
	5.00	2	.6
	Total	334	95.2
	System	17	4.8

Environmental Faith Commitment (EFC) items had an acceptable Cronbach alpha quotient of .73 with three items (items 1, 2 and 4) with good inter-item correlations. The items included are: “My faith tells me to participate in environmental conservation and preservation” (EFC 1)); “I feel that God asks me to take care of our environment” (EFC 2); and, “Working for the environment makes me happy” (EFC 4). Inter-item correlation for these items showed a good internal association between the items in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Inter-Item Correlation Matrix for EFC

	EFC 1	EFC 2	EFC 4
EFC 1	1.000		
EFC 2	.547	1.000	
EFC 3	.437	.447	1.000

Likewise, the measure on religion (FSAR) had Cronbach’s Alpha of .88 with good inter-item correlations:

Table 3. Inter-Item Correlation Matrix for Religious Attitudes

	EFC 1	EFC 2	EFC 4
Rel belief	1.000		
Spirituality	.740**	1.000	
Rel Behavior	.724**	.699**	1.000

**, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations between EFC and Religious Attitudes (FSAR)

Since we want to use EFC and religious attitudes as dependent variables, we checked if EFC and religious attitudes are correlated. Through Pearson r correlation (Table 4) we verified that students’ religious attitudes (Belief: r = .467, p = .01; Spirituality: r = .419, p = .01; Rel behavior: r = .338, p = .01) are significantly correlated to EFC. The significant positive correlations between EFC and religious attitudes suggest that students’ perceived faith inspired environmental commitment (EFC) has affinity to their religious views (Table 4). Thus, EFC perspectives indicate how student environmental view may reflect faith perspective.

Table 4. Correlations between EFC and Religious Attitudes

	1	2	3	4
1 Env. Faith Commitment (EFC)	1			
2 Rel. Belief	.467**	1		
3 Spirituality	.419**	.740**	1	
4 Rel. Behavior	.338**	.724**	.699**	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Before proceeding to one way ANOVA, we checked for normality of data through their mean and median. Then we looked into their skewness and kurtosis. For age and EFC, the mean and median has a similar score of 10.00 which suggest normality. Skewness is .106 while kurtosis is – 1.18 which are within the limits. For Gender and EFC, the mean is 9.71 while the median is 9.33. Skewness score is -.79 and kurtosis is 2.68.

Environmental Faith Commitment (EFC)

One-Way ANOVA for age Groups and EFC

First, we tested the data set for homogeneity of variances (Table 5). With a non-significant result (Table 5, p .083) there is homogeneity of variances. Hence, we can adapt the model showing the differences in means between EFC and age groups as shown in the Post Hoc test below.

Table 5. Test of Homogeneity of Variances (Age and EFC)

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2.503	2	327	.083

Table 6. ANOVA (Age and EFC)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.864	2	1.432	5.181	.006
Within Groups	90.376	327	.276		
Total	93.239	329			

Table 7. Multiple Comparisons (Age and EFC)

Dependent Variable: EFC

Tukey HSD

(I) Age Grp	(J) Age Grp	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1.00	2.00	.07018	.07171	.591	-.0987	.2390
	3.00	-.15100	.07061	.084	-.3173	.0153

2.00	1.00	-.07018	.07171	.591	-.2390	.0987
	3.00	-.22118*	.07044	.005	-.3870	-.0553
3.00	1.00	.15100	.07061	.084	-.0153	.3173
	2.00	.22118*	.07044	.005	.0553	.3870

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Of the three age groups being tested for differences in mean responses towards EFC, the 19-20 yr. old (2) and 21 yr. old and above (3) showed statistically significant differences in mean scores for EFC. Between the first (18 yr. old and below) and third age groups (21 yr. old and above) and between the first and second age groups, no statistically significant difference is observed for EFC.

One way ANOVA for Academic Program, Religious affiliation and EFC

For academic programs and EFC, the test for homogeneity of variances indicates the significance score at $p = .746$ which means that we can adapt the model showing the differences in scores for academic programs and EFC. However, ANOVA results suggest there is no statistically significant differences in mean scores ($p = .728$). Like the academic programs, the test for homogeneity for religious affiliation and EFC yielded a higher sig. result ($p = .158$) suggesting we can use the model showing the differences of means using ANOVA. However, ANOVA analysis results suggest the difference is not statistically significant ($p = .144$).

One-Way ANOVA for Gender and EFC

Through the test for homogeneity, we observe a higher p value ($p = .256$) hence we adapt the model showing the differences in mean scores for gender and EFC. ANOVA analysis showed a statistically significant result ($p = .032$) for the differences in mean scores. Reviewing the results from Tukey to determine which variables are significantly different, we observe the statistically significant differences between male and female responses but not for other gender preferences.

Table 8. Test of Homogeneity of Variances (Gender vs. EFC)

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.374	2	334	.255

Table 9. ANOVA (Gender vs. EFC)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.928	2	.964	3.466	.032
Within Groups	92.875	334	.278		
Total	94.803	336			

Table 10. Multiple Comparisons (Gender vs. EFC)

Dependent Variable: EFC

Tukey HSD

(I) GENDER	(J) GENDER	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
MALE	FEMALE	-.15492*	.05896	.024	-.2937	-.0161
	OTHERS	-.15657	.37569	.909	-1.0410	.7279
FEMALE	MALE	.15492*	.05896	.024	.0161	.2937
	OTHERS	-.00164	.37471	1.000	-.8838	.8805
OTHERS	MALE	.15657	.37569	.909	-.7279	1.0410
	FEMALE	.00164	.37471	1.000	-.8805	.8838

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Summary and Highlights of the Results

One-Way ANOVA for EFC and Age, Academic program and Religious Affiliation. Academic program and religious affiliation responses are not statistically significantly different for Environmental Faith Commitment responses of students. On the other hand, certain age groups (19-20 and 21- and above) [$F(2,327) = 5.18, p = .006$] and Gender [$F(2,334) = 3.47, p = .032$] are statistically significantly different. Age groups 22 yrs old and above ($M = 4.39$) have higher mean scores for religious attitudes over students 19-20 yrs old ($M = 4.18$). hence older students in this sample tend to have higher scores for EFC. With regard to Gender, the female scores ($M = 4.33$) are higher compared to the male mean scores ($M = 4.17$) for EFC. Surprisingly, 2 informants who replied “others” showed equal mean scores with the female group. But this is subject to further confirmation due to low count.

Overall, the following highlights are drawn from the key findings:

a. When students grow older in age, their scores are higher for EFC. Their awareness for environmental issues and how faith views these appear to mature. This idea is both supported by the studies conducted by Tucker and Dorsey (2008), “The Role of Religion in Environmental Attitudes: A Study of College Students” and Whitmarsh and O’Neill (2010), “Green Identity, Green Action: The Role of Faith in Environmental Citizenship” respectively. In RE curriculum, RE courses taken by older students may consider incorporating community engagements that promote environmental conservation and preservation, educating and advocating for ecology and earth care;

b. Female responses are higher for EFC compared to male responses. Female students have higher agreements towards conservation, preservation and advocating for ecology and earth care. This is reinforced in McCright and Dunlap (2011) study, “Gender and Environmentalism: The Social Bases for Environmental Concern” that women demonstrate higher level of concern for environmental issues than male. Zelezny, Chua, & Aldrich (2000) likewise affirm that female students generally exhibit stronger pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors compared to male. Women show more inclinations towards environmental care. Hence, women may take lead roles in community engagement activities. In class, they can be tapped to lead in creative roles to organize simple activities in campus and in the classroom.

c. There is no significant difference in responses for academic programs and religious affiliation hence there is no need to single out one’s religion or academic programs when integrating ecological inputs in an RE curriculum in college. Wright and O’Leary (2016) in their study, “The Role of Religion in Environmental Attitudes and Behaviors: A study of College Students” concluded that there are no significant differences in environmental concerns when comparing students from various academic programs. Gibson and McKeown have similar findings in their study: “Sustainability Assessment: Criteria and Process.” The authors noted that educational background and religious affiliation have no significant differences in attitudes towards environmental concerns.

Religious Attitudes

One-Way ANOVA for Age Group vs. Religious Attitudes

Testing for homogeneity of variances, there is homogeneity since the result (Table 11) is statistically higher than .05 (Belief: $p = .224$, Spirituality: .317 and Rel. Behavior: .367 respectively) for the three religion dimensions. We can adapt the model showing differences. Likewise, ANOVA results (Table 12) show that the differences are statistically significant ($p = .001$). Hence, we can adapt the model showing the differences in means between religious attitudes and exact age groups shown in the Post Hoc results in Table 13.

Table 11. Test of Homogeneity of Variances (Age and Religious Attitudes)

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Rel Belief	1.504	2	327	.224
Spirituality	1.154	2	327	.317
Rel Behavior	1.006	2	327	.367

Table 12. ANOVA (Age and Religious Attitudes)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Rel Belief	Between Groups	5.769	2	2.885	12.310	.000
	Within Groups	76.625	327	.234		
	Total	82.394	329			
Rel Spirituality	Between Groups	5.024	2	2.512	8.194	.000
	Within Groups	100.251	327	.307		
	Total	105.275	329			
Rel Religiosity	Between Groups	5.094	2	2.547	8.145	.000
	Within Groups	102.258	327	.313		
	Total	107.352	329			

Table 13. Multiple Comparisons (Age and Religious Attitudes)
Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Age Grp	(J) Age Grp	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Rel Belief	1.00	2.00	.11666	.06603	.182	-.0388	.2721
		3.00	-.20070*	.06502	.006	-.3538	-.0476
	2.00	1.00	-.11666	.06603	.182	-.2721	.0388
		3.00	-.31736*	.06486	.000	-.4701	-.1646
	3.00	1.00	.20070*	.06502	.006	.0476	.3538
		2.00	.31736*	.06486	.000	.1646	.4701
Spirituality	1.00	2.00	.11221	.07552	.299	-.0656	.2900
		3.00	-.18452*	.07437	.036	-.3596	-.0094
	2.00	1.00	-.11221	.07552	.299	-.2900	.0656
		3.00	-.29673*	.07419	.000	-.4714	-.1220
	3.00	1.00	.18452*	.07437	.036	.0094	.3596
		2.00	.29673*	.07419	.000	.1220	.4714
Rel Behavior	1.00	2.00	.05317	.07628	.765	-.1264	.2328
		3.00	-.23012*	.07511	.007	-.4070	-.0533
	2.00	1.00	-.05317	.07628	.765	-.2328	.1264
		3.00	-.28329*	.07493	.001	-.4597	-.1069
	3.00	1.00	.23012*	.07511	.007	.0533	.4070
		2.00	.28329*	.07493	.001	.1069	.4597

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

We observe several significant differences in mean scores for religious attitudes in terms of age. For religious belief, those who are 18 years old and below significantly differ in responses with those aged 21 years old and above but not between 18 years old and 19 years old. For spirituality, those who are (2) 19-20 years old differ significantly from those (3) 21 years old and above but not between (2) and (1). For religious behavior, (2) and (3) significantly differs but not with (2) and (1).

Academic Program and Religious Attitudes

The test for homogeneity shows a higher significance score (Table 14) hence model can be adapted. Academic programs have an effect on students' spirituality [$F(3, 347) = 3.47, p = .016$] but not for religious belief and religious behavior.

Table 14. Test of Homogeneity of Variances (Academic Prog. And Religious Attitudes)

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Rel Belief	.253	3	347	.859
Spirituality	.963	3	347	.411
Rel Behavior	.777	3	347	.508

Table 15. ANOVA (Academic Program and Religious Attitudes)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Rel Belief	Between Groups	1.675	3	.558	2.271	.080
	Within Groups	85.327	347	.246		
	Total	87.003	350			
Spirituality	Between Groups	3.271	3	1.090	3.473	.016
	Within Groups	108.957	347	.314		
	Total	112.228	350			
Rel Behavior	Between Groups	2.315	3	.772	2.435	.065
	Within Groups	109.963	347	.317		
	Total	112.277	350			

Genders and Religious Attitudes

Table 16 show the model is acceptable. ANOVA analysis (Table 17) suggest statistically significant differences for gender in three dimensions. Gender has an effect on religious belief [F (2,334) = 6.74, p = .001], religious behavior [F (2,334) = 6.86, p = .001] and spirituality [F (2, 334) = 15.54, p = .001]. Post Hoc test (Table 18) indicates the differences is between male and female but not for other gender preferences.

Table 16. Test of Homogeneity (Genders vs. Religious Attitudes)

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Rel Belief	2.706	2	334	.068
Spirituality	4.927	2	334	.008
Rel Behavior	.573	2	334	.565

Table 15. ANOVA (Academic Program and Religious Attitudes)

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Rel Belief	Between Groups	3.300	2	1.650	6.737	.001
	Within Groups	81.804	334	.245		
	Total	85.104	336			
Spirituality	Between Groups	9.262	2	4.631	15.536	.000
	Within Groups	99.554	334	.298		
	Total	108.815	336			
Rel. Behavior	Between Groups	4.326	2	2.163	6.860	.001
	Within Groups	105.314	334	.315		
	Total	109.640	336			

Table 18. Multiple Comparisons (Genders and Religious Attitudes)
Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) GENDER	(J) GENDER	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Rel Belief	MALE	FEMALE	-.18673*	.05534	.002	-.3170	-.0565
		OTHERS	.39394	.35258	.504	-.4361	1.2240
	FEMALE	MALE	.18673*	.05534	.002	.0565	.3170
		OTHERS	.58067	.35166	.226	-.2472	1.4086
	OTHERS	MALE	-.39394	.35258	.504	-1.2240	.4361
		FEMALE	-.58067	.35166	.226	-1.4086	.2472
Rel Spirituality	MALE	FEMALE	-.32479*	.06104	.000	-.4685	-.1811
		OTHERS	.44697	.38896	.485	-.4687	1.3627
	FEMALE	MALE	.32479*	.06104	.000	.1811	.4685
		OTHERS	.77176	.38794	.116	-.1415	1.6851
	OTHERS	MALE	-.44697	.38896	.485	-1.3627	.4687
		FEMALE	-.77176	.38794	.116	-1.6851	.1415
Rel Behavior	MALE	FEMALE	-.23200*	.06279	.001	-.3798	-.0842
		OTHERS	-.03939	.40006	.995	-.9812	.9024
	FEMALE	MALE	.23200*	.06279	.001	.0842	.3798
		OTHERS	.19261	.39901	.880	-.7467	1.1320
	OTHERS	MALE	.03939	.40006	.995	-.9024	.9812
		FEMALE	-.19261	.39901	.880	-1.1320	.7467

Religious Affiliation and Religious Attitudes

Religious belief and spirituality (Table 19) passed the significance test while religious behavior slightly exceeded the .05 mark. However, ANOVA analysis (Table 20) did not generate statistically significant differences in all three dimensions. Hence, no post hoc test is run to further analyze the differences based on religious affiliation.

Table 19. Test of Homogeneity of Variances (Religious Affiliation and Religious Attitudes)

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Rel Belief	1.553	3	330	.201
Spirituality	2.370	3	330	.071
Rel Behavior	2.520	3	330	.058

Table 20. ANOVA (Religious Affiliation and Religious Attitudes)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sig.
Rel Belief	Between Groups	.896	3	.299	1.179	.318
	Within Groups	83.663	330	.254		
	Total	84.560	333			
Spirituality	Between Groups	.158	3	.053	.161	.923
	Within Groups	108.155	330	.328		
	Total	108.313	333			
Rel Behavior	Between Groups	1.328	3	.443	1.353	.257
	Within Groups	107.912	330	.327		
	Total	109.240	333			

Summary and Key Results

One-Way ANOVA for Religious Attitudes and Age, Genders, Academic program and Religious Affiliation. There is no significant difference in religious affiliation responses for religious attitudes. Significant differences in mean scores for gender are observed in Religious Belief [F (2,334) = 6.74, p = .001], Religious behavior [F (2,334) = 6.86, p = .001] and spirituality [F (2, 334) = 15.54, p = .001]. In addition, Academic program [F (3, 347) = 3.47, p = .016] and Age groups have an effect on religious beliefs [F (3,327) = 12.31, p =.001]; spirituality [F (2, 327) = 8.19, p = .001] and religious behavior [F (2, 327) = 8.15, p = .001]. Like EFC, female religious attitudes are higher (M = 4.45, SD = .47) than male responses (M = 4.27, SD = .53). For academic programs, the statistically significant difference is noted in spirituality [F (3, 347) = 3.47, p = .016] but not in beliefs and behavior. For age groups, each cluster statistically significantly differ in all three religious’ dimensions. Hence students’ age has an effect on religious attitudes.

Overall, two significant findings are highlighted here: a. Like EFC, there is no significant differences for religious attitudes in religious affiliation. It can mean that for environmental faith inspired views, student perceptions are similar across varied religious affiliations. Religious biases are not distinct here; b. Gender, academic programs and age significantly differ for religious attitudes. The female shows higher scores together with the older students for religious attitudes.

DISCUSSION

Overall, this study has shown that only age and gender has effects upon EFC while age, academic programs and gender has effects upon their student religious attitudes from the sample. Students’ environmental faith commitment (EFC) suggest that their faith encourage them to participate in environmental initiatives and take care of our world. The study of Schultz and Zelesny (1999) show that values predict environmental attitudes. Certain values which faith may happen to endorse may also be responsible for people’s environmental attitudes. Our sample describe an opposing view to anthropocentric or previous conservative Christian views that places emphasis on the person rather than the environment or ecology. This inclination towards an ecocentric view by young people coupled with nurturing attitudes is consistent with previous results taken from Filipino students (Baring, Molino, Reysen 2021) and

other non-Asian and western settings (Le Hebel, Montpied, Fontanieu 2014) where young people reported favorable views towards ecology.

The informants from our sample affirm this point by suggesting having positive dispositions towards working on environmental issues. However, the exclusion of item 3 suggesting actual participation in environmental practices means that their appreciation of faith's encouragement to work in favor of the environment need concretization through deeds. With this in mind, we test how students' faith commitment for the environment correspond to students' age, academic programs, religious affiliation, gender, and religious attitudes.

Higher age of students has an effect upon EFC. Their awareness for environmental issues and how faith views these appear to show maturity. "The longer the education, the more extensive is the knowledge about environmental issues" (Kollmuss & Agyeman 2002, p. 248). Age in Gupte's study (2008) predict pro-environmental behavior. While in work settings age differences is not significant, older individuals tend to observe protective behavior towards the environment (Wiernik, Dilchert & Ones 2016). This insight is confirmed in our present study where older students indicate pro-environment mindset. In addition, "older age groups had higher scores in conservation, recycling, reduced meat consumption, and boycotting" (Agoston et al. 2024, 132). The "relationship between ecological beliefs, EAN and EB seems to be stronger for older children." (Collado et al 2015, 85). There is a mix of opinion with regard to younger generation's view towards ecology. One view suggests youth indifference to the environment, showing "pessimistic views of the future" (Smith 2009, p. 671). However more literature appear inclined to see young people being concerned with ecology.

In RE curriculum, RE courses taken by older students may consider incorporating community engagements that promote environmental conservation and preservation, educating and advocating for ecology and earth care. Female responses are higher for EFC compared to male responses. Female students have higher agreements towards conservation, preservation and advocating for ecology and earth care. Women show greater concern than men in environmental issues (Davidson and Freudenburg 1996). In the study of Kollmuss & Agyeman (2002) citing Fliegenschnee & Schelakovsky (1998) and others, while women are thought to be less extensive in environmental knowledge... they are said to be "more emotionally engaged, show more concern about environmental destruction ... and are more willing to change..." (Kollmuss & Agyeman 2002, p. 248). Speaking from an ecofeminist view, Gupte (2008) describes women to be "inherently closer to nature than men" (Gupte 2008, p. 47) and are inclined towards natural caring attitudes when predispose them for caregiving. The "driving force behind gender differences in environmental surveys is differences in perceived vulnerability to risks from the environment, not necessarily differences in ecological sensibilities" (Bord and O'Connor 1997, 830).

What does it imply for environmental activities in campus? Women show more inclinations towards environmental care. Hence, women may take lead roles in community engagement activities. In class, they can be tapped to lead in creative roles to organize simple activities in campus and in the classroom. There is no significant differences in responses for EFC according to academic programs and religious affiliation hence there is no need to single out one's religion or academic programs when integrating ecological inputs in an RE curriculum in college.

Likewise, age, gender and academic programs have an effect on religious attitudes. When it comes to gender and age, religious attitudes are significantly different. Like the EFC results, the female shows higher scores together with the older students for religious attitudes.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this paper has shown a complex mosaic of viewpoints regarding the relationship between college students' religious attitudes and environmental faith commitment. It highlights the complexities involved in integrating environmentalism and faith, when exposing potential points of agreement as well as disagreement with respect to students' diverse context.

The findings showcase how religious beliefs and environmental stewardship can be affected by certain demographic profiles selected for this study. Some participants indicated how their religious traditions instilled in them a strong feeling of environmental responsibility, while others expressed reluctance or ambiguity due to theological interpretations or the importance of other moral imperative. Nonetheless, the researchers found shared themes of moral responsibility and ethical concern among certain points of view, indicating a good place for discussion and cooperation.

Furthermore, this study clarifies the influence that religious communities and institutions may have on college students' attitudes and actions on the environment. Davignon and Thomson (2015) showed how denominational universities offer moral guidance to students. Smith and Snell (2009) placed in context the dynamic world of young adults which significantly accommodate spiritual and religious experiences. The participants emphasized how their environmental consciousness may be shaped by leadership messages, community standards, and religious beliefs. The study of Mayrl and Oeur (2009) implicitly show how institutional influences vis a vis religious idea may make their mark in future research with college students. This emphasizes how religious organizations may have the power to spur environmental action by using their social networks and moral authority to support ecological stewardship and sustainability programs.

Crucially, this research emphasizes the necessity of careful, situation-specific thinking when interacting with different religious viewpoints on environmental matters. Given the diversity found in religious communities, interventions, and advocacy work ought to be customized to speak to the cultural settings, values, and beliefs of various groups. In order to promote understanding and cooperation toward common environmental goals, this calls for communication, cooperation, and respect amongst religious leaders, faith communities, and environmental activists. Overall, this study adds to the expanding corpus of research on the relationship between environmentalism, ethics, and faith by illuminating then nuanced interactions between college students' environmental sentiments and religious convictions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agoston, C., Balázs, B., Mónus, F., & Varga, A. (2024). Age differences and profiles in pro-environmental behavior and eco-emotions. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 48(2), 132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01650254231222436>
- [2] Baring, R., Sarmiento, P. J., Sibug, N., Lumanlan, P., Bonus, B., Samia, C., & Reysen, S. (2018). Filipino college students' attitudes towards religion: An analysis of the underlying factors. *Religions* (3), 85. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel9030085>
- [3] Baring, R., Molino, J., and Reysen. 2021. The development and validation of the Christian environmentalism scale (CES) from a Philippine sample. *Journal of Empirical Theology* 34(2), 145-168.
- [4] Bord, R., and O'Connor, R. (1997). The gender gap in environmental attitudes: The case of perceived vulnerability to risk. *Social Science Quarterly* 78(4), 830-840.
- [5] Collado, S., Evans, G., Corraliza, J., and Sorre, M. (2015). The role played by age on children's pro-ecological behaviors: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 44(1), 85-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.09.006>
- [6] Davignon, Phil, and Robert A. Thomson Jr. (2015). "Christian Colleges and Universities as Moral Communities: The Effects of Institutional Characteristics on Student Religiosity." *Review of Religious Research* (57)4, 531-554
- [7] Davis, T. L., Kerr, B. A., and Kurpius, S. R. (2003). Meaning, purpose and religiosity in at-risk youth: The relationship between anxiety and spirituality. *Journal of Psychology & Theology*, 31(4), 356-365. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=2822edlf-53c3-405e-b890-0d31Idf43fd8%40sessionmgr4003&vid=2&hid=4108>
- [8] Davidson, D. and Freudenbur, W. (1996). Gender and environmental concerns: a review and analysis of available research. *Environment and Behavior* 28: 302-339.
- [9] Dunlap, R.E. and Jones, R.E. (2002). *Environmental concern: Conceptual and measurement issues. Handbook of Environmental Psychology* (pp. 481-503).
- [10] Gibson, R.B. and McKeown, R. (2005). Sustainability Assessment: Criteria and Process. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management*, 7(4), 473-496.
- [11] Gupte, M.(2002). Gender, feminist consciousness, and the environment. *Women & Politics* (24)1, 47-62, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1300/J014v24n01_03.
- [12] Johnson, C. and Hayes, J. (2003). Troubled spirits: Prevalence and predictors of religious and spiritual concerns among university students and counseling center clients. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 409-119. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.50.4.409>
- [13] Kollmuss, A. and Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? *Environmental Education Research*, 8(3), 239-260. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350462022014540>
- [14] Kothe, E., Ling, M., North, M., Klas, A., Mullan, A., and Novoradovskaya, L. (2019). Protection motivation theory and pro-environmental behaviour: A systematic mapping review. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 71(4), 411-432, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajpy.12271>.
- [15] Lau, W., Ehii, C., Lam, J., Lau, E., and Cheung, S. (2015). The relationship between spirituality and quality of life among university students: An autoregressive cross-lagged panel analysis. *Higher Education*, 69(6), 977-990.
- [16] Le Hebel, F., Montpied, P., and Fontanieu, V. (2014). What can influence students' environmental attitudes? Results from a study of 15-year-old students in France.

- [17] Mayrl, D., and Oeur, F. (2009). "Religion and Higher Education: Current Knowledge and Directions for Future Research." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 48(2), 260-275.
- [18] Miller, W. and Thoresen, C. (1999). *Spirituality and health*. In W. Miller (Ed.), integrating spirituality into treatment. American Psychological Association, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/10327-001>
- [19] Sapp, S. (2017). *The role of religious and spiritual beliefs in the academic success of college students: Theses and Dissertations*. 299. https://csuepress.columbusstate.edu/theses_dissertations/299
- [20] Smith, C. (2009). *Reconnecting with earth: Ecospirituality as the missing dimension in spirituality and sustainability education*. International Handbook of Education for Spirituality, Care and Wellbeing.
- [21] Smith, C. and Patricia S. 2009. *Souls in Transition: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of Emerging Adults*. Oxford University Press.
- [22] Sawatzky, R, Gadermann, A., and Pesut, B. (2009). An investigation of the relationships between spirituality, health status and quality of life in adolescents. *Applied Research Quality of Life*, 4, 5-22. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-009-9065-y>
- [23] Schultz, P. W. and Zelesny, L. (1999). Values as predictors of environmental attitudes: Evidence for consistency across 14 Countries. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 19(3), 255-265.
- [24] Tucker, M.A. and Dorsey, A. (2008). The role of religion in environmental attitudes: A study of college students. *Environmental Educational Research*, 14(5), 577-592.
- [25] Whitmarsh, L and O'Neill, S.J. (2010). Green identity, green action: The role of faith in environmental citizenship. *Journal for Environmental Psychology*, 30(2)218-229.
- [26] Wiernik, B., Dilchert, S., and Deniz, O. (2016). Age and employee green behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7(194), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00194>
- [27] Wright, P.J. and O'Leary T. (2016). The role of religion in environmental attitudes and behaviors: A study of college students. *Environmental Educational Research*, 22(2), 153-169.