Online Supplemental Material for

Sixty Years of Studying the Sacred:

Auditing and Advancing the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality

Table S1

Growth Trends of English-Language Publication in the Three Reviewed Journals

Figure	*PRS* (*k* = 724)	*IJPR* (*k* = 535)	*APR* (*k* = 250)	Overall corpus (*k* = 1,509)
	Before 2000	**Before 2000**	**Before 2000**	**Before 2000**
# of yrs w/ volumes	0	9	7	13
# issues/yr	--	*M* = 4.00 (*SD* = 0.00)	*M* = 1.00 (*SD* = 0.00)	*M* = 2.69 (*SD* = 1.54)
# articles/yr	--	*M* = 30.22 (*SD* = 4.35)	*M* = 3.57 (*SD* = 2.94)	*M* = 18.56 (*SD* = 14.14)
# pages/yr	--	*M* = 274.89 (*SD* = 13.30)	*M* = 41.00 (*SD* = 44.67)	*M* = 172.56 (*SD* = 123.50)
	2000–2014	**2000–2014**	**2000–2014**	**2000–2014**
# of yrs w/ volumes	7	15	14	15
# issues/yr	*M* = 3.57 (*SD* = 1.13)	*M* = 4.00 (*SD* = 0.00)	*M* = 1.86 (*SD* = 1.03)	*M* = 3.08 (*SD* = 1.27)
# articles/yr	*M* = 24.29 (*SD* = 9.59)	*M* = 25.87 (*SD* = 3.23)	*M* = 16.00 (*SD* = 4.00)	*M* = 21.72 (*SD* = 6.90)
# pages/yr	*M* = 283.71 (*SD* = 83.25)	*M* = 315.07 (*SD* = 25.04)	*M* = 308.50 (*SD* = 97.61)	*M* = 306.42 (*SD* = 71.52)
	2015–2021	**2015–2021**	**2015–2021**	**2015–2021**
# of yrs w/ volumes	7	7	7	7
# issues/yr	*M* = 4.14 (*SD* = 0.38)	*M* = 4.00 (*SD* = 0.00)	*M* = 2.86 (*SD* = 0.38)	*M* = 3.67 (*SD* = 0.66)
# articles/yr	*M* = 45.00 (*SD* = 8.54)	*M* = 24.43 (*SD* = 3.46)	*M* = 16.86 (*SD* = 2.67)	*M* = 28.76 (*SD* = 13.27)
# pages/yr	*M* = 449.71 (*SD* = 80.42)	*M* = 311.71 (*SD* = 53.24)	*M* = 348.29 (*SD* = 26.93)	*M* = 369.90 (*SD* =)
	Overall: 2008–2021	**Overall: 1991–2021**	**Overall: 1962–2021**	**Overall: 1962–2021**
# of yrs w/ volumes	14	31	28	35
# issues/yr	*M* = 3.86 (*SD* = 0.86)	*M* = 4.00 (*SD* = 0.00)	*M* = 1.89 (*SD* = 0.99)	*M* = 3.16 (*SD* = 1.24)
# articles/yr	*M* = 34.64 (*SD* = 13.84)	*M* = 26.81 (*SD* = 4.19)	*M* = 13.11 (*SD* = 6.54)	*M* = 23.05 (*SD* = 11.34)
# pages/yr	*M* = 366.71 (*SD* = 116.63)	*M* = 302.65 (*SD* = 35.13)	*M* = 251.57 (*SD* = 144.20)	*M* = 295.34 (*SD* = 111.92)

Note. *PRS = Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*; *IJPR = International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*; *APR = Archive for the Psychology of Religion*; # = number; w/ = with; yr = year; yrs = years; *k* = number of articles; *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation.

Table S2

Coding Criteria

Article or study feature	Coding criterion or criteria
Subjects (standardized keywords)	The standardized keywords that "were coded by APA [American Psychological Association] when the articles were classified into the PsycINFO database" (Kozlowski et al., 2017, p. 240). These keywords were obtained from the "Subjects" (Subject Terms) line of this review's PsycINFO search results. These keyword terms are the "subject headings used to index the publications in the database" (EBSCO Help Glossary, n.d.). Within PsycINFO, these standardized keyword terms are from the *APA Thesaurus of Psychological Index Terms*. According to the *APA Thesaurus of Psychological Index Terms, index terms* (standardized keywords) "are controlled vocabulary terms used in database records to make searching easier and more successful" (APA, n.d., para. 4). APA (n.d.) has explained the rationale and methodology for this standardized coding: "By standardizing the words or phrases used to represent concepts, [people] don't need to try and figure out all the ways different authors could refer to the same concept. Each record in APA's databases contains controlled vocabulary terms from the *Thesaurus of Psychological Index Terms*. APA staff index records according to the source document's level of specificity. For example, an experimental population labeled 'high school students' will be indexed with the term 'High School Students,' not the broader and less specific term 'Students.' Therefore, any relevant narrower terms should be included in the list of index terms in your search. Related terms may also closely match a search topic and should be considered as well. With the wide variety of concepts and vocabulary used in the psychological literature, search and retrieval of records about specific concepts is virtually impossible without the controlled vocabulary of a thesaurus. This controlled vocabulary provides a way of structuring the subject matter in a way that is consistent among users (e.g., searching for Dysphoria, Melancholia, and Depression can all be achieved by searching the term 'Major Depression')." (APA, n.d., https://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/training/thesaurus, para. 4–6).

Article or study feature	Coding criterion or criteria
Times cited in PsycINFO	The number of times the article was cited in the PsycINFO database as of March 1, 2022. This number was indicated by the phrase "Times Cited in this Database."
Times cited in Google Scholar	The number of times the article was cited in the Google Scholar search engine as of March 1, 2022. According to Google Scholar, their search engine "includes journal and conference papers, theses and dissertations, academic books, pre-prints, abstracts, technical reports and other scholarly literature from all broad areas of research" (Google Scholar, n.d., para. 1). Google Scholar has elaborated: "[Google Scholar includes] works from a wide variety of academic publishers, professional societies and university repositories, as well as scholarly articles available anywhere across the web. Google Scholar also includes court opinions and patents. We index research articles and abstracts from most major academic publishers and repositories worldwide, including both free and subscription sources…. While we try to be comprehensive, it isn't possible to guarantee uninterrupted coverage of any particular source. We index articles from sources all over the web and link to these websites in our search results. If one of these websites becomes unavailable to our search robots or to a large number of web users, we have to remove it from Google Scholar until it becomes available again. Our meticulous search robots generally try to index every paper from every website they visit, including most major sources and also many lesser known ones. That said, Google Scholar is primarily a search of academic papers. Shorter articles, such as book reviews, news sections, editorials, announcements and letters, may or may not be included. Untitled documents and documents without authors are usually not included. Website URLs that aren't available to our search robots or to the majority of web users are, obviously, not included either. Nor do we include websites that require you to sign up for an account, install a browser plugin, watch four colorful ads, and turn around three times and say coo-coo before you can read the listing of titles scanned at 10 DPI... You get the idea, we cover academic papers from sensible websites…. We normally add new papers several times a week. However, updates to existing records take 6-9 months to a year or longer, because in order to update our records, we need to first recrawl them from the source website. For many larger websites, the speed at which we can update their records is limited by the crawl rate that they allow." (Google Scholar, n.d., https://scholar.google.com/intl/en/scholar/help.html#coverage, para. 1–12).
Total *N* (study sample size)	This number was coded based on each empirical study's analyzed sample, after all data screening and exclusion had occurred. For multiwave studies (i.e., longitudinal studies), the sample size of the lowest-sample wave was coded. For cross-sectional studies that had nonimputed missing data and used pairwise deletion for analyses, the lowest pairwise sample size was coded. Nonempirical articles were left blank.
Trimmed total *N*	Based on scholarly precedent (Fraley & Vazire, 2014; Reardon et al., 2019), a trimmed total *N* was coded, whereby all empirical studies with sample sizes of 1,000 or more were recoded as having a sample size of 999. This recoding allowed the calculation of a trimmed mean *N*. Nonempirical articles were left blank.

Article or study feature	Coding criterion or criteria
Article or study type	Each article or study was coded into one of the following eight categories: (a) *empirical* (if it involved the collection of data on or from human participants), (b) *meta-analysis* (if it was empirical and involved the quantitative synthesis of results from "multiple studies of a phenomenon into a single result by combining the effect size estimates from each study into a single estimate of the combined effect size or into a distribution of effect sizes," VandenBos, 2015, p. 644), (c) *mini meta-analysis* (if it was empirical and involved the quantitative synthesis of results from multiple studies within the same published article), (d) *theoretical* (if it was nonempirical and involved primarily the articulation or exploration of conceptual issues), (e) *book review* (if it was nonempirical and primarily involved the description, summary, evaluation, or critique of a single book or a multivolume work), (f) *systematic review* (if it was nonempirical and primarily involved the narrative synthesis of numerous studies/publications of a phenomenon, for the purpose of reviewing, integrating, and drawing conclusions from them; Vogt & Johnson, 2011), (g) *editorial* (if it was nonempirical and primarily involved an editor, author, or group of authors expressing their opinion on an issue of interest to the journal, scientific field, or society at large), or (h) *commentary/reply* (if it was nonempirical and primarily involved an editor, author, or group of authors commenting on or replying to an editorial). Each article was coded as only one study type, based on which type classified it best.
Study analytic method	Each article or study was coded into one of the following four categories: (a) *nonempirical* (if it did not involve the collection of data on or from human participants), (b) *quantitative* (if it was empirical [involved the collection of data on or from human participants] and only analyzed the collected data quantitatively), (c) *qualitative* (if it was empirical and only analyzed the collected data qualitatively), or (d) *mixed methods* (if it was empirical and involved the analysis of collected data both quantitatively and qualitatively). Each article or study was coded into only one of these categories, based on which methodology classified it best.
Study design	Each empirical study was coded into one of the following four categories: (a) *cross-sectional* (if it was an empirical study that involved data collection at a single point in time and did not involve either random assignment to groups or manipulation of any independent variables), (b) *experimental* (if it was an empirical study that involved data collection at a single point in time and either random assignment of participants to distinct groups [experimental design] or the manipulation of at least one independent variable [quasi-experimental design]), (c) *longitudinal* (if it was an empirical study that involved data collection at more than one point in time and involved neither random assignment to groups nor manipulation of any independent variables besides time), or (d) *longitudinal and experimental* (if it was an empirical study that involved data collection at more than one point in time and involved either random assignment to groups or manipulation of at least one independent variable besides time). Each article or study was coded into only one of these categories, based on which design classified it best. Nonempirical articles were left blank.

Article or study feature	Coding criterion or criteria
Study location / Country(ies)	Each empirical study was coded for the country or countries within which the sample was recruited. Most empirical studies that were international (i.e., involved recruitment of participants from two or more countries) were coded based on the specific two to 10 countries within which the sample was recruited. However, some studies were instead coded "International," because it was clear they recruited participants from multiple countries but they either failed to specify the countries within which they recruited participants or they recruited from so many countries (i.e., 10 or more) that it was nonmeaningful to indicate all the countries. Nonempirical articles were left blank.
Study sample type	Each empirical study was coded for the type(s) of samples it recruited. Each empirical study was coded for as many sample type descriptors as seemed necessary for meaningfully understanding the population from which the participants were recruited. There were a wide variety of sample types, but some of the most frequent ones were the following: (a) Adults (online [i.e., community adults that were recruited via online crowdsourcing—see definition of "Online crowdsourced sample" below]), (b) Adults (non-online [i.e., community adults that were *not* recruited via online crowdsourcing), (c) College Students and/or Graduate Students (see definition of "Student sample" below), (d) Youth (see definition of "Youth-inclusive sample" below), (e) Clinical Sample (see definition of "Clinical sample" below), and (f) Older Adults (non-online; a sample of community adults who were all over the age of 50 and were not recruited via online crowdsourcing). Many studies were coded as having more than one sample type (e.g., College Students and Adults; Youth and Parents; Youth and Adults) and/or as involving sampling a special population. Regarding the latter, some commonly studied "Special Populations" were: (a) Special Population (Clergy, Adults), (b) Special Population (Congregants, Adults), (c) Special Population (Jewish Adults), and (d) Special Population (Muslim Adults).
Preregistration	Each empirical study was coded as "1" if it was preregistered. *Preregistration* was defined as "[having] a time-stamped, read-only record of a study's rationale, hypotheses, methods, and analysis plan on an independent online repository" (Hardwicke et al., 2022, p. 246), such as Open Science Framework (OSF) Registries, AsPredicted.org, or ClinicalTrials.gov. Nonempirical articles were left blank.
Open data	Each empirical study was coded as "1" if it involved publicly sharing the raw data that underlay the study's scientific claims and/or any applicable *analysis scripts*—"computer code or instructions for recreating the analysis in point-and-click software" (Hardwicke et al., 2022, p. 246). These empirical studies typically involved data shared either via the Open Science Framework (OSF) or via a larger study's official website (e.g., https://americanfamiliesoffaith.byu.edu/, http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/, https://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp, or https://www.nichd.nih.gov/research/supported/seccyd). Empirical studies that did not involve publicly shared data or analysis scripts were coded as "0." Nonempirical articles were left blank.

Article or study feature	Coding criterion or criteria
Open materials	Each empirical study was coded as "1" if it involved publicly sharing "original research materials [e.g., survey instruments, stimuli, software, videos] and protocols" (Hardwicke et al., 2022, p. 246). These empirical studies typically involve materials shared via the Open Science Framework (OSF), a large study's official website (e.g., https://www.baylor.edu/baylorreligionsurvey/, https://adventisthealthstudy.org/researchers/questionnaire-survey-archive, or https://spiritualityandhealth.duke.edu/index.php/religious-cbt-study/therapy-manuals/), or as part of the publication itself (e.g., in tables, Appendixes, or Online Supplemental Materials). Empirical studies that did not involve open materials were coded as "0." Nonempirical articles were left blank.
Open access	Each article was coded as "1" if it was available publicly and freely (Hardwicke et al., 2022), without having to access it through a paywall. Most of these articles were indicated as Open Access (OA) on APA's PsycINFO and/or on their journal publisher's official website (https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/rel, https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/hjpr20/current, or https://journals.sagepub.com/home/prj).
Empirical study	Each study was coded as empirical ("1") if it involved the collection of data from human participants.
Empirical article	Each article was coded as empirical ("1") if it involved the collection of data from human participants.
Multistudy article	Each article was coded as multistudy ("1") if it included more than one empirical study. Each article that was nonempirical was left blank, and each article that involved a single empirical study was coded "0."
Distinct article	Each separate article was coded as distinct ("1"). In other words, multistudy articles were only coded once (i.e., they were only coded "1" for the first study in that article).
Student sample	Each empirical study was coded as "1" if all or part of its sample was recruited from the undergraduate and/or graduate student population at an institution of higher education. Samples recruited from student populations at elementary, middle, or high schools were not included; instead, they were coded as "0." Empirical studies that did not specifically recruit college or graduate students were also coded as "0." Nonempirical articles were left blank.
Community adult sample	Each empirical study was coded as "1" if all or part of its sample was recruited from adults ages 18 or above in the general community (as opposed to adults recruited in a clinical setting or a higher education setting). All other empirical studies (e.g., those that only recruited Youth, College Students, or a Clinical Sample) were coded as "0." Nonempirical articles were left blank.
Online crowdsourced sample	Each empirical study was coded as "1" if all or part of its sample included adults ages 18 or above who were recruited via a website, online portal, email listserv, or internet-based company such as Qualtrics Panels, Prolific Panels, Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), Facebook.com, Craigslist.org, or Reddit.com. This coding was done to enable differentiation between community-adult samples recruited via online crowdsourcing from those that were not; these two types of samples were labeled "Adults (online)" or "Adults (non-online)," respectively. All other empirical studies were coded as "0." Nonempirical articles were left blank.

Article or study feature	Coding criterion or criteria
Clinical sample	Each empirical study was coded as "1" if all or part of its sample was either (a) recruited in a clinical setting (e.g., an outpatient or inpatient psychiatric clinic, medical center or hospital, or Veteran's Affairs center) or (b) recruited based on a shared psychiatric diagnosis (e.g., depressive, anxiety, trauma-related, psychotic, or substance use disorders), medical diagnosis (e.g., diabetes, HIV, lung disease, chronic illness, or cancer), or clinical experience (e.g., cancer survivors, abuse survivors, bereavement, or cardiovascular surgery). All other empirical studies were coded as "0." Nonempirical articles were left blank.
Youth-inclusive sample	Each empirical study was coded as "1" if all or part of its sample included participants under age 18 years. All other empirical studies were coded as "0." Nonempirical articles were left blank.
U.S.-only sample	Each empirical study was coded as "1" if it only involved recruitment of participants from the United States. All other empirical studies were coded as "0." Nonempirical articles were left blank.
In a non-U.S. single country	Each empirical study was coded as "1" if it only involved recruitment of participants from a single country other than the United States. All other empirical studies were coded as "0." Nonempirical articles were left blank.
International sample	Each empirical study was coded as "1" if it involved recruitment of participants from two or more countries. All other empirical studies were coded as "0." Nonempirical articles were left blank.

Note. Coding procedure: The third author (EJH; a third-year undergraduate psychology student with 1 semester of psychology of religion research experience) coded the citation counts, which were verified by the second author (EKL; a first-year master's in clinical mental health counseling student with 1 year of psychology of religion research experience). The second author coded the article features and utilized open science practices after extensive training with the first author (EBD; a professor of psychology with 17 years of research experience in the psychology of religion/spirituality and 4 years of experience with open science practices). Single coders were used to develop analysis based on the experience of experts in the field to determine frequency data of categories of article features. After establishing simple agreement over the course of the first 100 coded articles, the second and first author achieved over 80% agreement in coding, and any subsequent disagreement was settled by reaching consensus. Moreover, the first author meticulously checked the coding for all studies to ensure accurate information and make any needed corrections.

Table S3

Most Frequent Locations for Empirical Psychology-of-Religion Studies Conducted in a Single Country Other Than the United States

PRS (*k* = 724)	*IJPR* (*k* = 535)	*APR* (*k* = 250)	Overall corpus (*k* = 1,509)
Israel (*k* = 15, 2.1%)	Canada (*k* = 39, 7.3%)	The Netherlands (*k* = 18, 7.2%)	Canada (*k* = 56, 3.7%)
Poland (*k* = 15, 2.1%)	Belgium (*k* = 24, 4.5%)	United Kingdom (*k* = 14, 5.6%)	United Kingdom (*k* = 43, 2.8%)
Canada (*k* = 14, 1.9%)	The Netherlands (*k* = 20, 3.7%)	Iran (*k* = 13, 5.2%)	The Netherlands (*k* = 40, 2.7%)
India (*k* = 14, 1.9%)	United Kingdom (*k* = 15, 2.8%)	Belgium (*k* = 11, 4.4%)	Belgium (*k* = 39, 2.6%)
United Kingdom (*k* = 14, 1.9%)	China (*k* = 14, 2.6%)	Turkey (*k* = 9, 3.6%)	China (*k* = 32, 2.1%)
China (*k* = 13, 1.8%)	Poland (*k* = 12, 2.2%)	Sweden (*k* = 8, 3.2%)	Poland (*k* = 32, 2.1%)
Singapore (*k* = 11, 1.5%)	Australia (*k* = 9, 1.7%)	Thailand (*k* = 8, 3.2%)	Israel (*k* = 29, 1.9%)
Iran (*k* = 10, 1.4%)	Israel (*k* = 9, 1.7%)	Germany (*k* = 7, 2.8%)	Iran (*k* = 26, 1.7%)
Australia (*k* = 8, 1.1%)	Germany (*k* = 6, 1.1%)	Norway (*k* = 7, 2.8%)	India (*k* = 19, 1.3%)
Italy (*k* = 5, 0.7%)	Norway (*k* = 6, 1.1%)	Indonesia (*k* = 5, 2.0%)	Australia (*k* = 18, 1.2%)
		Israel (*k* = 5, 2.0%)	Germany (*k* = 17, 1.1%)
		Pakistan (*k* = 5, 2.0%)	Turkey (*k* = 15, 1.0%)
		Poland (*k* = 5, 2.0%)	
United States (*k* = 519, 71.7%)	United States (*k* = 273, 51.0%)	United States (*k* = 71, 28.4%)	United States (*k* = 863, 57.2%)
Non-U.S. (*k* = 165, 22.8%)	Non-U.S. (*k* = 225, 42.1%)	Non-U.S. (k = 154, 61.6%)	Non-U.S. (*k* = 544, 36.1%)
International (*k* = 40, 5.5%)	International (*k* = 37, 6.9%)	International (*k* = 25, 10.0%)	International (*k* = 102, 6.8%)
49 distinct countries	50 distinct countries	44 distinct countries	73 distinct countries
North America (*k* = 541, 74.72%)	North America (*k* = 314, 58.69%)	North America (*k* = 75, 30.00%)	North America (*k* = 930, 61.63%)
Europe (*k* = 53, 7.32%)	Europe (*k* = 116, 21.68%)	Europe (*k* = 96, 38.40%)	Europe (*k* = 265, 17.56%)
Asia (*k* = 78, 10.77%)	Asia (*k* = 54, 10.09%)	Asia (*k* = 57, 22.80%)	Asia (*k* = 189, 12.52%)
Oceania (*k* = 10, 1.38%)	Oceania (*k* = 12, 2.24%)	Oceania (*k* = 1, 0.40%)	Oceania (*k* = 23, 1.52%)
Africa (*k* = 7, 0.97%)	Africa (*k* = 3, 0.56%)	Africa (*k* = 2, 0.80%)	Africa (*k* = 12, 0.80%)
South America (*k* = 4, 0.55%)	South America (*k* = 5, 0.93%)	South America (*k* = 0, 0.00%)	South America (*k* = 9, 0.60%)
Intercontinental (*k* = 31, 4.28%)	Intercontinental (*k* = 31, 5.79%)	Intercontinental (*k* = 19, 7.60%)	Intercontinental (*k* = 81, 5.37%)

Table S4

Higher-Order Themes Most Evident in the Audited Psychology-of-Religion/Spirituality Articles' Keywords and Titles, 1962–2022

Standardized keywords		Article titles	
Theme	Hits	Theme	Hits
Spirituality	762	Religious	743
Religion	580	Spirituality	739
Religious beliefs	462	Religion	487
God concepts	319	Study	418
Religious experiences	97	God	295
Psychology	96	Development	179
Atheism	48	Analysis	57
Morality	41	Review	51
Stress	38	Moral	33
Religious affiliation	37	Symptoms	28
Buddhism	16		

Note. The themes in this table are based only on content analyses of published English-language research in *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* (*PRS*) from 2008 to 2022, *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* (*IJPR*) from 1991 to 2022, and *Archive for the Psychology of Religion* (*APR*) from 1962 to 2022. Specifically, the results of two Latent Semantic Analyses (LSAs) using Leximancer Version 5 are presented. Theme size for the LSAs of keywords and titles was set at the Leximancer default of 33%. Themes are presented in order of their relative importance, and *hits* denote "the number of text blocks in the [corpus of keywords or titles] associated with the Theme" (Leximancer, 2021, p. 33).

Table S5

Lower-Order Concepts Most Evident in the Audited Psychology-of-Religion/Spirituality Articles' Keywords and Titles, 1962–2022

Standardized keywords			Article titles		
Ranked concepts	Count	Relevance	Ranked concepts	Count	Relevance
Religion	515	78%	Religious	543	64%
Spirituality	405	61%	Religion	317	37%
Religious beliefs	342	52%	Spirituality	265	31%
Religiosity	330	50%	Psychology	221	26%
God concepts	151	23%	Religiosity	145	17%
Coping behavior	101	15%	Study	111	13%
Psychology	96	14%	God	107	13%
Well-being	75	11%	Experience	98	12%
Religious practices	67	10%	Relationships	96	11%
Muslims	57	9%	Health	94	11%
Religious experiences	54	8%	Coping	80	9%
Christians	48	7%	Role	77	9%
Faith	48	7%	Beliefs	66	8%
Atheism	48	7%	Well-being	65	8%
Religious fundamentalism	47	7%	Mental	62	7%
Attachment behavior	45	7%	Model	61	7%
Mental health	45	7%	Life	60	7%
Prayer	45	7%	Development	58	7%
Test validity	43	6%	Personality	57	7%
Islam	43	6%	Analysis	57	7%
Morality	41	6%	Orientation	56	7%
Psychometrics	40	6%	Social	52	6%
Cross cultural differences	40	6%	Attitudes	51	6%

Note. In Leximancer Version 5, *count* is "the total number of text context blocks across the data each concept is identified within." Concepts are ranked according to how frequently they occur. *Relevance* is the connectivity (co-occurrence) between that concept and all other concepts. It is "the percentage of context blocks that are coded with that concept, relative to the most frequent concept in the list. Simply, relevance is a percentage representation of the count value of each concept, divided by the single highest count value."

Table S6

Lower-Order Concepts Most Evident in the Audited Psychology-of-Religion/Spirituality Articles' Keywords Over Time

Top 10 ranked concepts before 2000		Top 10 ranked concepts 2000–2004		Top 10 ranked concepts 2005–2009	
	Co-count (Likelihood)		Co-count (Likelihood)		Co-count (Likelihood)
Religious affiliation	16 (43%)	Self-concept	5 (22%)	Religious experiences	17 (31%)
Theories	8 (40%)	Religious experiences	11 (20%)	Health	8 (28%)
Psychology	38 (40%)	Morality	8 (20%)	Mysticism	8 (26%)
Motivation	6 (30%)	Mysticism	6 (19%)	Theories	5 (25%)
Cross-cultural differences	10 (25%)	Christianity	5 (15%)	Attachment behavior	11 (24%)
Meaning	7 (23%)	Stress	5 (13%)	Jews	7 (23%)
Rating scales	5 (22%)	Personality	2 (11%)	Human sex differences	5 (23%)
Personality traits	6 (20%)	Religious beliefs	33 (10%)	Test validity	9 (21%)
Major depression	6 (18%)	Psychology	9 (9%)	Islam	9 (21%)
Human sex differences	4 (18%)	Islam	4 (9%)	Christianity	7 (21%)
Top 10 ranked concepts 2010–2014		Top 10 ranked concepts 2015–2019		Top 10 ranked concepts 2020–2022	
Forgiveness	16 (50%)	Prosocial behavior	12 (46%)	Anxiety	8 (42%)
Buddhism	7 (44%)	Atheism	21 (44%)	Stress	15 (39%)
Personality traits	13 (43%)	Jews	12 (40%)	Atheism	17 (35%)
Meaning	13 (42%)	Rating scales	9 (39%)	Prosocial behavior	9 (35%)
Health	12 (41%)	Personality	7 (39%)	Attitudes	7 (33%)
Death	4 (40%)	Faith	18 (38%)	College students	7 (32%)
Dying	4 (40%)	Buddhism	6 (38%)	Individual differences	6 (32%)
Self-concept	8 (35%)	Well-being	27 (36%)	Christians	15 (31%)
Attachment behavior	15 (33%)	God concepts	54 (36%)	Motivation	6 (30%)
Attitudes	7 (33%)	Coping behavior	36 (36%)	Death	3 (30%)

Note. In Leximancer Version 5, *co-count* is "the total number of text context blocks across the data that a concept co-occurs with the selected concept [time period]." *Likelihood* is "the percentage of text segments that contain the concept in the list and also contain the selected concept.... This statistic complements the count statistic, to give an estimate of conditional probability. The likelihood approximates the conditional probability that if the data discusses this concept then the data will also mention the selected concept."

Table S7

Lower-Order Concepts Most Evident in the Audited Psychology-of-Religion/Spirituality Articles' Titles Over Time

Top 10 ranked concepts before 2000		Top 10 ranked concepts 2000–2004		Top 10 ranked concepts 2005–2009	
	Co-count (Likelihood)		Co-count (Likelihood)		Co-count (Likelihood)
Response [to an editorial]	12 (35%)	Empirical	7 (24%)	Research	14 (36%)
Women	10 (34%)	Model	12 (20%)	Positive	5 (24%)
Review [of a book]	17 (33%)	Development	11 (19%)	Personality	13 (23%)
Science	7 (29%)	Review [of a book]	9 (18%)	Development	13 (22%)
Theory	14 (29%)	Experience	15 (15%)	Approach	9 (22%)
Psychology	63 (29%)	Coping	12 (15%)	College	5 (22%)
Religion	85 (27%)	Personality	8 (14%)	Orientation	12 (21%)
Development	15 (26%)	Theory	7 (14%)	Fundamentalism	7 (21%)
Relation	10 (21%)	Attachment	4 (13%)	Validation	8 (21%)
Meaning	7 (19%)	Psychology	29 (13%)	Response [to an editorial]	7 (21%)
Top 10 ranked concepts 2010–2014		Top 10 ranked concepts 2015–2019		Top 10 ranked concepts 2020–2022	
Adolescents	17 (37%)	Muslim	16 (47%)	Struggles	15 (36%)
Behavior	18 (36%)	Relational	5 (45%)	Stress	10 (36%)
Prayer	13 (33%)	Struggles	19 (45%)	Role	27 (35%)
Spiritual	11 (33%)	Emerging	9 (45%)	Life	20 (33%)
Growth	7 (32%)	Existential	8 (44%)	Moral	11 (33%)
Validation	12 (32%)	Gender	11 (44%)	Identity	11 (32%)
Effects	14 (30%)	Secular	11 (38%)	Use [e.g., of a substance]	11 (32%)
Attachment	9 (30%)	Effects	17 (37%)	Symptoms	9 (32%)
Health	27 (29%)	Sample	15 (37%)	Prejudice	10 (30%)
Stress	8 (29%)	Growth	8 (36%)	Existential	5 (28%)

Note. In Leximancer Version 5, *co-count* is "the total number of text context blocks across the data that a concept co-occurs with the selected concept [time period]." *Likelihood* is "the percentage of text segments that contain the concept in the list and also contain the selected concept.... This statistic complements the count statistic, to give an estimate of conditional probability. The likelihood approximates the conditional probability that if the data discusses this concept then the data will also mention the selected concept."

Table S8

Lower-Order Concepts Most Evident in Each of the Audited Psychology-of-Religion/Spirituality Journals' Keywords

Top 20 ranked concepts in *PRS* (*k* = 587, 39.00% of available corpus)		Top 20 ranked concepts in *IJPR* (*k* = 663, 44.05% of available corpus)		Top 20 ranked concepts in *APR* (*k* = 255, 16.95% of available corpus)	
	Co-count (Likelihood)		Co-count (Likelihood)		Co-count (Likelihood)
Attitudes	16 (76%)	Theories	14 (70%)	Personality traits	11 (37%)
Stress	26 (68%)	Motivation	14 (70%)	Human sex differences	7 (32%)
Anxiety	12 (63%)	Psychology	66 (69%)	Psychometrics	12 (30%)
Major depression	20 (61%)	Mysticism	21 (68%)	Muslims	17 (30%)
Forgiveness	19 (59%)	Rating scales	15 (65%)	Religious experiences	16 (30%)
Test construction	21 (55%)	Jews	18 (60%)	Personality	5 (28%)
Spirituality	218 (54%)	Religious affiliation	22 (59%)	Meaning	8 (26%)
Mental health	24 (53%)	Psychometrics	22 (55%)	Islam	11 (26%)
Atheism	25 (52%)	Religious beliefs	182 (53%)	Buddhism	4 (25%)
Coping behavior	52 (51%)	Cross-cultural differences	21 (53%)	Religious practices	15 (22%)
Christians	24 (50%)	Religious practices	35 (52%)	Christianity	7 (21%)
God concepts	73 (48%)	Health	15 (52%)	Religiosity	67 (20%)
Well-being	36 (48%)	Prejudice	19 (51%)	Morality	8 (20%)
Self-concept	11 (48%)	Religious fundamentalism	24 (51%)	Religious fundamentalism	9 (19%)
Religiosity	156 (47%)	College students	11 (50%)	Religion	98 (19%)
Test validity	20 (47%)	Death	5 (50%)	Faith	9 (19%)
Prosocial behavior	12 (46%)	Dying	5 (50%)	Well-being	14 (19%)
Religious conversion	10 (45%)	Attachment behavior	22 (49%)	Test validity	8 (19%)
Buddhism	7 (44%)	Islam	21 (49%)	Test construction	7 (18%)
Prejudice	16 (43%)	Individual differences	9 (47%)	Prayer	8 (18%)

Note. In Leximancer Version 5, *co-count* is "the total number of text context blocks across the data that a concept co-occurs with the selected concept [time period]." *Likelihood* is "the percentage of text segments that contain the concept in the list and also contain the selected concept.... This statistic complements the count statistic, to give an estimate of conditional probability. The likelihood approximates the conditional probability that if the data discusses this concept then the data will also mention the selected concept."

Table S9

Lower-Order Concepts Most Evident in Each of the Audited Psychology-of-Religion/Spirituality Journals' Titles

Top 20 ranked concepts in *PRS* (*k* = 587, 32.57% of available corpus)		Top 20 ranked concepts in *IJPR* (*k* = 845, 46.89% of available corpus)		Top 20 ranked concepts in *APR* (*k* = 370, 20.54% of available corpus)	
	Co-count (Likelihood)		Co-count (Likelihood)		Co-count (Likelihood)
Emerging [e.g., adults]	14 (70%)	Review [of a book]	49 (96%)	Empirical	13 (45%)
Stress	19 (68%)	Theory	34 (69%)	Muslim	72 (44%)
Struggles	27 (64%)	Response [to an editorial]	23 (68%)	Personality	22 (39%)
Symptoms	18 (64%)	Science	16 (67%)	Existential	6 (33%)
Adolescents	28 (61%)	Prejudice	21 (64%)	Study	32 (29%)
Adults	27 (57%)	Attachment	19 (63%)	Experience	27 (28%)
Role	44 (57%)	Approach	24 (59%)	Fundamentalism	9 (27%)
Positive	12 (57%)	Relation	27 (57%)	Growth	6 (27%)
Relational	6 (55%)	Development	33 (57%)	Research	10 (26%)
Spirituality	146 (55%)	Psychology	125 (57%)	Relationships	24 (25%)
Christian	19 (54%)	College	13 (57%)	Coping	20 (25%)
Use [e.g., of a substance]	18 (53%)	Religion	174 (55%)	Orientation	14 (25%)
Religiosity	72 (50%)	Identity	18 (53%)	Social	13 (25%)
Well-being	32 (49%)	Students	17 (52%)	Secular	7 (24%)
Relationships	45 (47%)	Orientation	28 (50%)	Life	14 (23%)
Meaning	17 (46%)	Cognitive	17 (50%)	Religion	72 (23%)
Spiritual	15 (45%)	Existential	9 (50%)	Life	14 (23%)
Growth	10 (45%)	Fundamentalism	16 (48%)	Model	14 (23%)
Change	10 (45%)	Empirical	14 (48%)	Perspective	11 (22%)
Mental	28 (45%)	Health	45 (48%)	Sample	9 (22%)

Note. In Leximancer Version 5, *co-count* is "the total number of text context blocks across the data that a concept co-occurs with the selected concept [time period]." *Likelihood* is "the percentage of text segments that contain the concept in the list and also contain the selected concept.... This statistic complements the count statistic, to give an estimate of conditional probability. The likelihood approximates the conditional probability that if the data discusses this concept then the data will also mention the selected concept."