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In recent years there has been a growing interest in the faith and spirituality of the college student. James Fowler introduced his theory of faith development in 1978 claiming that every person has a faith which develops in ways similar to other forms of human development. Does James Fowler's theory provide significant information for a further understanding of the spiritual development of the college student? Does higher education need to be concerned with the faith development of its students?

This dissertation is made up of four articles dealing with each question. The study begins with an article presenting the argument that higher education needs to concern itself with the faith development of the college student. The second article provides a detailed comparison of faith development with five other developmental theories. The third article claims an existential link exists between faith development and other developmental theories. The fourth article presents a careful analysis of five first-year
students at a Christian college with a focus on perceptions of the students relationships with their parents.

The investigator used a purposive sample of two men and three women first-year students at a Christian college. The interviews were conducted using Fowler's research questions to begin the conversations with the respondents. Through a use of grounded theory the data were organized and categorized until a clear pattern began to form. The pattern of data suggested that the perceptions the students had of their parents had an affect on their perceptions of all else in life. Fowler's theory provided many explanations for the responses of the students but did not address the perceptions the students had of their parents and how those perceptions were expressed in their interpretations of life issues.
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Recently there has been a growing discussion in higher education literature of the spiritual side of every student (Genia, 1980; Shapiro and Fitzgerald, 1989; Shokley, 1989; and Boyer, 1989; Myers, 1991; Haggray, 1993). This interest is founded in the work of James W. Fowler. Fowler's theory of faith development is the first attempt to address the nature of faith as a developmental process. Such a theory opens the discussion of the nature of the developmental struggles experienced by the traditional college student to a new field of understanding.

Leon McKenzie provides an argument for the importance of understanding the developmental process of faith transformation in the college student. In McKenzie's discussion of the way adults learn, he claims that though it may be true that the various developmental theories are logically distinct from each other, they are existentially linked (McKenzie, 1982, p. 20). That is to say, though each developmental theory stands on its own in form and structure, to claim that the developmental process so described by the theory occurs in isolation from all other forms of development is irresponsible. Such is the nature of developmental theory, one grows and changes in the context of
a complexity of experiences, relationships, perceptions, physical abilities, and intellectual capacity.

This means not only does faith development occur in the context of all other forms of development, it is directly affected by what is happening in the other forms of development. The same is true for other forms of development being directly affected by what is happening in the development of one's faith.

If this is true, the implications for the professional concerned with the development of the college student must be that faith development is as important in describing the development of the college student as are the other theories of development. It should follow that the faith experience of the student would shed some light on the moral development, psycho-social development, cognitive development, as well as the level of complexity of the student's understanding and perception.

What this study does not do is advocate an emphasis upon organized religion. What this study does do is point to an understanding of reality that claims something beyond simply the world of fact. The concept of faith development has to do with making meaning, something all people do. Making meaning entails interpreting what we perceive and attaching to it some significance. Making meaning assumes there is
something more than fact in the world. Though fact is very important, without meaningfulness fact becomes a cold, lifeless reality. Poetry, philosophy, ethics, the arts, all seek to make meaning, and thus are all acts of faith. This is the intent of this study, to seek answers to why we perceive the world as we do, to discover why we interpret and make meaning as we do.

This author's growing interest in Fowler's research and theory coupled with the increased awareness in higher education of the developmental needs of the student has led to this particular study.

Dissertation Organization

There have been some questions raised about Fowler's theory, including whether "faith" can develop as Fowler claims (See Dykstra & Parks, 1986, Faith development and Fowler). This dissertation is organized around four specific questions: 1) What is the definition of the "faith" that Fowler uses in his theory, and does that "faith" and its development have anything to do with higher education? 2) How does faith development compare with and inform other developmental theories often used by student services practitioners?; 3) Does faith develop, how does faith
develop, and is there a connection or "link" with other forms of human development? 4) Is the method that Fowler uses in his research self-serving, does Fowler actually use qualitative analysis or not, and does Fowler's theory of faith development adequately describe what is going on with the student's faith struggles?

To address all of these questions a format made up of four papers, hereafter referred to as chapters, was adopted in which each of the questions would be a focus of a paper. The dissertation is organized by beginning with the questions as to the definition of faith offered by Fowler's theory, and whether faith so understood has any role in higher education. The second chapter addresses in detail how Fowler's theory informs and compares to the developmental theories often used by higher education professionals. The third chapter focuses on how faith develops and whether or not it does develop as do other forms of human development by demonstrating a "link" binding faith development theory with other theories of human development. The fourth chapter provides a descriptive case study in which the qualitative method of grounded theory is used in studying the faith development of five first-year traditional students in a Christian college to address the question of whether or not Fowler's theory adequately accounts for the distinct patterns in the data arrived at
through the grounded theory approach.

Fowler's theory is carefully reviewed in chapters one, two, and three. Each of the chapters has a review of the literature appropriate for the focus of that particular question. Though each chapter is a complete paper to be submitted for publication, together they provide a progressive study of faith development in higher education.

The purpose of this study is that through addressing these questions about faith development the importance of faith development theory for higher education in describing the development of the student will be as evident as the theories of Piaget, Kohlberg, Erikson, Chickering, and Perry.

Finally, there is a general conclusion that focuses on what was found in this study and what further research is suggested by the data gathered for this case study. The appendices include the unitized data organization, a summation and description of the final categories of data unitized, the list of questions used from Fowler's research manual, a copy of the consent forms each of the student respondents filled out and signed.
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CHAPTER 1. FAITH DEVELOPMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION: 
THE ROLE OF FAITH IN LEARNING

A paper to be submitted to the Journal of Higher Education

John H. Bolen

Abstract

The purpose of the paper is to address the question, "Does Fowler's understanding of faith conform to the needs and purposes of higher education?" This question is addressed by defining Fowler's understanding of faith and examining the history of such faith in education in the United States. The conclusion is that if it does, then faith is vital in the development of the college student. This vitality is presented through several specific implications for the administration of higher education.

I. Introduction

Why would departments of Higher Education want to incorporate Faith Development theory into their curriculum? Why should they? And what is faith development that Higher
Education departments should consider it? What does faith and its development have to do with the university, especially the public university?

This article shall attempt to answer each of these questions by: first, a short review of the history of the purpose of higher education in this country; second, to show that faith, as interpreted in Faith Development theory, is already involved in the purpose of education; third, provide a brief overview of faith development theory; and finally, discuss what implications faith development theory has for higher education.

II. History

Higher education in the United States began because the church wanted an educated clergy.

To be more specific, the desire of important religious denominations (such as the Anglican and Calvinist) for a literate, college-trained clergy was probably the most important single factor explaining the founding of the colonial colleges (Brubacher and Rudy, 1958, p. 6).

The first curriculum was dominated by religion and moral philosophy.

American higher education was the child of religion, and the history both of the church denominations and the westward expansion can
be traced through the history of America's colleges and universities (Holmes, 1975, p. 9).

However, the founders of Harvard had a much broader vision of the purpose of higher education than the preparation of clergy. Harvard's purposes were clearly understood:

train a literate ministry, educate future lawyers and civic leaders, and, more generally, perpetuate the tradition of humane learning in the New World (Boyer, 1981, p. 9).

What was the tradition of "humane" learning that Harvard wanted to perpetuate? The Puritans brought with them the traditions of the Old World, traditions in education that saw a complimentary relationship between the sciences and religion. The religious permeated all aspects of the curriculum. Religion and science were together, not out of pragmatic necessity, but out of a sense of meaningfulness.

What was the religious? For many in the early days of this country the religious did mean the strict traditions and dogmas of the church, but not in the colonial colleges, the religious meant something more (Brubacher and Rudy, 1958, p. 9). The religious had to do with the deeper meaning of life, what made living worthwhile. The presence of the religious was a recognition that life had a deeper meaning than the sciences and philosophy could discover or explain. The humane tradition perpetuated the idea that such an approach
to education was for the purpose of benefiting all of society by recognizing this "deeper meaning" (Rudolph, 1962, p. 7).

The humane tradition could be characterized as an effort to develop persons not workers, human beings not professionals (Brubacher and Rudy, 1958, p. 287).

This direct involvement of religion in higher education did diminish in post-enlightenment nineteenth century. Religion and science were no longer complimentary. Philosophers tried to distance themselves from teachers of religion. Though the direct influence of religion continued to decline in the university, the institutions of higher education were still viewed as the "bastions" of the moral order, and as such found itself often at odds with society in a role as critical participant (Boyer, p. 56).

With the Morril Act of 1862 and the subsequent formation of state universities, the emphasis on science in the university increased (Rudolph, 1962, p. 247). In the second half of the nineteenth century business and the entrepreneurs of business became more directly involved with higher education. Johns Hopkins founded the first fully graduate institution. J. D. Rockefeller paid out thirty million to found the University of Chicago in 1892 (Smith, p. 58). It seemed that the entrepreneurs of business were competing to see who could establish the most prestigious university. The
emphasis of these newly founded institutions was research, not the educative process. The purpose was not to directly benefit society, but to provide profitable advantages for the entrepreneurs of business (Rudolph, 1962, p. 180).

Josiah Royce, a student at Johns Hopkins in its earlier days, saw "wisdom" and "God's name" as two traditions united in a new morality in the academic and spiritual search for truth at Johns Hopkins (Smith, p. 55). The motto of Johns Hopkins was Veritas Vos Liberabit (the truth shall make you free). However, there appeared to be a movement away from the complimentary joining of "wisdom" and "God's name" by the turn of the twentieth century. The departmentalism of the university, and the devaluing of the humanities dismayed Royce. In a critical analysis of Johns Hopkins, Royce stated that in his estimation scholarship as a spiritual construction was absent (Smith, p. 70).

Johns Hopkins appeared not to be the exception. With the influence of business financing and the demands from business for profitable research, the universities began to isolate the "hard" sciences from all other disciplines, and in the process downsizing the departments of the humanities.

Woodrow Wilson, in 1896, warned that education was becoming too practical, that science was promoting a quick fix to complex problems (Boyer, p. 13). By 1900 it appeared
that the research universities had forgotten the "humane tradition" of seventeenth century Harvard. It even appeared that Harvard itself was suffering from idealogical amnesia (see also Rudolph's, 1962, discussion of the role of pragmatics and vocationalism in the university).

Since 1900 the research universities have embraced the enlightenment notion of the "purity" of the field of discipline by separating all of the disciplines so as to prevent the "pollution" of one discipline by another (Wilshire, p. 169), thus fragmenting the focus of the university and creating what Clark Kerr called the "multiversity" (Smith, p. 155; Brubacher and Rudy, 1958, p. 284). Such fragmentation has benefitted the profitable industries of society, but at what cost to humane society?

The philosophy of education that brought about the founding of higher education in the United States was one that emphasized the need to ask the "why" as much as the "what" and the "how." At some point, according to Sir Walter Moberly, the institutions of higher education have failed to ask the "why" of existence let alone attempt to provide any answers (Smith, p. 295).

As Ernest Boyer states, "Any institution committed to the inquiry into the human experience must inevitably confront questions of purpose and meaning" (Boyer, p. 58).
That appeared to be the dominant philosophy of higher education in the first 200 years of its history in the United States (Rudolph, 1962, p. 6). However, we have progressively lost sight of such a philosophy over the last 150 years.

Bruce Wilshire refers to what has happened in the colleges and universities as a "moral collapse" (p. xxiii). With the focus on fact-based research and the emphasis on the "what" and "how" of reality, something has been lost, or if not lost, at least misplaced.

That "something" is the need to make meaning out of our existence. Paige Smith stated that the need to believe and to find meaning in life is as basic as the need for food or sex (Smith, p. 172).

Is it my desire to simply reestablish the traditions of a seventeenth century Harvard? Do I long for the stringent dogmas and doctrines of religion that burned young women as witches or proclaimed Darwinism as anti-God? Do I harbor the false perception that higher education used to be everything it isn't now? Do I wish to once and for all reconcile science and religion? Quite the contrary. If we understand the history of higher education and religion so simplistically that we fear faith issues and religion because of the restrictions it once imposed on academia, then we miss another important element of that history. It is my
contention that what we can learn from the history of higher education is that the search for meaning was at the heart of the "humane tradition." "The religious tradition...impels institutions to search for meaning and transcendence, a move away from the search for survival, market share, and the competitive edge" (Wilcox, p. 65).

Colleges and universities may still believe that they are answering the needs of society, but what needs are being met? The needs of the military complex (Smith, p. 10)? The needs of the corporate machine (Smith, p. 13)? The needs of present comforts at the expense of the future (Smith, p. 294)? At what cost for direction, purpose, and moral veracity (Smith, p. 218)?

III. Faith: Furthering the Purposes of Education

Perhaps one reason for the shift away from religion's influence on higher education is a misunderstanding of the character of faith. Religion at its worst has been a roadblock to the intellectual pursuit of truth (Kung, p. 82). All one need do is reflect on the October, 1992 recanting of the Roman Catholic Church regarding Galileo Galilei. In 1633 Galileo was ordered excommunicated from the church for the heretical teaching that the earth was not at the center of
the universe. That it has taken three centuries for the church to formally acknowledge its error does not strengthen the argument that faith furthers the purpose of higher education. In fact, Galileo and others like him did the only thing they could to pursue truth, step outside the confines of the church (Funk & Wagnalls New Encyclopedia, 1993 Yearbook, Events of 1992, p. 335).

It is what we believe that often leads to the conflict between religion and science. It is difficult to distinguish the content of faith from the nature of faith, but in fact that is what we must do in order to explicate the claim that faith contributes to the purposes of higher education. The content of faith often involves the doctrines, dogmas, and traditions of organized religion as well as the prejudices, social mores, and cultural background of the individual. The nature of faith defines faith as action, what it does in dealing with the why's and wherefore's of life and how it works. The content may at times be so volatile that it overshadows the nature of faith. However, we cannot overlook the fact that the content of faith varies from individual to individual and is more indicative of that person's level of development than the nature of faith in general.

The nature of faith is not mere belief as currently understood. Many think that faith is nothing more than
believing in something for which there is no verifiable evidence. Centuries ago the use of the verb "to believe" meant what the German word, belieben, means today, "to hold dear, to prize, to give allegiance to, to be loyal to, to value highly" (Parks, p. 10). The Latin "credo" meant literally, "I set my heart," which is commonly translated "I believe."

"To believe connoted an essential human activity involving the whole person" (Parks, p. 11). However, "to believe" has progressively come to be associated with accepting as true that for which there is no evidence. "To believe" came to represent an anti-scholarly attitude. "To believe" came to mean giving assent to a proposition, dogma, or doctrine. For some, the more intellectually absurd a proposition the greater the belief.

With such an understanding of "to believe" it is no wonder that "faith" is thought to be outside the realm of the intellect and therefore having no place in academia. To understand faith in this way is to ignore the etymology of the word. Faith has more to do with making meaning out of life than with blind obedience to an absurd doctrine. Faith is what people do to make sense out of things (Parks, p. 12).

Faith is the active process of every human to make meaning out of life. "Meaning-making is the activity of
seeking pattern, order, form, and significance" (Parks, p. 14). Faith, in this sense, is a dynamic process that involves the total person. Faith is what we do when we order our thoughts and organize our imaginings. Faith is at work whenever we find ourselves attempting to interpret the meanings of a difficult circumstance in our lives. Faith is what unifies our thoughts (Fowler, 1981, p.19).

Kenneth Stokes defines faith as "the finding and making meaning of life's significant questions and issues, adhering to this meaning, and acting out" (Stokes, p. 12).

Faith is what we do when we find ourselves seeking a deeper meaning to events, ideas, conflicts, crises, and moments of celebration.

Though it is true that faith is more than "mere" belief in that which cannot be proved, there is something to that side of faith. There is a measure of risk involved in faith. Faith does often lead one to accept those propositions that objectively considered might not be justifiable on material grounds. However, it is just this nature of faith that often enables a scientist to make a move from one demonstrated proposition to another yet to be demonstrated proposition. Faith involves how we make our life's wagers, and faith enables us to take that risk (Fowler, 1981, p. 5).

F. R. Tennant argued that faith is a natural tendency in
the acquisition of knowledge. The faith venture in secular contexts is continuous in kind with that of the religious prophets and apostles. Thus, faith is the indispensable volitional component within the process of acquiring knowledge, it plays virtually the same role in both religious and non-religious life (The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Vol. 3, p. 168).

Karl Popper, renowned logical positivist of the Vienna Circle, addressing faith and its place in science stated, "...our guesses (in science) are guided by the unscientific, the metaphysical (though biologically explicable) faith in laws, in regularities which we uncover" (Popper, p. 132).

Bertrand Russell, in his Human Knowledge, insisted (based on Hume's arguments) that the fundamental assumptions of science cannot be justified but must be accepted on faith (Russell, p. 57).

Stuart D. McLean states that, "Niebuhr understands faith as relationship to a center or centers of value and power. The passive or receptive side of faith is trust; the active side is expressed as loyalty and commitment" (Dykstra, p. 159). The "center or centers of value and power" will differ depending upon the content of one's faith, whether one exercises a faith as a scientist in the orderliness of the universe or as a religious believer in an ultimate source of
reality, but the nature of that faith is the same.

Though faith has been claimed by many even in scientific considerations, what is this nature of faith? Viewing the nature of faith and its structures and functions as distinct from its content provides for a definition of faith that addresses both the religious and the profane. Certainly one cannot claim the content of faith to be universal, but the nature of faith can be universally applied. It is this nature of faith that furthers the purposes of higher education and is found in both the great halls of theological enterprise as well as the laboratories of scientific researchers.

What is one of the most important purposes of higher education? According to Ernest Boyer, "...higher learning's most essential mission in the nation's service is the search for truth leading to the discovery of larger meanings that can be applied with integrity to life's decisions" (Boyer, p. 62). Boyer argues that the search for truth involves meaning-making. Where does faith fit in this search for truth? Before this question can be answered truth itself must first be considered.

What is truth? Is it that which can be captured in the binary code of an electronically digitalized instrument? Is truth fact? Does fact totally embody truth, and if it does
not, then why has much of higher education focused on the
discovery of fact? Is it this search for bare fact that has
so subdivided the disciplines as to create a "multiversity"
where there was once a "university"? Is the association of
truth with fact behind the development of a "knowledge
industry" we used to know as higher education? Is the
association of truth solely with verifiable fact behind the
loss of the "humane" tradition in higher education?

Truth is defined in the American Heritage Dictionary as
that which conforms to knowledge, fact, actuality, or logic.
Truth is most often used to refer to an idea corresponding to
a verifiable fact which forms the content of true knowledge
as a perception of that which is actual. Logic is the tool
by which one discovers the correspondence of the idea with
the verifiable fact. J. F. Fries states, "Truth is a matter
of correspondence between thought and object, but the object
is not something transcendent; it is simply an immediate
cognition. Truth is a relation between two levels of
cognition" (Mourelatos, p. 254). F. Brentano simply states
that the measure of truth is evidence. Thomas Hobbes stated
that "Evidence is to truth, as the sap to the tree...for this
evidence, which is meaning with our words, is the life of
truth. Knowledge, thereof, which we call science, I define
to be evidence of truth, from some beginning or principle of
sense..." (Peters, p. 34). Whether we agree with Hobbes' epistemology he does make the point that fundamental to a discussion of truth is the relationship of evidence to what is claimed to be true. What sort of evidence depends upon how one comes at the truth.

If one comes at truth as a matter of science and the correspondance theory of truth, then evidence refers to physical fact that is verifiable by a series of controlled experiments. Ferdinand Schiller stated that truth is relative to the evidence and to the purpose of the investigator; no degree of verification will ever establish the absolute truth of a statement (Abel, p.311). Schiller went on to claim that the concept of "fact" is ambiguous. Facts are relative to the state of the science, the methods, the instruments, the aims and bias of the scientist. Facts are relative to the hypothesis used, to our own senses, to our memory, and to our language (Abel, p.311). It would seem that the correspondance theory of truth requires a level of "faith" to function. But of course that has already been shown to be the case. This leads to another approach to truth.

Soren Kierkegaard made the point that there is only one truth but two alternative views of truth, the scientific and the moral or religious. Whether there is only "one" truth or
not resists objective discovery, but there are at least two approaches to truth. The one approach seeks to objectify truth, the other recognizes truth as relational (MacIntyre, p. 338).

George Santayana in his discussion of the realms of Being, stated that truth is about matter, or what exists, and yet it is independent of existence both because "no fact can be a description of itself" and even if nothing existed it would still be true that nothing existed. "Truth is timeless and independent of all beliefs" (Olafson, p. 287).

Perhaps Martin Heidegger's view of truth as the Pre-Socratic concept of aletheia, the unhiddenness of Being, addresses what Kierkegaard meant by the "moral or religious" view of truth, or what Santayana meant by the timeless independence of truth. Truth in this sense cannot be separated from meaningfulness. Truth, as the unhiddenness of being, cannot be objectified from the question "Why" (Heidegger, p. 20).

"Scientific" truth seems to deal with the questions of "what" and "how" as well as some "why" questions dealing with material comparisons, but it does not address the metaphysical "why." Science lifts high its praise of objective truth, but when given much consideration it becomes clear that purely objective truth amounts to a tautology
which, as Wittgenstein maintained, expresses no thoughts. John Grote, an English moral philosopher and epistemologist of the nineteenth century, argued against the idea that only science could give us truth, "Science treats perception simply as the action of one body on another, and it investigates the antecedents and concomitants of all thoughts and feelings indifferently. Hence it can give no adequate account of truth and falsity in thought" (Schneewind, p. 393).

Gilson addressed the limits of science when he wrote "...scientists never ask themselves why things happen, but how they happen...why anything at all is, or exists, science knows not, precisely because it cannot even ask the question" (Gilson, p. 140). He went on to say that we cannot answer the how unless we also answer the why. Schiller made the further point that the objective and logical truth of science made a mistake in depersonalizing truth. Logic had made three fatal abstractions: from actual thinking processes (psychological); from purpose, truth, or utility; and from meaning, matter, and context (Abel, p. 320).

Peter Koestenbaum, in an article reviewing the philosophy of twentieth century Spanish philosopher Miguel de Unamuno y Jugo, presented Unamuno y Jugo's understanding of truth stating that, "Through its identity with belief and
action, truth is ultimately an act of will" (Koestenbaum, p. 184). True belief is a function of our whole being, and that is what science does not address. The will to believe is as much a part of science as it is a theologian's foundation for talking about God. Both are the expression of faith. Higher education, by focusing on the what and how at the expense of the why, has forgotten a critical element in the search for truth.

It is this metaphysical why that seemed to be at the center of the "humane" tradition of the earlier Harvard years. It is this why that demands a responsible consideration of morality, ethics, values, and meaningfulness in life. It is this why that is addressed in the understanding of faith as found in Faith Development theory. Further, it is this why that has lost its centrality in the curriculum and philosophy of higher education. Without the metaphysical why being raised in higher education the purposes of higher education have been directed more toward generating profit in industry than in providing what Boyer called "greater meaningfulness" for society. Faith development theory addresses directly that "greater meaningfulness" by alerting higher education professionals to that which engages the young person coming to the campus, the search for truth that alludes science. This search for truth
not only enriches the life of the individual, but benefits the search for truth in the laboratories by giving direction and purpose to the how and what of science. Without the metaphysical "why" reality will be rendered an empty vessel; though beautiful to behold, holds nothing.

IV. Faith Development Theory: An Overview

Faith is dynamic and universal and develops through similar maturation processes as those found in moral and psychological developmental theories (Fowler, 1981, pp 10-12.).

James Fowler was greatly influenced in forming his faith development theory by the theories of Jean Piaget, Erik Erikson, and Lawrence Kohlberg. However, it has not been fully documented or determined that there is a direct relationship between psychological and cognitive development and the development of faith. Still, there are several indicators that point to some kind of relationship.

An indicator of great importance is of the relationship Fowler's theory has with the formal structure of the theories of Piaget, Erikson, and Kohlberg. Fowler's understanding of faith makes it possible to focus on how one makes meaning, and therefore how one perceives and interprets one's
experiences of and in the world. Such perceptions can be studied and measured based upon patterns of meaning-making, narrowness of perceptions as opposed to broader perceptions, and what accompanies the varying perceptions.

Fowler's faith development theory categorizes how we go about making meaning through six stages and a prestage as summarized below:

PRE-STAGE: Undifferentiated faith, the emergence of trust (age 0-2). A time when the person's style of faith is being forged. The infant begins to develop a trust for the nurturing parent. The development of trust is paramount to the development of faith in subsequent years. The infant is very self-directed and inward. The infant also requires a great deal of attention. A possible danger from a faulty development of trust at this point may be a poorly developed faith in the future (Fowler, 1981, p. 121).

STAGE 1: Intuitive-projective faith (2-6yrs). The child uses the new tools of speech and symbolic representation to organize his or her sensory experiences into meaningful knowledge. In this stage the person uses life experiences to describe God. At this stage the child is becoming self-aware, begins to interpret life around him or her through his or her own experiences. In this stage the person experiences the unknown or the spiritual as being expressed in the lives
of those he or she trusts from the pre-stage period (Fowler, 1981, p. 122).

**STAGE 2: Mythic-Literal faith (10 yrs.).** The person now has the ability to narratize his or her experiences into concrete stories. This person tends to understand the Bible literally, and is in great awe of the mythic nature of the symbols of the church. There is also the inability for this person to objectify his or her experiences, everything being very personal. The child understands law or obedience through reciprocity. If you do something wrong a bad thing will happen to you. An "eye for an eye" form of justice. A grandiose sense of responsibility develops here as well. (Fowler, 1981, p. 149).

**STAGE 3: Synthetic-conventional faith (adolescence).** Authority is now externalized. There is the sense of a significant other, someone with whom the person closely relates and trusts. The person begins to interpret life through others. The person now begins to take into account what others are feeling. God is now seen as a significant other, a companion, guide and personal support. The person experiences God as being very personal. The person is a conformist, that is, conforming his or her beliefs to match those with whom he or she closely relates, often a peer group or other significant group to which the person wishes to
belong. This person does not critically evaluate his or her own faith or that of the group. Symbols of the church take on a sacred power. This person has a faith that is childlike and filled with trust only for those with whom he or she conforms, otherwise is very suspicious of those with differing viewpoints. This person is fiercely loyal to his or her group. Such loyalty often expresses itself in a myopic world-view. Fowler claims that the majority of people in the United States fit this stage (Fowler, 1981, pp. 157-167).

**STAGE 4: Individuative-reflective faith (adult).** This person perceives that he or she has burned his or her bridges from stage 3 and has moved on. Symbols have been demythologized, authority is now perceived as coming from within, and takes a very critical approach to everything including his or her own beliefs. This person has often been described as having an "executive" intellect. That is to say, he or she takes a very analytical and practical problem-solving approach to everything, including religion and faith. Characteristic of this stage are those who drop-out of church because they are turned off by the dogmas and doctrines of the church. The church is often viewed as unresponsive to the needs of the world (Fowler, 1981, p. 180).

**STAGE 5: Conjunctive faith (mature adulthood).** In this
stage the person accepts as axiomatic that truth is more multi-dimensional and organically interdependent than any one theory or account can contain. For this reason truth can be found in many religions. This person is open to the many varied religious faiths in his or her search for truth. This person's faith has solidified to the point that it becomes a touchstone or standard by which all others are tested. Yet one's faith is still flexible enough to grow when confronted with a perceived deeper truth. Revelation takes on a whole new dimension. In this stage one recommits themselves to the importance of the symbols of the church. The symbol's mythology is now interpreted through the world. The cross, for example, is now seen through the eyes of the revolutionary fighting for freedom, or through the eyes of the child starving in Ethiopia. A stage 5 shares with the stage 4 person in his or her dislike of doctrine and creed. What is most important is how the church responds to the world, not the doctrines of the church. This person places high on his or her list the concept of world citizenship over and above nationalism (Fowler, 1981, p. 186).

**STAGE 6: Universalizing faith.** This person transcends religion. All things in life are part of the cosmos. God is not hindered by doctrine or creed. God is free to act through whomever God chooses. At this stage a person tends
to be a redemptive-subversive not distinguishing his or her own life from the lives of the most oppressed. This person lives by his or her own principles that transcend all organized religions. If given a choice between dying and compromising his or her principles, the 6 will die (Fowler, 1981, p.200).

Though stage movement is sequential, Fowler argues that the stages are not hierarchical, that is, one stage is not better than another or that we necessarily must all end up being six's. Rather, this stage theory provides a form through which we can better understand the way we go about making meaning.

This stage theory is a theory of form not content. It simply traces the framework upon which an individual's faith develops. A common mistake is to assume that all stage 3 adults must be conservative fundamentalists when in reality there are many liberals who are very much stage 3 in the way they approach their beliefs.

Fowler claims that for a person to move from one stage to the next requires that he or she reach the full richness of the previous stage. He also claims that often such a move from one stage to another is accompanied or precipitated by some trauma or great experience.

Fowler does make the point that unlike the other
developmental models, a person may not go through all of the stages. It is possible for a person to remain in as early a stage as Stage 2. Fowler makes the assessment that the majority of adults in the United States remain at Stage 3. The reasons given for remaining at a given stage include: a low level of trust; a controlled environment that demands strict adherence to specific doctrines and dogmas; socially isolated from those whose culture and beliefs differ from one's own. To move from Stage 2 or 3 to the next stage requires support for such growth, courage, trust, self-confidence, and is often accompanied by a crisis situation.

Faith development theory simply claims that faith matures as we develop morally and psychologically. What produces what cannot be said. What can be said is that faith development theory does provide some tremendous possibilities for understanding ourselves and each other in our faith lives.

V. Implications for Higher Education

In a project of the Center for Adult Faith Development at the College of St. Thomas in St. Paul, MN, Dr. Kenneth Stokes attempted to find the relationship between the changing dynamics of adulthood and a person's developing
faith (*Faith Development In The Adult Life Cycle*).

There were three phases: the first involved developing hypotheses based on current literature and research; the second involved a statistically valid sample of 1042 subjects from the United States and Canada that were interviewed by the Gallup Organization providing quantitative data; the third phase involved 41 people representative of the United States who were interviewed using Fowler's method.

There were seven hypotheses developed in the first phase. For our purposes we are interested in the first and the seventh hypotheses. (For more information on this study contact: Dr. Kenneth Stokes, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN). They are:

Hypothesis 1. The dynamics of Faith Development are different for men and women.

In the quantitative study when men and women were compared concerning their attitudes toward faith and their experiences regarding change, there was no appreciable difference. However, life changes tended to have a greater perceived affect on the woman's life than that of the man. Women also tended to see religion as more important than men. Women were more concerned about developing their faith than men.

In the interviews women appeared to have a greater
difficulty in making the transition from stage 3 to 4 but an
easier time from stage 4 to 5 than men. Stokes concluded
that though differences appeared, it could not be determined
what extent the differences were and if they were great
enough to warrant concern.

Hypothesis 7. Faith Development is positively related
to one's involvement in educational experiences.

Both the Gallup quantitative study and the interview
method showed that with more education a person's horizons
broadened and he or she developed a greater acceptance of
change and transition from stage to stage. Of course it was
clear that the type of change the person underwent depended
on the kind of educational experience.

Stokes understood the faithing of the individual to be a
"meaning-making" process that was enriched and deepened with
more positive educational experiences. A positive
educational experience was one that promoted a stage level of
thinking that was above the current stage of development of
the student within an environment of trust and felt security
on the part of the student.

The first implication from Stokes' research is that
though women and men do have some differences in how they
perceive and value faith development, the differences are not
great enough to call for a separate program for each gender.
The professor and the college administrator does need to be sensitive to the possibility that the woman will be more concerned about her faith development and respond to life experiences or crises in a more profound way than men. However, the professor and the administrator must also keep in mind that even with these differences the important similarity between the genders is how they develop in their faith and spiritual lives. There is enough similarity to allow for different experiences within the same classroom.

The second implication from Stokes' research is that positive educational experiences do have a "growth" affect on the development of the individual's faith life. The curriculum and the approach of the professor in institutions of higher education are based upon a level of multiplicity (Knefelcamp, 1978, pp. 38,39) which is an element of stage 4 in faith development, and with most students coming into the college scene at a stage 3, the educational experience in a college setting is probably positive if the environment is one of trust and respect.

All educational endeavors must have a purpose and an aim. The question is, can faith development theory impact that purpose and aim? Yes, for by understanding the stage of faith of a student one can better understand how that student approaches the "why" of life. Where is the student coming
Faith development also alerts us to the importance of asking "why" in the context of researching the "what" and the "how." Without a recognition of a spiritual side to the student and the professor, the institution of higher education risks the possibility of losing meaningfulness and truth as the purpose and aim of education.

Faith development can help us by revealing truths about how faith grows, and the different structures through which faith is expressed. Faith development acts as a companion to our educational efforts giving us insight into the meaning of faith and how it relates to our lives.

"In its degree of certainty, faith stands between knowledge (scientia) and opinion" (Hicks, p. 165). Thomas Aquinas identifies faith as a bridge between knowledge and opinion. Faith is what encourages us to wager, to take a risk, to have an opinion. Therefore, faith development can help us structure our educational efforts. For example, if we know that the adolescent has a non-critical view of his or her faith and is very protective of his or her spiritual life as it is expressed in his or her accepted peer group, then we have an idea how the person might go about forming opinions. As a stage 3, the student might form opinions from what is learned in class that would conform to his or her narrow view of the world. That narrow view might be so firmly set that
the student will refuse to change his or her opinions on racism, for example, regardless of the knowledge the student gains in class. Knowledge by itself will not bring about growth, faith development tells us it takes peer support and the challenge of contradictory beliefs. It takes developing new relationships on campus that challenge racist beliefs, for example.

Therefore, to reach students we must first develop an environment of trust in which the students feel that their rights are respected, that they are valued as human beings, that they are accepted as they are, and yet can be challenged. As educators we must always develop trust with the student for trust is just as important to Fowler in his theory as it is to Erikson and Piaget.

Faith development will enable the educator to communicate to the student and better relate to the student's needs. Many students coming to college for the first time will find themselves alone and feeling very self-conscious at a time when their closely held beliefs are becoming more important. Beliefs that could be the cause of fear, anger, and rebelliousness. It is also a time when their beliefs are thrown into question by being exposed to a plurality of belief. All of this leads to a student who is ripe for stage transition out of inner conflict. For that reason one must
be careful not to mistake the struggle of stage transition as simply over-active sophomoric pranks.

Though Fowler claims his theory is not hierarchical, he does argue in his latest book, *Weaving the New Creation*, stages 4 and 5 describes the structure of faith which will be much more conducive to social harmony, growth, learning, and wisdom (Fowler, 1991, pp. 22-25). Most entering freshmen will be stage 2 or somewhere between stage 2 and 3. According to Fowler, stage 4 and 5 are the stages in which the person is open to new ideas, seeks to better understand his or her world, and is self-critical. It would seem this stage movement would be a worthy goal of any educator. This movement would be toward a person becoming self-motivated, willing to learn new things, taking risks in creatively new ideas. This person would be more comfortable with the pluralistic setting of the university campus and the world. A person who is willing to question held beliefs and seek out the truth wherever it may be found. A person who will take the risk to develop opinions that require a broader understanding of global society.

This understanding of hierarchy does not harm Fowler's theory, rather it makes it more honest. If stage movement is sequential then a stage 3 cannot jump a stage and become a stage 5 person. The implications for education include an
unabashed effort to encourage stage movement in the student from a stage 3 structure of meaning-making to a stage 4.

Another way in which Faith Development theory can aid education is by helping us to see that we need to develop life-span programs in our educational efforts. Life-span education is based upon the assumption that the person matures continually throughout his or her life. Indeed, Fowler has shown that there is reason to believe that faith matures in much the same way, therefore, faith never stops growing. If this is the case there is another justification for continuing study throughout the life of the person. Fowler's theory also portrays many adults as not moving beyond stage 3, therefore we cannot assume the age of the student determines his or her stage of faith development. Life-long learning must also seek to include other forms of study that promote a movement toward stage 4 and 5.

Life-span education is based upon developmental theory. Such education says to us that we need to challenge people from the cradle to the grave. Faith development gives us the structure for that challenge. As educators we are reminded that even the older students are still developing in their faith as well as in their psychological selves.

Other implications for higher education might include: peer support groups, full-time chaplaincy service that is
sponsored outside the public university or funded in the private college, mixers that promote students from different religious traditions to facilitate a greater understanding of each other, emphasis on critical thinking in course work, discussion forums that bring together representatives from religious groups that are in conflict around the world, working cooperatively with the churches in the local community to provide a home-away-from-home church family. There are many other possibilities for programming. All such possibilities must take into account the fact that the college/university setting is the one place where a person will have the opportunity to know people, ideas, traditions, beliefs, and values from other traditions.

That is the way faith development can help education, by providing some structure to our spiritual lives and how it affects the rest of who we are. Helping those in higher education to better understand how people make meaning, how people perceive and interpret their world.

VI. Conclusion

There are at least two approaches to truth in the educative process: the correspondance with verifiable concrete data and the metaphysical "why." Neither can stand alone.
Higher education needs to take a holistic approach to the search for truth by embracing both approaches. Truth by correspondence with verifiable "fact" alone is a cold and lifeless truth. Truth found in the search for an answer to the metaphysical "why" by itself becomes a groundless, mindless commitment to that which becomes esoteric and eventually meaningless. However, together the truth out of a correspondence to verifiable fact and out of a search for metaphysical answers provides for a world of "meaningfulness." A world in which fact and that which lies beyond fact compliment each other and opens up the possibilities of imagination, creativity, and purpose. It is this understanding of reality that recognizes the importance of faith development theory in higher education. It is not, finally, an attempt to reconcile religion and science. To be concerned about faith development in the life of the student does not necessarily mean being concerned with his or her religious life. What it does mean is to be concerned about how the student makes meaning out of his or her life.
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Abstract

This paper examines the relationship of James W. Fowler's theory of faith development with the theories of Piaget, Kohlberg, Erikson, Chickering, and Perry by addressing the question, "How does faith development compare with and inform other developmental theories often used by higher education professionals?" The purpose is to present a unified description of human development that takes into account all of these theories demonstrating that faith development is an important part of human development.

I. Introduction

In the book, Life Maps: Conversations on the Journey of Faith, published in 1978, James Fowler introduced a theory which claimed that one of the developmental issues facing each person involves a dynamic and changing faith. A further claim was made that this theory would describe the structures
of how people make meaning out of the ultimate experiences and crises of their lives which would, in turn, affect the way they perceived the world and themselves in that world (Fowler and Keen, 1978, pp. 36-38).

Daniel Aleshire and C. Ellis Nelson, raised serious questions as to the research methodology of Fowler's theory, yet claimed that Fowler's theory does "likely accomplish" accurate reflection of the real world. They also claim that his theory is internally consistent and its most positive attribute is that it contributes to new ways of thinking about faith (Nelson & Aleshire in Dykstra, 1986, p.199).

Sharon Parks wrote The Critical Years (1986), based on her experiences with traditional college students through various roles: residence director; director of student activities; instructor; chaplain; teaching fellow; scholar; and professor (Parks, p. xiii). She provides a description of the traditional college student based upon several developmental theories but especially Fowler's theory. Parks contends that "...we human beings seem unable to survive, and certainly cannot thrive, unless we can make meaning" (Parks, p. xv). She further states, "This capacity and demand for meaning is what I invite the reader to associate with the word faith" (Parks, p. xv). This is the same understanding of faith upon which Fowler bases his theory (Fowler, 1981, p.
4). Parks made the point that "...for our forebears, learning and faith were integral to each other" (Parks, p. xvi). Parks concludes that "...faith--the meaning-making that shapes a culture and its future--is of critical concern in higher education and wherever young adults search for a faith to live by" (Parks, p. xvii).

Is Parks correct that "meaning-making...is of critical concern in higher education"? The answer to that question is ultimately up to those involved in higher education. This article seeks to contribute to such considerations through a comparative study of Fowler's theory of faith development with other developmental theories currently used among higher education student services practitioners in understanding the college student.

A special emphasis on those stages of development of the various theories that are appropriate for the traditional first-year college student will be the focus of this comparative study. However, this study will involve a review of all of the stages of faith in Fowler's theory with accompanying comparisons in each stage, when appropriate, with each of the other developmentalists.
II. The Faith Development Theory of James Fowler and How it Compares to the Theories of Piaget, Erikson, Kohlberg, Chickering, and Perry: An Emphasis on the Developmental Issues Facing a Traditional First-Year College Student

Kenneth Stokes defines faith as "the finding and making meaning in life's significant questions and issues, adhering to this meaning, and acting out" (Stokes, p. 12). Faith is the active process of every human to make meaning out of life. "Meaning-making is the activity of seeking pattern, order, form, and significance" (Parks, p. 14). Faith, in this sense, is a dynamic process that involves the total person. Faith is what we do when we order our thoughts and organize our imaginings. Faith is at work whenever we find ourselves attempting to interpret the meanings of a difficult circumstance in our lives. Faith is what unifies our thoughts (Fowler, 1981, p. 19).

Stuart D. McLean states that, "Niebuhr understands faith as relationship to a center or centers of value and power. The passive or receptive side of faith is trust; the active side is expressed as loyalty and commitment" (McLean in Dykstra, p. 159). The "center or centers of value and power" will differ depending upon the content of one's faith, whether one exercises a faith as a scientist in the
orderliness of the universe or as a religious believer in an ultimate cause of reality, the nature of faith remains the same.

Viewing the nature of faith and its structures and functions as distinct from its content provides for a universal definition of faith. Certainly one cannot claim the content of faith to be universal, but the nature of faith can be universally applied. Fowler's theory claims that faith is dynamic and universal and develops through similar maturation processes as those found in moral and psychological developmental theories (Fowler, 1981, pp 10-12).

James Fowler was greatly influenced in forming his faith development theory by the theories of Jean Piaget, Erik Erikson, and Lawrence Kohlberg. Such borrowing is of a formal nature. Fowler uses the framework of developmental theory to explicate his own understanding of faith. Fowler's understanding of faith allows for a developmentalist-structuralist treatment of faith.

Fowler's theory includes a pre-stage and six stages which categorize how we go about making meaning out of life. The following is a summary of each stage with accompanying comparisons to the theories of Piaget, Kohlberg, Erikson, Chickering, and Perry where appropriate.
PRE-STAGE: Undifferentiated faith, the emergence of trust (age 0-2 years). A time when the person's style of faith is being forged. The infant begins to develop a trust for the nurturing parent. The development of trust is paramount to the development of faith in subsequent years. The infant is very self-directed and inward. The infant also requires a great deal of affection. A possible danger for a faulty development of trust at this point may be a poorly developed faith in the future (Fowler, 1981, p. 121).

PIAGET— The corresponding stage of development in Piaget's theory is the sensorimotor stage. "In this first stage thought is the coordination of actions and the gradual elaboration of action schemata by which the baby orients itself to the world...As yet there are no 'self' and 'other'" (Fowler, 1981, p. 53).

Fowler does adopt the structure of Piaget's theory, however, he disagrees with the separation of cognition and affection in Piaget's theory. Fowler argues that in faith "the rational and passional are fused" (Fowler and Keen, 1978, p. 37).

ERIKSON— The emphasis on trust in Fowler's theory resonates with Erikson's estimation that trust developed early in life is essential to the proper resolution of later psychosocial conflicts. The basic trust vs basic mistrust
psychosocial conflict can be resolved in the ego virtue of hope (Fowler, 1981, pp. 54,55).

Fowler accepts the recognition in Erikson of the "influence on rationality of unconscious dynamics, and emphasize the role of symbolic functioning in the processes of personal development and transformation" (Fowler and Keen, 1978, p. 37).

**STAGE 1: Intuitive-projective faith (2-6 years).** The child uses the new tools of speech and symbolic representation to organize his or her sensory experiences into meaningful knowledge. In this stage the person uses life experiences to describe God. The child is becoming self-aware, begins to interpret life around him or her through his or her own perceptions and experiences the unknown or the spiritual as being expressed in the lives of those he or she trusts from the pre-stage period (Fowler, 1981, p. 122).

**PIAGET—** The preoperational or intuitive stage of thinking. "The differentiation of self from world effected in the sensorimotor stage undergoes another decisive step as the child begins to use language to express and explore experience." This is the beginning of a long transition, "initiated by the joining of language and thought..." (Fowler, 1981, p. 56).
Fowler agrees with Piaget of the importance of cognitive development arguing that without the ability to use language with thought and to distinguish between self and the world, the child would not be able to move into Fowler's Stage One (Fowler and Keen, 1978, p. 43).

**ERIKSON— Autonomy vs shame and doubt** for the two- and three-year-old, and initiative vs guilt for the four-through six-year old. "There is now an experienced and named sense of self as separate from others." The ego virtue that can emerge in a healthy resolution of autonomy vs shame and doubt is "will." The ego virtue that can emerge from initiative vs guilt is a sense of "purpose" (Fowler, 1981, pp. 58-62).

There is a parallel between the resolution of the crises in Erikson's theory and the movement through the Stage process for Fowler. Fowler argues that shame and devaluation will also show forth in the child's attitudes toward God, and how he or she sees him or herself in relationship to the world. At this point in faith development the child can either begin to "open up" to the world or "close up" from the world. The child is developing a mythology that will either be "scary" or "encouraging," for the child cannot distinguish between make-believe and reality (Fowler and Keen, 1978, p. 44).

**Kohlberg— Heteronomous morality**, the first stage of
moral development. The child is not yet able to coordinate the perspectives of self and others, and with thought dominated by perception, will look for external clues as to what is right and wrong. What is right is what avoids punishment, obedience for its own sake, and a perception of the superior powers of authorities (Fowler, 1981, pp. 57,58).

Fowler's theory so closely mirrors Kohlberg's that all one need do is look at the description of Kohlberg's theory and see the similarity with Fowler's. Both Kohlberg and Fowler see that the perspective of the child, whether it is of a moral nature or a faith nature, is influenced by a perceived external authority. Fowler borrows the structure of perceptions and influences as used by Kohlberg in explaining the various moral stages of development (Fowler and Keen, 1978, pp. 42-43).

STAGE 2: Mythic-Literal faith (10 years). The person now has the ability to narratize his/her experiences into concrete stories. This person tends to understand the Bible literally, and is in great awe of the mythic nature of the symbols of the church. There is also the inability for this person to objectify his or her experiences, everything being very personal. The child understands law or obedience through reciprocity. If you do something wrong a bad thing will happen to you. An "eye for an eye" form of justice. A
grandiose sense of responsibility develops here as well (Fowler, 1981, p. 149).

**PIAGET—** "The domination of thought by egocentrism and perception begins to give way to what may be designated as the first truly logical operations of thought. The emerging stable and flexible system of logical operations we call concrete operational thinking." Children begin to think in linear and orderly ways (Fowler, 1981, p. 63).

It is possible for a traditional entering student to retain much of the concrete operational thinking of this stage in Piaget's theory (Fowler, 1981, p. 149). This logical ability makes it possible for the child to narratize his or her experiences in a linear pattern of coherence. The limitations of the child's logical thought leads to the continued formation of a mythology that, for the child, explains those things that the child does not understand (Fowler, 1981, p. 149). This often leads to the literalism and being in "awe" mentioned in the description above.

**ERIKSON—** Industry vs inferiority, as the child becomes coordinated and able to manipulate and create, he or she is seeking competence in being able to accomplish what he or she could not do before. With positive encouragement this crisis can be resolved in a "lasting sense of competency" (Fowler, 1981, p. 67).
This is a crucial period for the faith development of the child. If the child has not had positive encouragement as mentioned in the description of Erikson's *Industry vs Inferiority* crisis, then the child may remain at Fowler's Stage Two indefinitely. This is the first stage in which Fowler claims a person can remain in even into adulthood. Without a sense of competence the person will not trust themselves and their own judgments, and therefore will be suspicious of those who challenge well-formed and "rooted" beliefs (Fowler, 1981, p. 150).

**Kohlberg—Individualism, instrumental purpose and exchange,** the child is beginning to be able to recognize and honor the rights and claims of others, and the consequences of failing to do so. The child follows rules when it is in the child's immediate interest to do so. What's right is what is fair, or equal exchange. To serve one's own needs in a world where others have needs too (Fowler, 1981, p. 66).

This stage in Fowler's theory is "marked by increased accuracy in taking the perspective of other persons..." The child becomes aware of the "rights" of others and the demands of others. The child begins the difficult task of balancing his or her needs and wants with those of others. In morality this leads to reciprocity, in faith it leads to a growing clarification of the content of one's faith in relationship
with the recognized external authority. The recognition of "others" can either be expressed as those who do not share the faith, or as those who are different but who should be respected regardless of differences of faith.

Chickering and Perry—Because Fowler's theory allows for the possibility that an entering student might still be dominated by a Stage Two structure of meaning-making, it is important to include the theories of Chickering and Perry at this early stage.

The achievement of Chickering's vectors of competence and managing emotions and autonomy would be much more difficult for a person remaining in Fowler's Stage Two structure of meaning-making, because the person has yet to adequately establish autonomy, control of his or her own emotions, and a level of competence that can only be achieved when a person can trust themselves. If an entering student is still dominated by a Stage Two structure of meaning-making, it is an indication that the student does not trust him or herself, for only through a high level of trust can a person move through Fowler's later stages (Fowler, 1981, p. 149).

Perry's theory characterizes the entering student as thinking dualistically. This person believes there is an absolute truth and those in authority must be the harbingers
of that truth. This form of thinking is characterized by both Fowler's Stage Two and Stage Three structures of meaning-making (Fowler, 1981, pp. 149, 172, 173).

STAGE 3: Synthetic-conventional faith (adolescence). Authority is externalized. There is the sense of a significant other, someone with whom the person closely relates and trusts. The person begins to interpret life through others. The person now begins to take into account what others are feeling. God is now seen as a significant other, a companion, guide and personal support. The individual experiences God as being very personal. The person is a conformist, that is, conforming his or her beliefs to match those with whom he or she closely relates, often a peer group or other significant group to which the person wishes to belong. This person does not critically evaluate his or her own faith or that of the group. Symbols of the church take on a sacred power. This person has a faith that is childlike and filled with trust only for those with whom he or she conforms, otherwise is very suspicious of those with differing viewpoints. This person is fiercely loyal to his or her group. Such loyalty often expresses itself in a myopic world-view. Fowler claims that the majority of people in the United States fit this stage (Fowler, 1981, pp. 157-167).
PIAGET—The traditional entering college student, eighteen years old, has reached, according to Piaget, the "formal operational" level of mental function. This means simply that the person is able to think both objectively and subjectively while understanding the difference. The person is able to think analytically, symbolically, abstractly, and metaphorically. However, the student is in the early stages of "formal operational" thinking and therefore may not show the kind of sophistication of thought usually found in metaphor and symbol (Piaget, pp. 46-66).

Fowler would agree with Piaget that a traditional entering college student would be able to deal with abstract thinking but with limitations. The limitations are in the area of "passional" feelings as opposed to cognitive function. Fowler's joining of the passional with the cognitive is quite evident in this stage of Fowler's theory. It is the unquestioned commitment to one's belief system that will limit that person's ability to see beyond the concrete literalism of Stage Three in faith development to the metaphorical thinking of a Stage Four in faith development (See Fowler and Keen, 1978, pp. 34-41 and Fowler, 1981, p. 154).

ERIKSON—Erikson claims that the eighteen year old is in the middle of searching for his or her identity.
Developing identity is the most important and often traumatic experience for the student and has a "...claim to recognition as the adolescent ego's most important accomplishment" (Erikson, 1968, p. 211). If the identity is not developed by the time the person is twenty-one years old, the skill of being intimate and faithful to another will be greatly diminished. This is perhaps the most critical time in the development of the individual (Miller, p. 180).

Erikson argues that if the person has not positively resolved the conflicts of Trust vs Mistrust, Autonomy vs Shame and Doubt, Initiative vs Guilt, and Industry vs Inferiority, the struggle for identity will be greatly conflicted. Instead of a strong self-identity the student will suffer role confusion and transfer his or her identity to a group or organization (Erikson, 1982, p. 74).

In Erikson's theory a person moves through all of the stages either positively resolving the conflicts at each stage thus achieving the accompanying virtue, or negatively resolving the conflicts with a continued decline in the emotional and psychological health of the individual (Erikson, 1982, p. 72). In Fowler's theory the person could remain in Stage Three indefinitely. When an adult retains a conventional faith, personal identity becomes fused with a group in which too much emphasis is placed on militant
ritualism, and fanaticism results (Erikson, 1982, p. 74). Exclusivity also emerges because the person who remains in a conventional faith experiences a conflict between intimacy and isolation in which isolation dominates. That is why the adult Stage Three in Fowler's theory is isolated from those outside the identity group.

Kohlberg—His theory claims that the entering traditional college student is at Stage Three, Mutual Interpersonal Expectations: Good-boy/Nice-girl. The student seeks to be accepted at any cost. The student seeks to live up to what is expected by people close to him or her or the perceived expectations of the group to whom he or she most identifies. This means that the student will conform to the morality of the group or persons by whom he or she wishes to be accepted. This person will also do anything demanded of him or her in order to be accepted. The idea of what is fair is, "If I do this for you (accept you), then you must do this for me" (Kohlberg, p. 629).

The entering student may still indicate in their moral perceptions Kohlberg's previous stage of moral development, Stage Two, Individualism: Instrumental Purpose and Exchange, following rules only when it is to someone's immediate interest to do so. A sense of fairness is found in what is considered an equal exchange. Equal exchange, as described
in Stage Two, disregards any extenuating circumstances when it comes to what is considered fair. A first-year student will resent the extra privileges that a senior receives for many reasons, not the least of which would be the first-year student's level of moral development. By the time the student is a senior Kohlberg's stage four should be achieved, "Social System and Conscience," in which an individual makes up his or her own mind about what is right, and sees a duty to contribute to society and therefore will not do that which would harm society, even if not doing so, for example, might lose friends in a fraternity (Fowler, 1981, p. 82).

Kohlberg claimed that one's morality is expressed through one's moral actions. Fowler viewed faith as that which is expressed through one's actions. Faith is an action, a verb, in much the same way that Kohlberg's morality is an action (Kohlberg, 1984, p. 629 and Fowler, 1981, p. 14). Fowler's Stage Three portrays the person as being loyal to and dependent upon a group with whom that person identifies. Kohlberg also portrays this stage of moral development as characterized by the desire to be accepted at any cost by a group with whom the person wants to belong. Together, these theories present a person who makes meaning out of his or her world through the beliefs and traditions of the group for whom they will do most anything to remain in
good standing. The external authority of the group will determine greatly the attitudes of the student toward those on campus who are outside the group (Fowler, 1981, p. 173).

**CHICKERING-** According to Chickering the entering student is faced with all of these "vectors": achieving competence; managing emotions; developing autonomy; developing identity; building relationships; discovering purpose; and achieving integrity. Chickering's theory tells us that the entering student is most likely beginning to achieve a sense of competence and has yet to manage his or her emotions. In the effort to manage his or her emotions the student is also, often for the first time, faced with being autonomous, and with that the need for self-identity. This is an on-going struggle for the young adult that does not end with college (Chickering, p. 8, p. 41).

Chickering has attempted to capture in his vectors a commonality shared by all developmental theories. He defined vectors this way: "...vectors of development...each seems to have direction and magnitude--even though the direction may be expressed more appropriately be a spiral or by steps than by a straight line" (Chickering, 1984, p. 8). The person does not develop by moving "from" one stage leaving it behind to the "next" stage, rather a person develops within the context of the spiral or circle in which the person's
previous development becomes a part of the current process of development.

Fowler would agree with Chickering's assessment of the process of development. A further link with Chickering can be found in the fusing of the "passional" with the "cognitive" in Fowler's theory. As in Chickering where the managing of emotions is as much a part of the student's development as achieving competence and autonomy, in Fowler one cannot separate the three vectors. Though faith development concerns managing emotions, it also involves the level of competence, autonomy, identity, relationships, purpose, and integrity. If the student remains in Fowler's Stage Three, the student will not be able to achieve a high level of competency in the academic enterprise due to the limitations of the student's logical, metaphorical thinking. According to my understanding of Fowler the limitations are partially caused by the unreasoned loyalty to an external authority figure often found in a group to whom the student is committed. Such loyalty hinders the academic process of valuing all sides of an issue in the pursuit of rational solutions. The same is true in the pursuit of identity and the development of meaningful relationships. If one remains in Fowler's Stage Three, one's identity will not be one's own, resulting in fragile relationships with very little
The entering student views the world dualistically. Everything is either right or wrong. The world is made up of good and bad, truth and lies, black and white. There is absolute truth and all the student has to do is get it from the professors. The problem the entering student has is that the academic enterprise recognizes a world-view that claims there is more than just right and wrong, there are gray areas between black and white.

Absolute truth may or may not exist. In this atmosphere the entering student will struggle with his or her own beliefs and challenge the veracity of the professors who may give the student as many variations of truth as the student has professors (Perry, pp. 79-88).

The entering student will go through a process of accepting multiplicity in that he or she will have to be able to look at more than one side of every question. Students will be asked to look beyond their own beliefs and opinions and take seriously the beliefs and opinions of others. In multiplicity students will be willing to do that, but will still not see the beliefs and opinions of others to be as valid as their own. Only when a student reaches relativism does the student come to recognize the truth and validity of opposing viewpoints. Only then does the student begin to
truly appreciate the academic enterprise (Perry, p. 33).

Fowler's Stage Three describes one of the characteristics of this structure of meaning-making as being narrow in an understanding of right and wrong, truth and falsehood. A Stage Three structure of meaning-making perceives truth as that which conforms to the belief systems of the "identity group," or that group to whom the person is committed recognizing the authority of the group for setting such criteria for what is true or false (Fowler, 1981, p. 173). One could argue that this fits quite well with Perry's understanding of dualistic thinking. If the student remains in a Stage Three level of faith, the best the student will achieve in Perry's theory is multiplicity. The student will be able to accept the fact that there is more than one way to look at something and that there are others who claim their view is true though it conflicts with one's own. What the student will not be able to do is accept the "truth" of such other viewpoints. The student will look at the other viewpoints, not to learn from them, rather to look for weaknesses in them in order to validate their own beliefs.

Therefore, it could be argued that the student who fails to achieve "relativism" much less "commitment in relativism" has also failed to move from Fowler's Stage Three to Stage Four. If that is the case, what one's religious commitments
are and what group the student is committed to could make a significant difference in how well the student can develop multiplistic, and even relativistic understandings of truth. Likewise, when a student is challenged to think of truth as relative, Kenneth Stokes' research shows that such educational experiences encourages movement from Stage Three toward Stage Four structures of meaning-making (Stokes, 1981, A Research Report of: Faith Development in the Adult Life Cycle).

**STAGE 4: Individuative-reflective faith (adult).** This person perceives that he or she has burned his or her bridges from stage 3 and has moved on. Symbols have been demythologized, authority is now perceived as coming from within, and takes a very critical approach to everything including his or her own beliefs. This person has often been labeled as having an "executive" intellect in that he or she takes a very analytical and practical problem-solving approach to everything, including religion and faith. Characteristic of this stage are those who drop-out of church because they are turned off by the dogmas and doctrines of the church. The church is often viewed as unresponsive to the needs of the world (Fowler, 1981, p. 180).

**PIAGET-** "The formation of personality, as a matter of reflective personal engagement, only emerges with the
development of formal operational thinking" (Fowler, 1981, p. 69). The traditional student begins with a limited form of "formal operational thinking" that becomes more sophisticated in its self-reflection and development of an identity and personality. The student begins to plan for his or her future and becoming motivated to discipline his or her academic efforts to achieve the goals set for the future. As the student advances through the college experience the development of "true formal thought" capable of constructing all possible combinations of relations, systematic isolation of variables, and deductive hypothesis-testing will be encouraged by the ever-increasing complexity of higher level courses and greater expectations of achievement by the faculty (Fowler and Keen, 1978, p. 28).

The true formal operational thinking of Piaget's theory is found in Fowler's description of the Stage Four structure of meaning-making. Such meaning-making requires that the person be able to perceive complex combinations of relations due to the person's demand for a critical approach to matters of meaning. Such a critical approach would not be possible without true formal operational thinking. One could argue that failure to reach this stage of Fowler's theory would greatly hinder the maturation of formal operational thinking to the level of "true" formal operational thinking. Though
one might be cognitively capable of true formal operational thinking, if the person is hindered emotionally and psychologically as expressed in Fowler's Stage Three adult, such capability would be used not to search for further truth but to further secure the accepted truths of a Stage Three structure of meaning-making.

ERIKSON—"The young adult is ready for intimacy, that is, the capacity to commit oneself to concrete affiliations and partnerships and to develop the ethical strength to abide by such commitments even though they may call for significant sacrifices and compromises" (Fowler, 1981, p. 80). The crisis of Intimacy vs Isolation can lead to a positive resolution in the virtue of love. However, if the person has not achieved fidelity through the positive development of an identity, intimacy becomes problematical. Intimacy with another requires self-identity, trust in oneself, trust in others, commitment to maintain a relationship, and a respect for the other, which is not possible without fidelity.

Fowler sees Stage Four as the stage of the executive intellect. This person is able to respect others, has enough self-trust to trust others, is not bounded by received tradition, and seeks for the truth in all sides of an issue. A person can move through Stage Three to Four if she has developed Erikson's virtue of fidelity. If she has not, she
will be greatly hindered in moving beyond Stage Three. This may be, perhaps, one of the dynamics involved in the stagnation of stage movement in Fowler's theory (Fowler, 1981, p. 182).

A person who moves into Fowler's Stage Four will be a person ready for an extended relationship with a pluralistic world.

Kohlberg—A person in Fowler's Stage Four could be either in Kohlberg's Stage Four, Social System and Conscience or Kohlberg's Stage Five, Social Contract/Utility and Individual Rights. Both Kohlberg's stages require at least the executive mentality of Fowler's Stage Four. Kohlberg's Stage Four is characterized by a sense of duty to keep the laws, except in extreme cases (Fowler, 1981, p. 83). What is right is what contributes to society. Kohlberg's Stage Four is the last of the Conventional stages of moral development. This is somewhat of a transition stage through which the person moves into Postconventional moral thinking.

Kohlberg's Stage Five, Social Contract/Utility and Individual Rights, requires the "true formal operational thinking" of Piaget', the capability of intimacy expressed in Erikson, and the fully developed executive intellect and critical approach to solving problems found in Fowler's Stage Four. Toward the fulfillment of Fowler's Stage Four one
would be entering into Kohlberg's Stage Five (Fowler, 1981, p. 83).

*CHICKERING-* As a student nears the end of his or her college career the vectors of competence, managing emotions, autonomy, identity, and relationships should be, if not fully achieved, at least a developing part of the personality of the student. Without the positive experience of these vectors it is difficult to see how a student could survive a college career without being protected from the demands and expectations of both social life and the classroom. The development of purpose and integrity may not fully occur in college.

Fowler's Stage Four characterizes a person who has a sense of competence, who has managed his or her emotions, who is comfortable with his or her autonomy, and has established an identity that sets him or her apart from others. The kind of relationship a Stage Four would experience would be one based on equality, mutual respect, openness, and trust. The Stage Four would not be uncomfortable with ideas and traditions foreign to her own. Purpose and integrity would come to this person through an understanding of the relative nature of truth. Purpose and integrity would then be expressed through an appreciation of the pluralism of society and the world. Should a person remain in Fowler's Stage Three, his or her
purpose and integrity would be expressed through an effort to do away with pluralism in society in favor of one's own belief system (Fowler, 1981, pp. 182, 183).

PERRY- The student would reach a point at which he or she would understand truth to be relative. This is much different than multiplicity which only requires the person to recognize several views on a single point. Perry's use of relativism requires that the student recognize not only the various views on a single point, but to value those views. Such value reflects the commitment of the student that there is truth in the various views. The student recognizes the reasons for various opinions are based on the connectedness of ideas and how well they fit into the whole picture. However, the student has not yet achieved a sense of commitment, seeing everything as relative and therefore all ideas as being somewhat devalued. This sense of being unconnected to any one idea over any other can give way to a development of commitment in relativism. I would contend that moving from simple relativism to a commitment in relativism is precisely the movement occurring from the initial introduction to Fowler's Stage Four through its fulfillment.

Fowler's Stage Four characterizes a person who accepts the relative nature of truth and faith. Because of such a
position the Stage Four person is able to be self-critical, respect differing opinions, resort to reason as the preferred approach to problems, and is skeptical of emotion-laden defenses of traditional beliefs. This person is also characterized as burning his or her "bridges" behind him or her, thus perhaps experiencing some of the disconnectedness the student faced with nothing but the relativism of Perry's theory (Fowler, 1981, p. 182).

STAGE 5: Conjunctive faith (mature adult). In this stage the person accepts as axiomatic that truth is more multi-dimensional and organically interdependent than any one theory or account can contain. For this reason truth can be found in many religions. This person is open to the many varied religious faiths in his or her search for truth. This person's faith has solidified to the point that it becomes a touchstone or standard by which all others are tested. Yet one's faith is still flexible enough to grow when confronted with a perceived deeper truth. Revelation takes on a whole new dimension. In this stage one recommits themselves to the importance of the symbols of the church. The symbol's mythology is now interpreted through the world. The cross, for example, is now seen through the eyes of the revolutionary fighting for freedom, or through the eyes of the child starving in Ethiopia.
A Stage Five shares with the Stage Four person in his or her dislike of doctrine and creed. What is most important is how the church responds to the world, not the doctrines of the church. This person places high on his or her list the concept of world citizenship over and above nationalism (Fowler, 1981, p. 186).

**PIAGET-** We have moved beyond the reach of Piaget's theory. At this point of development in Fowler's theory the person is operating in true formal thought.

**ERIKSON-** To simply say that Erikson's Generativity vs Stagnation corresponds with Fowler's Stage Five is to lose sight of the fact that a thirty-year-old Stage Five is much different than a fifty-year-old Stage Five. One can be in Fowler's Stage Five structure of meaning-making and not yet be in Erikson's psychosocial stage of Generativity vs Stagnation (Fowler, 1981, p. 85).

If one has developed the virtue of love through a positive resolution of the crisis of Intimacy vs Isolation, then one's move into the crisis of Generativity vs Stagnation will most likely be resolved positively as well. However, in order for one to fully experience the crisis of Generativity vs Stagnation one would have had to experience the most productive years of one's life and then be faced with a transition into a phase of a different kind of productivity.
"Generativity marks a culmination of the virtues or strengths of previous stages in an adulthood that is ready to care for what has been and is being created" (Fowler, 1981, p. 85).

Certainly, one who positively resolves the crisis of Generativity vs Stagnation would most probably be in Fowler's Stage Four or possibly Five. Remaining in Fowler's Stage Three would make such a positive resolution of the crisis very difficult and false. Instead of producing care, one would produce a sense that they are to be cared for, or that others do not really need to be cared for. The stagnation that would follow for Erikson would be seen in Fowler's terms as a dead or hollow faith (Fowler, 1981, p. 173).

**KOHLBERG- Social Contract/Utility and Individual Rights** corresponds to Fowler's Stage Five. The person in Kohlberg's Stage Five is aware that people hold a variety of values and opinions, and that morality is relative to the group. There are, however, some recognized nonrelative rights, such as life and liberty. The perspective taken in moral decision making is that of a rational person who is aware of the values and rights of others. This is the first of the postconventional stages. An appreciation for pluralism characterizes this person's moral outlook.

The person characterized in Fowler's Stage Five seeks for truth in all traditions, religious and otherwise. This
person values the symbolic through the rights due others. This stage is personified in a pluralistic view of the world and an identification of the self as a world-citizen. As a result, the moral decision-making of such a person will be more concerned about each individual circumstance and context rather than with a set of absolute rules (Fowler, 1981, p. 197, 198).

**CHICKERING AND PERRY** - At this point of development in Fowler's theory Chickering's vectors would all be a valued part of the personality. The person would have achieved the ability to master all of the vectors. Perry's *Commitment in Relativism* would have been achieved at this stage. A position that allows for the person to find an anchor in one's own beliefs while remaining open to new ideas and truths. This person does not fear investigation of his or her beliefs or opinions, rather encourages such investigation in the hopes of learning something new. One could argue that this is the attitude required for a pluralistic view of the world and self in the world (Fowler, 1981, p. 198).

**STAGE 6: Universalizing faith.** This person transcends religion. All things in life are part of the cosmos. God is not hindered by doctrine or creed. God is free to act through whomever God chooses. At this stage a person tends to be a redemptive-subversive not thinking about his or her
own life being separate from the lives of the most oppressed. This person lives by his or her own principles that transcend all organized religions. If given a choice between dying and compromising his or her principles, the Six will die (Fowler, 1981, p.200).

ERIKSON— All people will reach the crisis of Integrity vs Despair in their lives, though they will probably never achieve Fowler's Stage Six. This comes as perhaps the most significant difference between Fowler and the other theorists. Fowler's Stage Six is a very elite stage. Very few ever achieve such faith maturity. However, though a person may be in Fowler's Stage Five, they will still be able to positively resolve Erikson's Integrity vs Despair. That is true even for an adult who remains in Stage Four of Fowler's theory. It is probably not true of a person in Fowler's Stage Three. To remain in Stage Three requires a virtual cut-off of the person's inner self and identity (Fowler, 1981, p. 172).

Ego integrity or wisdom is the outcome of a positive resolution of Erikson's final stage. "Ego identity is the ego's accrued assurance of its investment in order and meaning" (Fowler, 1981, p. 86). The absence of such ego identity is despair. In old age a person can either become one who outlives all of his or her friends, or one who could
never outlive all of his or her friends, having nothing to do with longevity.

Fowler's theory describes an older person who has moved to Stage Five as one who is accepting of the world and of self. The Stage Six is one who goes a step further and truly identifies with the world. This enhances Erikson's concept of wisdom and provides it with a structure of meaning-making that becomes wisdom itself (Fowler, 1981, p. 203).

KOHLBERG—Stage Six in Kohlberg's theory is much more attainable than is Stage Six of Fowler's theory. It is possible for a person remaining in Fowler's Stage Five to achieve a Universal Ethical Principle in their moral thinking. This person follows a self-chosen principle and will not compromise that principle. This person is characterized as a rational person who exercises universal moral principles. These are principles that presuppose a recognition of the various traditions, beliefs, ethnic histories of the world and takes them into account when thinking ethically. The principles are to be universal and general in such a way that they can be applied to any culture or any tradition. Whether this is ever fully achieved is open for debate, however, such efforts as those of Hans Kung to develop a world ethic is an example of Kohlberg's Stage Six (See Kung's book, Global Responsibility: In Search of a
III. Conclusion

Fowler's theory has been compared to the theories of five other developmentalists to inform the reader. The relationship of the theories points to an understanding of the person, especially the traditional college student, assuming the complexity of experiences and influences that drive the perspectives of students. These various experiences and influences in a student's life are so complex it requires several theories and studies to address the intricacies of human development (Barr and Upcraft, 1990).

Faith development is as much a part of each college student as is his or her search for identity, moral reasoning, articulation of abstract thinking, or developing a higher level of truth-seeking through a pluralistic understanding of reality. Faith is not something that a student leaves at the door when he or she enters the classroom or residence hall. The implications for higher education include a renewed interest in what students perceive and why students perceive and interpret the world as they do. This perception and interpretation is what makes up the meaning-making of faith as found in Fowler's theory.
It is not enough to know that a student is seeking identity, learning how to articulate abstract thoughts, or developing a higher level of understanding in a pluralistic setting. How the student initially makes meaning influences what the student "sees" in his or her world. One may know "what" a typical student "sees" in his or her world, or what he or she experiences in his or her world, but why does the student see "that" and not something else? Why does the student interpret his or her experiences one way rather than another? To be able to influence what a student sees in the first place, that is, what a student perceives, would greatly affect the direction of the student's growth.

We are beings who learn through our senses. What we sense is filtered through who we are psychologically, psychosocially, physically, morally, and spiritually. To affect human development is to affect a change in our "filters" through which we sift the information we receive keeping only that which conforms to our level of understanding and acceptance of the world. Faith development provides descriptions of what form those filters take. Such descriptions are essential in understanding what programs, what events, what settings will best encourage the movement toward a level of meaning-making that is open to a pluralistic world in which the search for truth involves a
self-critical approach to fact and faith.

How can a student be open to the multitude of ideas, cultures, traditions, truths, and benefit by the experience if the student does not grow developmentally? Will the growth of the student in moral, psychosocial, and cognitive development be hindered if his or her faith development is stagnated at Stage Three? As has been shown, the student who remains at Stage Three will probably not develop morally, and his or her psychosocial development will result in a negative resolution of the crisis of each stage. A student remaining at Stage Three will also be one who remains at the primitive side of formal operational thinking, thus hindering further growth. Studies have shown, however, that providing opportunities for students' beliefs and the contradictions in their beliefs to be challenged in a setting of trust and respect will encourage positive movement from Stage Three to Stage Four. Providing such opportunities along with all of the other programs planned for students will enhance already effective efforts toward promoting developmental growth in the college student.

It is my contention that the achievement of Fowler's Stage Four, Individuative/reflective Faith, should be the goal of higher education. Such a stage involves the kind of perception of the world that allows for pluralism, relativity
of truth, self-criticism, acceptance of new ideas, a seeking of understanding, a problem-solving mentality, in short, the sort of person who excells in academics. Such a person would be one who recognizes the rights of others, regardless of tradition, culture, race, beliefs, or nationality. The development of such a person would be a lofty goal for any college or university.
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CHAPTER 3. FOWLER'S FAITH DEVELOPMENT THEORY: THE LINK WITH THE THEORIES OF KOHLBERG, ERIKSON, CHICKERING, AND PERRY, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS
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Abstract

This paper addresses the question, "If faith develops, how does it develop?" Does faith develop in anyway similar to psycho-social or moral development? This paper presents the argument that faith does develop in ways that can be measured by other developmental models. This argument proceeds through the search for that which "links" faith development with the theories of Kohlberg, Erikson, Chickering, and Perry.

I. Introduction

The religious development of a person may be distinguished logically from the total human development of the person, but logically distinct developmental processes are not existentially separate; all logically distinct developmental processes are coextensive and ineluctably linked (McKenzie, p. 20).

The student services practitioner is concerned with the
whole person when dealing with a college student. To better meet the needs of the student, many professionals look to developmental theory (Pascanella and Terenzini, 1991). Recent discussion has raised the issue that there is a spiritual side to human development (Genia, 1990; Shapiro & Fitzgerald, 1989; Shokley, 1989; and Boyer, 1989; Delworth and Hanson, 1989; Myers, 1991; Haggray, 1993; Cureton, 1989). McKenzie refers to religious development as ineluctably linked with other developmental processes, this link indicates that the student services practitioner and theorist, if not versed in faith development, is not as prepared to work with students than if he or she had known of the theory (Barr and Upcraft, 1990).

To illustrate the link, this paper will deal individually with Kohlberg, Erikson, Chickering, and Perry, and how Fowler's theory, the foundation of faith development theory, can be linked to those theories in an understanding of human development.

II. Review of Fowler's Theory of Faith Development

Fowler's theory of faith development was formed during Fowler's doctoral work at Harvard in the early seventies. He was introduced to the work of Lawrence Kohlberg and as a
result became deeply interested in the developmental process. Fowler had developed an understanding of faith as a dynamic process of acting out one's inner-most convictions. Fowler began noticing a difference in the way people expressed their convictions and that these differences were somewhat age related. Fowler reasoned that if faith is active, if it is an acting out of our inner convictions, if it is a response to that which concerns us ultimately, as explained by Paul Tillich (1957, p.1), then does that faith change over the years or remain static?

Fowler began to interview forty men from one of the housing units on Harvard's campus. From his interviews Fowler began to notice a clear struggle the men were having with trying to make sense out of their life experiences. Fowler then began to interview children of all ages and gender as well as older adults. Something was happening in their lives. But what was happening? It wasn't just people's beliefs that were changing, it was the way people experienced and made sense out of the world. If faith, Fowler reasoned, was a process of making meaning out of life's experiences, if faith was a grounding of meaning through which we viewed the world, if faith was intimately involved in all of our life's experiences, then could it be possible that faith is affected by how we develop
intellectually, psychologically, physically, and socially?

Fowler saw definite differences between children of five years of age and children of ten years of age. What could account for that difference? Fowler began longitudinal studies of children through their formative years. He saw an amazing parallel between how a child made meaning and saw the world and how he or she developed morally, according to Kohlberg's theory.

Fowler concluded that faith is a dynamic meaning-making that does develop in ways similar to psychological and moral development. Faith can be measured if seen as something more than belief in doctrines, creeds, and the supernatural. Faith is measured by the stages in Fowler's theory tracking a person's changing perception of the world and the self in the world and how that person acts out these perceptions. Faith is universal in that everyone experiences a need to make meaning out of life's experiences. This faith has a direct affect upon the development of the total person and for that reason cannot be overlooked by student services practitioners.

MacKenzie was quoted as seeing an ineluctable link between the social, physical, psychological, moral, and religious areas of human development. Though we can separate them logically for detailed study, the fact remains that none
of them are independent of the other. As H. Richard Niebuhr stated, "...one will discover how the exigencies of church discipline, the demands of the national psychology, the effect of social tradition, the influence of cultural heritage, and the weight of economic interest play their role in the definition of religious truth" (p. 17). How one interprets his or her world and makes meaning out of that experience is affected by all of the factors studied in human development. Faith development simply focuses on one aspect of human development; fundamental meaning-making. Why does one young adult have a broad world-view while another is suspicious of anyone who even looks different? Why do some young people enjoy the company of a pluralistic crowd while others seek a homogeneous group? There are many developmental factors at play here, not the least of which is faith development. Faith development may even help a student counselor discover some clues about a student's perspective that other theories would not provide. Delworth and Hanson, (1989), L.J. Myers, (1991), argue for the need for considering faith development in the student services practitioner's efforts to better understand the student.
III. The Link With Lawrence Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development

Fowler's theory was deeply influenced by Kohlberg (Fowler, 1981, p. 38). He borrowed much from Kohlberg in forming his own theory, especially the formal stage structure with its accompanying assumptions. Kohlberg maintained that moral judgment translates into morality and moral action (Kohlberg, 1984, p. 3). Fowler also claimed that faith is acted out and is not just a matter of belief. In Kohlberg's stages, the person develops autonomy and self-reliance by attaining greater levels of maturity in moral judgment (p. 44-48). The general pattern of developmental theories requires a higher level of autonomy in each succeeding stage. Fowler's theory is no different, with stage 4 (individuative-reflective faith) requiring a higher level of autonomy than that of the previous stage (see Table 1).

Kohlberg's higher stages also require a greater reliance on reason, logical comprehensiveness, universalizability, and consistency (p. 176). Similarly, Fowler's stage 5 (conjunctive faith) and 6 (universalizing faith) require a higher level of reason, logical comprehensiveness, and universalizability than the other stages.

During the first year, a traditional college freshman
Table 1: Kohlberg's Moral Stages and Fowler's Stages

KOHLBERG'S MORAL DEVELOPMENT STAGES

I. Preconventional

1. Heteronomous Morality
   What is right is what avoids punishment, obedience for its own sake, superior power of authorities.

2. Individualism, Instrumental Purpose and Exchange
   Following rules only when it is to someone’s immediate interest: what’s right is what is fair, equal exchange. To serve one’s own needs in a world where others have needs too.

II. Conventional

3. Mutual Interpersonal Expectations: Good-boy / Nice-girl
   Living up to what is expected by people close to you or perceived expectations of society. Need to be accepted at any costs.

4. Social System and Conscience
   Fulfilling the actual duties to which you have agreed. Laws are to be upheld except in extreme cases. Right is contributing to society. Will try to avoid doing what others should not do. Differentiates social from interpersonal motives.

III. Postconventional

5. Social Contract/Utility and Individual Rights
   Being aware that people hold a variety of values and opinions, that morality is often relative to the group. There are some nonrelative rights, life and liberty. Perspective of a rational person aware of values and rights of others. Pluralism is tolerated.

6. Universal Ethical Principles
   Follows self-chosen principles and will not compromise those principles. A rational person who exercises universal moral principles.

FOWLER'S STAGES OF FAITH DEVELOPMENT

Pre-stage: Undifferentiated Faith

Stage 1: Intuitive-projective faith (2-6 years)
   Experiences God through those in whom they trust and are in awe of.

Stage 2: Mythic-literal faith (10 years)
   Believes in the mystical and magical as being literally true. Interprets the world through self-interest. Understands reciprocity.

Stage 3: Synthetic-conventional faith
   Authority is placed in the identity group. Becomes uncritical of identity group. Is not able to be self-critical. Does not see contradictions in belief systems of group. Life interpreted through peer group.

Stage 4: Individuative-reflective faith
   Executive-mentality. Problem solving approach to all difficulties. Is critical of most conventional religion as being hypocritical, not contributing to society.

Stage 5: Conjunctive faith
   Sees truth as being found in all traditions. Values the symbols through the rights due others.

Stage 6: Universalizing faith
   Redemptive-subversive. Lives by his/her own principles and will not compromise.
(18-19 years of age) will most likely be at Kohlberg's stage 2 (individualism) or 3 (good-boy/nice-girl). This is paralleled in Fowler's theory with stage 3 (synthetic/conventional) in which Fowler's studies have shown to be the stage of most college freshmen.

Characteristics of Kohlberg's good-boy/nice-girl, parallel those of Fowler's synthetic/conventional faith. In both, the student identifies with a specific group; moral norms are determined by what is acceptable to the identity group, and the student feels an obligation to conform to the norms of the group (Kohlberg, 1984, p. 629; Fowler, 1981, p. 74, 75). A similar sense of obligation is present in Fowler's conventional faith in that Fowler reminds us that the student would not be objective or critical of the identity group (Fowler, 1981, p. 154). Couple that with a morality based upon pleasing the group, and the possibility of conflict between campus authorities and the student become apparent.

Fowler's theory suggests broadening the student's identity group enough to challenge the person's narrow

---

1An Identity Group is that group of either peers or significant authority figures that claim the commitment of the individual such that their identity is determined by the group.
identification with the group and thus opening new avenues for identity development. If a student comes from a strict religious background, there will most likely be a rebellion against that strict group by identifying with a group that would seem most unlike the student's previous experience. Fowler's theory is one more justification for the careful planning that student services practitioners go through in order to provide the kind of identity group that will be beneficial to the positive growth of the student. Faith development will also help the student services practitioners and theorists identify what the student is seeking in an identity group and how the student will most likely perceive various groups and programs.

This search for a more appropriate identity group can be facilitated by exposing the student with a conventional faith to spiritual groups that exercise within Fowler's stages 4 or 5 (individuative-reflective or conjunctive faith) and Kohlberg's stages 4 or 5 (moral duty or social contract). The entering freshman would be open to that influence if accepted and treated with respect. This suggests the importance of mentor programs matching upper-class students with freshmen. However, it is also important to stabilize the student's comfort level in a new environment by providing opportunities for the student to also develop relationships
within a stage 2 or 3 group.

The key to understanding a student with a synthetic-conventional faith is the need for an identity group. The freshman hunger for acceptance. Knowing that such students are also in the good-boy/nice-girl moral stage alerts the student services practitioners to taking care what identity groups are provided for freshmen. The ideal group would promote autonomy and individual identity. However, such a development of autonomy and individuality can be fraught with conflict and anxiety, thus the need for close monitoring of such peer groups by the student services practitioners on campus (see also Lugo, 1974, p. 482).

IV. The Link With Erikson's Psychosocial Theory

Erikson made it clear that developing trust at an early age is essential to healthy human development (Erikson, 1982, p. 79). Fowler claims that trust is also the initial key to a healthy, developing faith. Even Erikson believed that "...religion is inextricably bound up in the mutuality of trust" (Wright, p. 150). Erikson links up with faith by stating that the rituals of a healthy religion foster trust in the child and that such rituals are carried out by the generative adult (p. 172, see Table 2).
Table 2: Erikson's Psychosocial Stages and Fowler's Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERIKSON’S PSYCHOSOCIAL STAGES</th>
<th>FOWLER’S FAITH DEVELOPMENT STAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Trust vs. Mis-trust</strong></td>
<td>Pre-stage: Undifferentiated faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing trust is necessary to gaining the first virtue: hope.</td>
<td>Developing trust is crucial to a healthy faith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Autonomy vs. Shame &amp; Doubt</strong></td>
<td>Stage 1: Intuitive-projective faith (2-6 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the child is treated in what he/she accomplishes will determine how he/she feels, whether secure in his/her autonomy or shrinking back in doubt or shame. Healthy resolution develops the virtue of will.</td>
<td>If treated with respect and encouraged by those in whom he/she trusts, will develop a healthy attitude in their spiritual life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Initiative vs. Guilt</strong></td>
<td>Stage 2: Mythic-literal faith (10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the child (2-6) is encouraged in his/her explorations and questions, he/she will develop a sense of purpose.</td>
<td>Interprets the world through a narrow vision. Difficult time distinguishing between fantasy and reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Industry vs. Inferiority</strong></td>
<td>Stage 3: Synthetic-Conventional faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the child becomes coordinated and able to manipulate and create, he/she is seeking competence in being able to accomplish what he/she could not do before. An emerging producer.</td>
<td>Identifies with a specific group in whom he/she places authority. Is uncritical of identity group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Identity vs. Role Confusion</strong></td>
<td>Stage 4: Individuative-Reflective faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking to find his/her way. If the child is allowed to develop as an individual, he/she will develop fidelity.</td>
<td>If the person does not move out of Stage 3, he will not be able to experience intimacy. Executive-mentality. Is his/her own person. Is able to treat others as adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Intimacy vs. Isolation</strong></td>
<td>Stage 5: Conjunctive faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the person develops an identity with fidelity, he/she will be able to experience intimacy with another. The virtue developed in a healthy resolution is love.</td>
<td>Truth is wherever he/she finds it. Trusts, loves, cares for others. Social conscience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Generativity vs. Stagnation</strong></td>
<td>Stage 6: Universalizing faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper resolution produces care.</td>
<td>World-citizen who is inclusive in love.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Integrity vs. Despair</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper resolution produces wisdom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The major difference between Fowler and Erikson is that the person continues through all of Erikson's stages, whereas in Fowler's theory adults can remain at the synthetic-conventional faith level of development. How this translates in Erikson's theory is that the adult who remains in Fowler's stage 3 (synthetic-conventional faith) is one who does not achieve a healthy resolution of the conflict inherent in the psychosocial stage movement. What happens, then, to the adult's psychosocial development if the adult remains in Fowler's stage 3?

When an adult retains a synthetic-conventional faith, personal identity becomes fused with a group in which too much emphasis is placed on militant ritualism, and fanaticism results (Erikson, p. 74). Exclusivity also emerges because the person who remains in a synthetic-conventional faith experiences a conflict between intimacy and isolation in which isolation dominates. The adult with a synthetic-conventional faith is psychologically and emotionally isolated from those outside the identity group.

Erikson claims that "...a main theme of life is the quest for identity" (Miller, 1989, p. 180). The virtue gained from a positive resolution of identity vs role confusion is fidelity. Erikson states that fidelity is strongly related to a mature faith (Erikson, p. 73). The
adult who remains in a synthetic-conventional faith has not developed a strong sense of trust and has placed all identity in the group. Fidelity does not emerge because the adult with a synthetic-conventional faith has opinions, thoughts, beliefs, and an outlook on life that are determined not by personal integrity but by the accepted norms of the identity group. Often people in this situation cannot tell you why he or she believes what he or she believes other than the fact that he or she believes it or that it is what the "church" believes or what all "Christians" believe or whatever the person's identity group believes. The adult with a synthetic-conventional faith will continue to move through Erikson's stages, but will most likely not develop the virtues of fidelity, love, or care. Which could account for why so many adults in stage 3 have a difficult time being caring and forgiving and accepting of those who are different, or a redefining of people who are different into characteristics that are similar to one's own. For example, when you hear the comment "Why, with old Jake you would never know he wasn't white. He's more white than most people I know."

If a main theme in life is to seek identity both psychologically and spiritually, then the student development professional needs to facilitate opportunities for the
individual to find a personal identity. Discussion groups dealing with topics of spiritual significance, which can include those deeper questions of life that require meaning-making, can be a very important aid in helping the student discover a personal identity.

As was mentioned earlier, Erikson claimed that healthy religious ritual helped develop trust. Healthy here means a religion as described in Fowler's stage 5 (conjunctive faith). Perhaps this suggests that bringing older, generative adults with a conjunctive faith to work as mentors or as leaders of spiritual discussion groups would facilitate the development of identity and fidelity, providing an important benefit for the struggling student.

V. The Link With Chickering's Vectors

Chickering has attempted to capture in his vectors a commonality shared by all developmental theories. He defined vectors as: "...vectors of development...each seems to have direction and magnitude--even though the direction may be expressed more appropriately by a spiral or by steps than by a straight line" (Chickering, 1984, p. 8). Chickering captured the interrelatedness of the various stages such that
he viewed the developing person as not moving from one stage to another, but rather as developing within the context of a spiral or circle in which a person's previous development becomes a part of the current process. Chickering's spiraling vectors are: achieving competence, managing emotions, developing autonomy, developing identity, building relationships, discovering purpose, achieving integrity (pp. 8-19). The vectors are presented as interrelated rather than sequential nonvariant stages (See Figure 1).

Fowler agrees with Chickering when claiming that faith development stages are better understood as a spiral rather than sequential hierarchical stages (Fowler, 1981, p. 274). Fowler argues that a person never leaves behind the previous stage when moving on to the next stage. Fowler's theory is similar to that of Chickering in that a person will sometimes reclaim a previous stage when under a lot of stress. This writer proposes that we all have the potential of experiencing each of Fowler's six stages such that there is constant movement within the context of the stages with one stage dominating in each season of our lives (Fowler, 1984, pp. 30,31).

Perhaps the most obvious link Fowler's theory has with Chickering's theory can be found in the struggling freshman
Figure 1: Chickering's Vectors and Fowler's Stages
who is attempting to move out of a synthetic-conventional faith. Chickering states, "The first task for many young adults is to loosen repressions from earlier years and to notice recurrent patterns of incident and reaction" (Chickering, p. 41). This task is made all the more difficult by the fact that many students graduating from high school have not yet learned how to manage their emotions. The young student enters the campus environment that has greater pluralism, more temptations, heavier responsibilities, and expanded freedom. The student with a synthetic-conventional faith simply is not able to manage emotions or deal with all of the above mentioned environmental changes by themselves. The identity group of a student with a synthetic-conventional faith has taken care of managing the emotions through group-accepted norms, and has probably taken over the student's personal responsibility. Pluralism was not tolerated within the identity group and so causes the student to become immediately uncomfortable in its presence. Between the two theories, the difficulties faced by the traditional first-year student are evident.

Fowler's theory adds insight to Chickering's vectors by confirming that there is more going on with the entering student than severing ties with parents. The young adult with a synthetic-conventional faith is struggling to think
and act like a person with the *individuative-reflective* level of faith; autonomous with a secure identity. The problem is that the young adult is mired in the *synthetic-conventional faith* and often finds a replacement identity group when coming to college rather than developing autonomy or an identity. The first-year student yearns to have the group manage his or her emotions and responsibilities.

Fowler adds to Chickering's *vectors* by showing that a student will be hampered in managing emotions, developing competence, developing autonomy, etc., if the student has not moved out of a *synthetic-conventional faith* as an adult. Is this to imply that moving out of a *synthetic-conventional faith* is necessary before the student can move through Chickering's *vectors*? Not any more than moving through the *vectors* implies that the person is moving beyond the *synthetic-conventional* level of faith. It is an interrelationship in development—the movement in the *vectors* and stages is coextensive. Fowler's theory presents the possibility of a spiritual side to the developmental process.

Chickering speaks of professors as mentors. A mentor is one who should take time with a student to provide an environment where the student can experience distance from the restrictions of the past. With such distancing, the mentor can provide a liberating present that allows positive
growth into the future. Erikson called such a mentor a generative adult. Fowler would see it as a person with a conjunctive faith nurturing the person with a synthetic-conventional faith into stage movement. Whatever the term, the student services practitioner has more programatic possibilities to facilitate such development if the spiritual nature of development is taken into consideration.

Many professors have a deep faith but are slow to share it due to a fear of promoting a religion or sounding fanatical. Though evangelism is not the proper role of a college professor, sharing that which deals with making meaning out of life's ambiguities will go a long way in providing the mentoring environment alluded to by Chickering.

Holding workshops on faith development for professors would facilitate this nurturing environment. Recently (February 1994) this author conducted a workshop on faith development for the faculty of Northern Iowa Area Community College for the purpose of increasing the professors' sensitivity to the various developmental levels of the students. By helping the professors to get in touch with their own faith development, professors can relate to that meaning-making side of life that is so often lost in the many distractions of the academic world. Getting in touch with one's meaning-making ability helps to identify a person's
stage of development.

VI. The Link With Perry's Continuum

William Perry's theory can be best understood as a continuum of development summarized in four general categories: dualism, multiplicity, relativity, and commitment in relativism. Perry claims that the student develops from a simply dualistic outlook in which everything is either right or wrong, black or white, to a more complex understanding of the world as relative (Knefelkamp, pp. 38,39. See Table 3).

Fowler claims a similar movement from a simpler to a more complex understanding and expression of faith. The person with a synthetic-conventional faith has a dualistic world-view; the identity group is right and everyone else is wrong; the world of reality contains absolute answers; and ambiguous answers are interpreted as a coward's way of avoiding making a decision (Fowler, 1991, p. 17). The Christian with a synthetic-conventional faith most often views the Bible as the absolute inerrant word of God that cannot be doubted. This attitude is played out in the world resulting in apparent contradictions in which absolute moral rules often create greater calamity than if the law had not
Table 3: Perry's Continuum and Fowler's Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERRY'S CONTINUUM</th>
<th>FOWLER'S STAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dualism</strong></td>
<td>Pre-stage: Undifferentiated faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterized by a “right-wrong, black-white” view of the world. Believes there is an absolute truth and answer for everything.</td>
<td>Stage 1: Intuitive-projective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplicity</td>
<td>Stage 2: Mythic-Literal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person is willing to admit that there is more than one version or side, but still does not see that other positions are valid for reasons inherent in the subject. Still believes that everyone just has opinions, not realizing the reasons behind varied opinions.</td>
<td>We begin with this stage because it is possible for an entering freshman to be a Stage 2 and dualistic in world-view. A Stage 2 is very strong in their dualistic beliefs to the point of mysticism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativism</td>
<td>Stage 3: Synthetic-conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student now realizes that ideas and truth are relative and unlike multiplicity, recognizes that the reasons for various opinions are based on the connectedness of ideas and how well they fit into the whole picture. However, the student is seeking something to hang on to because they see all reality as relative and need a commitment.</td>
<td>Very difficult for a Stage 3 young adult to accept ambiguity. Believes his/her identity group is right and everyone else is wrong. May develop appreciation for multiple views, but still sees his/her identity group as being more right than others. Multiplicity is an important step toward Stage 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment In Relativism</td>
<td>Stage 4: Individuative-Reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student has grown to a point that in the face of relative truth there is a courage, willingness to commit themselves to a core belief that takes into account the connectedness of reality and that a person needs to anchor themselves by taking a stand.</td>
<td>The executive-mentality relies on relativism for rational methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5: Conjunctive</td>
<td>Stage 6: Universalizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sees truth in all things. Truth is relative but has a belief structure that sustains the person in the face of ambiguity. This belief system is cognizant of the world and open to criticism. This person rededicates themselves to a belief that is inclusive.</td>
<td>The person has taken a step beyond simple commitment, interprets the world by his/her involvement in the world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
been held to be absolute. Consider the simple admonition to never lie.

When experiencing the dualism of a student who complains that the professor never gives the right answer, remember that student probably has a synthetic-conventional faith world-view. The student's faith development could be short-circuited, preventing the student from seeing more than his or her side of an issue. (It is interesting to note that some professors who may appear to have advanced beyond dualism may have in fact remained in a synthetic-conventional faith when it comes to religious matters with such a dualistic world-view hampering academic judgment.)

Encouraging more complex thinking through the curriculum can be facilitated by helping the student move from a synthetic-conventional faith to an individuative-reflective faith. The individuative-reflective intellect is more conducive to rational consideration taking into account all elements of a problem or thesis. The individuative-reflective intellect is autonomous and able to advance more complex arguments in searching for a rational answer to a problem. This complexity can be traced to the complexity of meaning-making which is inclusive in a search for truth.

Perry's category of multiplicity may fill the void
between a synthetic-conventional faith and an individuative-reflective faith. More happens in the transition from stage 3 to stage 4 in Fowler's theory than in any other era of life. The person with a synthetic-conventional faith could claim a multiplicitous world-view and still claim that his or her identity group is more right than anyone else. Multiplicity seems to be a necessary step in moving from a synthetic-conventional faith to an individuative-reflective faith. The person with an individuative-reflective faith has already achieved relativism taking as valid other viewpoints realizing that truth is relative to its context. Multiplicity does not require an individuative-reflective mentality as does relativism. 

Commitment in relativism occurs in the movement from an individuative-reflective faith to a conjunctive faith (stage 5, Fowler). The conjunctive faith rediscovers commitment to a core belief in the midst of a relativistic world. Such a commitment will most likely be experienced by some older returning students. That alone is good enough reason to treat the older returning student differently than the traditional 18 year old student. Many adults are ready for complex patterns of thought and should be given the opportunity through the curriculum to deal with issues that require an ability to make global connections.
Knowing this parallel between Fowler's theory and Perry's theory provides important information when considering all of the options available in encouraging the healthy development of the college student.

VII. Conclusions

Seeing how faith development is expressed through Fowler's theory and how the theory can be linked with the theories of Kohlberg, Erikson, Chickering, and Perry, indicates the nurturing of the spiritual nature of the student needs to be taken into consideration when planning programs. The benefit of such nurturing is in the positive affect on the other components of adult development. This link demonstrates how the short-circuited development in one of the other components could be caused by the arrested development of a student's faith. If the growth of the spiritual nature is nurtured, the link would indicate a possibility of growth in the other components of the person's development.

With this information one is better prepared to understand how a student makes sense out of his or her world. How one expresses his or her faith will indicate the level of moral and social development. It will also identify whether
or not the student has an appreciation for the relativity of truth or if the student is dualistic in perspective. Why a student struggles with relativity and multiplicity can often be clarified by the state of that student's faith development.

The existential link between how meaning-making, or faith, develops, and how one develops morally or psychosocially, is a reminder that though the various developmental theories can be studied apart from other theories, human beings do not develop in so clearly a demarcated way. Human beings develop psychosocially, cognitively, morally, and spiritually, together rather than one at a time. Each of the theories provide explanations and descriptions of only part of the human development puzzle. Unless one takes into account all of the theories, the developmental picture is only partially revealed.

Where moral development describes how one understands "fairness," "right or wrong," "good or bad," "moral or immoral," and then acts on that understanding, faith development describes how the same person perceives and interprets and thus makes meaning out of what he or she experiences. Faith development describes the limitations of each stage and how those limitations affect perceptions and interpretations of those experiences. These limitations
provide further explanation for why actions are perceived as "fair," "right or wrong," "good or bad," "moral or immoral." In this sense, "faith" preceeds "morality." A person will make a moral decision based upon the meaningfulness the person perceives in actions as either right or wrong, moral or immoral.

Meaningfulness, and how one makes such meaning, is described as an act of faith, or faith itself. This faith, this meaningfulness, is assumed by the theories of Erikson, Kohlberg, Chickering, and Perry. Without meaningfulness, without perceptions that interpret what one receives through his or her senses into meaningful experiences, human development is not possible. Faith development describes the process of making meaning which can clarify the human developmental experience.

This is the existential link uniting the theories of human development. This link provides a more complete understanding of how human beings develop. Without faith development theory, without recognizing what the other theories assume, a student services practitioner operates on an assumption he or she does not know exists. Such an assumption, that the student has meaningful experiences, without understanding how and why the student makes meaning as he or she does, prevents the student services practitioner
from providing ever more focused programs. Programs tailored more specifically to encouraging a growth in how one perceives and interprets the world. The fundamental level of meaning-making indicates the influence such growth would have on all subsequent areas of human development.

The implication for program planning moves faith development concepts to a position of priority over that of other developmental theories. Because of the fundamental nature of meaning-making, faith development should provide an approach to understanding the student which would lead to developing more efficacious programs.

VIII. Implications for Student Services Practitioners and Theorists

If faith development theory provides such an important addition to the developmental knowledge of the student services theorists and practitioners, then I would suggest the following implications for student services:

1. Graduate schools of higher education should include a session for staff development on faith development theory to better prepare student services practitioners.

2. Further study needs to be done in the faith development of the college student.
3. When developing mentoring programs, faith development teaches that a Stage 5 works much better with Stage 3's than does a Stage 4 type of meaning-making.

4. Because faith development is based upon a universal understanding of faith as meaning-making, emphasize meaning-making rather than religion, especially in the public university.

5. In the private college make the chaplain aware of faith development theory. In the public institution work in cooperation with a chaplaincy program to insure that all chaplains have adequate training in faith development theory.

6. Because faith development is existentially linked with the other developmental theories mentioned in this paper, one can use the findings from a faith development study of students to shed some light on the levels of development in other areas.
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CHAPTER 4. A CASE STUDY OF THE FAITH DEVELOPMENT OF FIVE FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS AT A CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
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Abstract

The focus of this paper is a study of the faith development of three first-year college women and two first-year college men through a qualitative analysis of interviews taken with each student. Grounded theory was used along with the unitizing of data to uncover patterns in the data. The conclusion of the study is that the data suggests some relationship between how a student perceives his or her parents and his or her faith development.

I. Introduction

James Fowler introduced a developmental theory in 1978 claiming that every human being has a faith that reflects the state of maturity in how one relates to his or her world (Fowler and Keen, 1978, pp. 36-38). This is a theory based on the model of development found in the theories of Jean Piaget, Lawrence Kohlberg, and Erik Erikson. That structure
embodies the sequential developmental process that faith, as meaning-making, passes through. For such a faith to be so dynamic requires an understanding of faith that transcends the particularization of content for the universality of its nature.

James Fowler, Sharon Parks, Kenneth Stokes, Paul Tillich, and H. Richard Neibuhr have all described faith as dynamic, universal, the process of making meaning out of life (Fowler, 1981, p. 4; Parks, p. xv; Stokes, p. 12; Tillich, p. 1; McLean in Dykstra, p. 159). Faith unites our inner experiences into an understandable whole (Fowler, 1981, p. 19). Because faith is how we make meaning of the world it affects how we perceive the world. Faith affects not only our perceptions of the world but also our self-perceptions. Faith determines what kind of interpreter we will be of what we experience. So much a part of our being is affected by our faith. We are our faith, our faith defines who we are, and in this way we perceive the world.

Since the introduction of faith development theory Fowler has been the subject of both praise and criticism. Daniel Aleshire and C. Ellis Nelson raise serious questions as to the self-serving nature of Fowler's research. Fowler had already fully developed the pre-stage and six stages of his theory before doing any primary research. Fowler has
also been questioned on his close adhearance to Kohlberg's model of moral development because of the apparent bias in Kohlberg's model that subordinates traditional feminine values of community, friendship, and love to the traditional masculine values of independence and cold reason (Gilligan, p. 29). In the face of this criticism Aleshire and Nelson commended Fowler on a theory that accurately reflects the real world, is internally consistent, and contributes to new ways of thinking about faith (Aleshire and Nelson in Dykstra, p. 199).

Is James Fowler's theory self-serving? Is it biased in favor of traditional male qualities? If faith develops in ways similar to the psychosocial, moral, and cognitive human development, then what does Fowler's theory tell us that the others do not?

There is a growing body of literature concerned with the spiritual development of the college student (see Genia, 1990; Shapiro & Fitzgerald, 1989; Shokley, 1989; and Boyer, 1989). What does Fowler's theory have to tell us about the traditional college student? Will it be helpful for college and university administrators who work closely with the students to know something about faith development? Would such knowledge improve curriculum development, residence hall discipline, or retention rates? These questions cannot be
answered by one paper, however, this paper does present a study that was done in an attempt to provide additional information to be used in addressing these questions.

The criticisms levelled at Fowler's theory and research were taken into account in the development of this study. Such considerations were made in site selection and student respondent selections. The method used by Fowler, according to his *Manual for Faith Development Research*, was the use of interviews in a qualitative study. However, because Fowler began with a theory, then conducted his interviews having developed questions from his theory, there was a concern that to follow Fowler's method too closely might not address whether or not Fowler's research was self-serving. Therefore, the grounded theory approach to qualitative research was used because in such a method the theory is derived from the data after analysis, not before.

The study will begin with a detailed discussion of the method of site selection, student respondent selection, and qualitative analysis method selection. Following the discussion of methodology will be a detailed analysis of each of the five respondents and the patterns discovered in the data. In this analysis the adequacy of Fowler's theory in describing what the students were experiencing will be included. Suggestions for future research and some thoughts
II. A Description of The Methodology of This Study

Five first-year students were selected through a purposive sample otherwise referred to as a criteria based sample (Merriam, pp. 48, 49; see also Ary, Jacobs and Rozaveih, 1985). The criteria selected involved gender, religious affiliation, and site selection.

The question of gender was raised by Carol Gilligan in her criticism of Lawrence Kohlberg's choice of men as research subjects (Gilligan, p. 18). The question was whether Kohlberg's interviewing men in his initial study influenced his formation of stages that promote a more traditional male model of maturity in the higher stages. This model is of a person who is independent, self-sufficient, sees all crises as problems requiring a rational solution, places being morally right over maintaining relationships, and promotes rationality over emotion as a sign of maturity. The argument is that though both men and women can be relational and "feeling" in their thinking it is more salient in the thinking of women. Women, therefore, would be described by a lower stage than the male who stands alone (Gilligan, p. 29; see also Belenky, Chapter 9 of
This criticism applies to Fowler's research as well. Fowler began his research after he had written the six stages borrowing heavily from Kohlberg. Though he interviewed both men and women he had developed the pre-stage and six stages and the complete theory before any of the interviews. Because Fowler borrowed so heavily from Kohlberg it can be argued that the male bias Gilligan referred to in Kohlberg's theory was transferred over to Fowler's theory.

There are at least three possibilities: 1). gender makes a difference in the developmental level of the entering student, 2). gender makes no difference in the developmental level, or 3). if there is a noticeable difference it may be a flaw in stage theory rather than gender. The criterion was set by this researcher to be two men and three women to offset the possible gender bias.

Therefore, three women and two men were chosen in order to address the possibility of gender bias. Five students were chosen to provide a manageable data base and a somewhat composite profile of the traditional entering student.

The second criterion involved religious affiliation. Sharon Parks argues that there is a link between the structures of faith development and the content of faith (Parks, p. 34). What meaning we make out of a crisis in our
lives is directly related to the structure of our meaning-making. That is to say, there are some forms of theology that support a Stage Three type of meaning-making rather than a Stage Four structure. Fowler makes the case for such an understanding in his latest book, *Weaving The New Creation*, (1991), when he points out that the prevailing theology of many fundamentalists focuses more upon being "saved" promoting the need of acceptance which is indicative of the Stage Three adolescent entering adulthood (Fowler, 1991, p. 79). This raises the possibility that the student's religious affiliation could make a difference in determining the stage of development of the student when he or she expresses the doctrines of that affiliation. Therefore, to allow for a more representative sample it was decided to select each student from a different religious affiliation. One student without a clear affiliation was requested to address the question as to whether or not a firm religious affiliation made any difference in developmental levels.

Though Fowler has done little research outside Christianity, I decided to remain within the general Christian faith for a religious affiliation criterion. The first criterion for selecting Christianity is that the college chosen is a Christian college and it was assumed that Christianity would best represent the student body. Second,
Christianity remains the dominate religion in the United States. Third, the limitations of this study do not allow for the question of faith development outside Christianity.


The ideal site is where (1) entry is possible; (2) there is a high probability that a rich mix of many of the processes, people, programs, interactions, and/or structures that may be a part of the research question will be present; (3) the researcher can devise an appropriate role to maintain continuity of presence for as long as necessary; and (4) data quality and credibility of the study are reasonably assured by avoiding poor sampling decisions (p. 54).

The Vice President of Student Affairs at a Christian Coalition collegel, did a quantitative study of the faith development of entering students at the college in 1988. An invitation was extended for a qualitative research project to study, through interview, the faith development of students at the college as a further clarification of the quantitative study. The quantitative study did not prove conclusive in its findings partly because the nature of faith development.

---

1 A Christian Coalition college is a fully accredited liberal arts college that is firmly committed to Christ in purpose, operation, and academic excellence and a member of the Christian Coalition of Colleges formed in 1976 (for more information see J. Dellenback, 1982, Purpose and goals of the Christian College Coalition, available from Christian College Coalition, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW; Washington, D.C. 20036). The name of the particular college selected for the site of this study has been withheld to protect the identities of the student respondents.
is more fully described through a qualitative study (Cureton, 1988, p. 76). With such an invitation (1) entry was possible; (2) through the Vice President's initiatives there was ready access for the researcher to all levels of campus life, thus providing a "rich mix" of what was required for the study; (3) continuity of the study was assured through the continued cooperation of the Vice President; (4) with the assistance of the Vice President the quality of the sample was enhanced.

The Christian College Coalition college made an excellent site selection for its emphasis on the faith development of the student. In the college's 1991-1993 catalog it states,

The campus lifestyle is designed to provide a unifying community experience for social, educational and faith development...The purpose of the College is to develop creative and thoughtful leaders who understand a maturing Christian faith (catalog, p.9).

The college's educational philosophy also made a faith development study not only possible but desirable on the part of the administration of the college. The following is the stated philosophy of education:

College strives for academic excellence through a variety of approaches to learning. In the belief that learning and Christian commitment are important to developing a well-rounded person,
students are encouraged to develop a view of the world in God's terms. College's curriculum provides the student with a broad educational experience which is also deep enough to prepare students to contribute to a rapidly changing world (catalog, p. 10).

Due to the limitations of this study there will not be any longitudinal studies done with the five respondents, rather the interviews taken in the first semester of their first year will provide the entire data for the study. What will be of interest to the college and the researcher will be the student's perceptions of the college and whether or not the college meets their expectations of a Christian college. Those perceptions will be reported in the conclusion of this study.

Finally, the research method was based upon a "grounded research" approach of a qualitative case study. A qualitative case study approach was selected because Fowler himself argued that faith development can be more effectively studied through qualitative analysis than quantitative (Fowler, 1978, pp. 34-37). Because Fowler used a qualitative case study approach, it seemed appropriate to use the same general approach if one were to address many of the questions facing Fowler's theory. The grounded theory approach was also chosen because Fowler began with a theory and used the theory to "score" the answers to the specific set of
questions asked in the interviews. This approach led to the challenge that Fowler's research is self-serving (see Nelson and Ale shire's article in Dykstra and Parks, eds., 1986, Faith Development and Fowler). Grounded research is characterized by the development of a theory "grounded" in the data and emerging from them (Merriam, 1988, pp. 141-144). Any prior theories are purposefully put aside with a focus on the data out of which would come subsequent theories as a way of critically reviewing the prior theories. Therefore, Fowler's theory was not assumed in the process of gathering data. The data was carefully studied to find any patterns that might lead to developing a theory which would then be compared with Fowler's theory.

The strength of a qualitative study is that it provides a rich and "thick" description of each respondent so that one would understand the meanings and intentions of the respondent. Kniker (1991) defines qualitative research,

> ...qualitative research is a descriptive record consisting of written and spoken words or behaviors....qualitative research refers to descriptions of people from their own point of view (p.2)

In that way the researcher can be certain that what is reported is not what the researcher imposes on the study, rather what the respondent meant in the interviews.

To secure such accuracy of account each respondent
reviewed the transcripts, the data categories, and the final critical review of his or her interviews and gave his or her approval. The rich description allows one to find patterns in the data and through the descriptions better understand if the patterns are corroborated by the meaning and intent of the respondent. The weakness of the grounded theory approach to case study is that one cannot transfer the findings from one interview as qualities to be found in the general population. All that can be claimed is a description of each respondent and the patterns that appeared in his or her interviews. Another weakness of the grounded theory approach is in the formation of theory. Because the formation of theory is dependent upon the data, if the data does not yield much information or if the data does not yield clear patterns, the formation of a theory is greatly impeded. If patterns are discernable a theory may not be the result because the patterns found in one study will often not be enough evidence for the formation of a theory. What can emerge are questions of any previous theories that are not corroborated by the data patterns.

The method of data gathering involved two hour-long interviews of each respondent on two succeeding days. Each interview was tape-recorded at the consent of the respondent. Release forms were explained and signed by both the
respondent and the researcher, a copy of which is found in Appendix E. After the interviews were completed the researcher transcribed the tapes. The typed transcripts were then read and re-read by the researcher. It is beneficial to read the transcripts enough times to become completely familiar with the text and context of the interviews. Greater insight is achieved by an increasing familiarity of the text. The results of the study as well as the data and its organization were examined by a peer reviewer.

In a grounded theory approach to a case study one may begin with a list of questions to initiate the interview. However, such questions are not meant to be the only questions asked, rather the list of questions are intended to initiate the conversation in which the respondent has the freedom to take the interview in any direction he or she wishes.

The list of questions used to initiate the interviews were taken, with permission, from Fowler's research manual. Because Fowler is the recognized authority on faith development (Parks, 1986, p. ix), and the original intent of the study was to further investigate whether Fowler's research was self-serving, gender-biased, or too narrow to include a range of Christian denominations, it seemed appropriate to use the questions he used in his research
(find the list of Fowler's questions in Appendix G).

After the interviews were transcribed the narrative was carefully read and divided into individual "thoughts" that stood alone. In reading a paragraph of narrative if there was a phrase or a statement that stood out in the paragraph that statement was separated from the rest of the paragraph. This process is called "unitizing the data" and is done in order to get at the key thoughts and points made in the interview.

"At this beginning stage of analysis, Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 344) suggest unitizing the data--identifying 'units of information that will, sooner or later, serve as the basis for defining categories'" (Merriam, 1988, p. 132). A unit must meet two criteria: 1. it should be heuristic; 2. the smallest piece of information about something that can stand by itself (Merriam, 1988, p. 132).

By taking these thoughts and phrases as separate "units" of data one is better able to determine the frequency of certain ideas or thoughts or subjects as they appear in the interview. Another purpose is to determine what subjects most interest the respondent and thus better understand the direction the interview followed. Such a determination is crucial in the grounded theory approach to qualitative analysis. Such an approach begins with a set of questions
but allows the respondent to ultimately determine the
direction of the interview. Such direction informs the
interviewer of what interested the respondent and how the
respondent interpreted the questions. This method allows the
data to develop the theory and not the theory interpreting
the data.

After the transcriptions have been unitized each "unit"
of data is then placed into a category. Categories are
"concepts indicated by the data (and not the data itself)...in short, conceptual categories and properties have
a life apart from the evidence that gave rise to
them" (Merriam, 1988, p. 133). "Developing categories,
typologies, or themes involves looking for recurring
regularities in the data" (Merriam, 1988, p. 133).

One uses the direction of the study, the data itself,
and one's intuitive process to form categories. Forming a
category involves both convergent and divergent thinking.
Convergence is determining what fits together in a single
category by reading each unit of data and looking for other
units of data that relate in some way. Divergence involves
fleshing out the categories once developed to define the
distinctivness of the category. There needs to be a
homogeneity within each category and clear differences
between categories (Merriam, 1988, pp. 134,135).
Categories were developed for each respondent from the two interviews given by the respondents. Because of the possible gender problems in Fowler's research this researcher decided to use the method of organizing categories found in Kenneth Stokes' research (see *A Research Report of: Faith Development in the Adult Life Cycle*, sponsored by the Center of Faith Development in the Adult Life Cycle, The University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN). In that research he kept the findings of each respondent separated in order to better determine any appreciable differences in the responses due to gender.

The categories were reformed after a third reading of the units of data. The categories were gathered into a second set of categories for each respondent. In this recategorization an effort was made to find more similarities between the smaller categories that might draw several categories into a more general category. The first categories yielded general topics which led to a second set of categories. This process helped the researcher determine what the major topics of interest were for each respondent. The categorization process was not dependent upon any prior theories, as a result the patterns beginning to emerge were free from any theory-based interpretations.

When that was completed a critical study was written for
each respondent and the results of that critical review sent to the respondents for their comments (see these critical reviews in Appendix A). Having received confirmation of the accuracy of the critical reviews a third step in categorization took place. All of the categories from all five respondents were studied to see if there were more general topics emerging from the second set of categories. Having found such general subjects, a third set of categories were gathered, this time made up of categories of each respondent to form ten final categories producing somewhat of a composite view of the five students.

This final categorization, along with the individual critical reviews, provided the background for the final report written on all five students in response to Fowler's theory of faith development. Identifying pattern formation in the data as objectively as possible is the purpose of unityzing and categorizing the data. Such patterns may yield theories or at least questions for further study.

In order to assure reliability, validity, and ethical procedure, each of the transcripts were sent to the corresponding respondent for his or her approval, corrections, additions, deletions, always with the possibility that the respondent might want to remove themselves from the study. After written permission to use
the transcripts was received the researcher then wrote a detailed analysis of the research data based on the unitized and categorized data. That analysis was then sent to each corresponding respondent who then sent back his or her approval. Only then was the final report written. Each respondent will receive the tapes of their interviews as well as the transcripts and a copy of the final report.

In order to fairly describe the profile of the students interviewed for this project it is to be remembered that, in Perry's words, "The person is always larger than the theory" (Parks, p. 41).

III. An Analysis of the Data
With a Description of Each Respondent

The five entering students selected for this study represent the following religious backgrounds: Roman Catholic, Baptist, Mormon, Pentecostal Assembly of God, and no particular affiliation. There were three women and two men selected, four eighteen years of age and one whose eighteenth birthday was a month after the interviews.

The organization of the data from all five respondents yielded initially 252 categories, though upon perusal of the categories the reader will discover that many of the
categories were similar in each of the respondents' list of categories. The number of categories was reduced for each respondent (see Appendix B for details of categorization). The 252 categories were eventually reduced to ten categories providing a composite profile of all five students.

The ten categories are listed below in the order of the category with the greatest number of units of data to the category with the fewest number of units of data. The categories are: 1. Parents (191 units), 2. Morality (188 units), 3. Conflict and Struggle (182 units), 4. How to get to Heaven (173 units), 5. Being religious (167 units), 6. Self-reflections and self-descriptions (158 units), 7. God (137 units), 8. Abortion and Homosexuality (132 units), 9. College experiences (109 units), 10. Satan (47 units).

The importance of looking at this arrangement of the categories is based upon the interview method. Using the open-ended approach of grounded theory, the respondent determined the ultimate direction of the interview. A single list of questions from Fowler's research manual was used with all of the respondents to start the interview and to suggest the direction of the interview. However, such questions were not used as the only appropriate questions. If, for example, the student had more to discuss regarding questions pertaining to his or her parents then more questions were
asked on that subject. Therefore, the order of the named categories will indicate what subjects appeared to be of greater interest to the respondents.

However, because this is a qualitative study and not a quantitative study, the number of units of data does not necessarily indicate the significance of the category. What it does do is direct the researcher's attention toward possible patterns that begin to form. Before any conclusions can be made about patterns in the data, the data must be re-read and studied to determine what the significance is of the category and what the data itself tells us beyond the simple number of units of data.

Three categories appear to be very close together in the number of "units" of information which might lead one to assume there is little significant difference between these categories so far as the interests and concerns of the students are concerned. Upon closer inspection one finds that though the categories "Parents," "Morality," and "Conflict and Struggle" appear similar through the numbers of units of data, there is a greater difference when one sees how the numbers are distributed among the five respondents.

The 188 units of data in the "Morality" category are fairly evenly distributed among the five students (see Appendix B for details). It is the category of "Parents" in
which the greatest difference becomes apparent.

Three of the respondents, pseudonyms: Frank, Mary, and Lorinda, spoke far more about their parents and their relationship with their parents than (pseudonyms) Mark and Alice. The frequency of references about parents and a struggle with parents one might expect from eighteen year old students. However, in the interviews of Mark and Alice this was not the case. Mark's interviews yielded only eight units concerning his parents and Alice's only thirteen. Frank's yielded sixty-one, Mary's yielded fifty-eight, and Lorinda's fifty-one. Frank, Mary, and Lorinda all indicated that they had experienced significant conflict with their parents. Mark and Alice both said that they had always had good relationships with their parents.

Frank stood out among the respondents on the number of units of data in both the "Parent" and the "Conflict and Struggle" categories. When looking at the other categories the only other category where Frank dominated was the category entitled "God" in which he had forty-five units of data. That category had to do with the student's perceptions of God. However, there did not appear to be any great differences in the "God" category among the other respondents. There did not appear to be any other appreciable differences between Frank's "units" count and the
count of the other respondents in the categories other than "Parents," "Conflict and Struggle," and "God."

When this great difference in distribution in the "Parent" category appeared this researcher raised the question, "Is there any connection between the differences of the perceived relationships of each student with his or her parents and the differences that might appear in any other categories?" Because one might expect eighteen year old students to be in conflict with their parents the number of units of data in the "Parent" category alone did not raise the question, rather the question was raised as a result of several readings of the interviews and the units of data. There was something more than simply adolescent rebellion against parents. Did any of the other respondents have anything in common with Frank's numbers? As has been mentioned above, Mary and Lorinda shared the dominance of the "Parent" category with Frank. A further question was raised, "Do Frank, Mary, and Lorinda share any other similarities in the ten categories?"

Lorinda dominated in the "Morality" category that had to do with the student's perception of what was right and wrong, good and bad, sinful and blessed, with fifty-two units of data. Frank had twenty-one units of data, and Mary had thirty-eight. These numbers did not appear much different
than the thirty-six units of data from Mark and the forty-one from Alice. There did not seem to be a great difference as far as the numbers were concerned. The same was true of the other categories except, "How to get to Heaven," "Self-reflections," and "Conflict and Struggle."

The focus of the analysis narrowed to the four categories that seemed to offer some interesting differences. The numbers of Frank, Mary, and Lorinda in the "Parents" category seemed dramatically different than the numbers of Mark and Alice in the same category. To determine if there was any significance to this dramatic difference, the other nine categories were more closely scrutinized thus yielding the four categories mentioned above.

Mark and Alice appeared to dominate in the number of units in the "How to get to Heaven" category with fifty-nine and forty-two units of data respectively. Frank, Mary, and Lorinda had thirty-one, thirteen, and twenty-eight units of data. Though this was not the dramatic difference that was found in the "Parents" category, it did seem to link Mark and Alice in one group and Frank, Mary, and Lorinda in another group.

The "Self-reflections" category provided some difficulty. Frank, Mary, and Lorinda each had twenty-two, twenty-six, and twenty-three units of data respectively.
However, Mark had only four units as compared to Alice's eighty-three units of data. In the other categories there seemed to be a symmetrical pattern that linked Frank, Mary, and Lorinda together and Mark and Alice together. However, in "Self-reflections" the same symmetry did not exist between Mark and Alice. Was this a significant difference that would invalidate the apparent connection between Mark and Alice? This also raised the question as to what connection the numbers indicated. A closer look at this category will be reviewed in a detailed analysis of each respondent (see, Bolen, 1994, Faith Development Interviews of Five First-Year Students at a Christian Coalition College: A Critical Summation, Appendix A).

The "Conflict and Struggle" category also yielded an interesting distribution of cards among the five student respondents. Frank had several more units of data than anyone else among the respondents. Frank had eighty-six units of data as compared to Mary's seventeen, Mark's thirty-five, Lorinda's twenty-eight, and Alice's sixteen units of data.

Apparently the only significant difference was the number of units of data of Frank as compared with everyone else. Mary and Lorinda did not seem to have a significantly different number of units than did Mark and Alice. Mark had
more in common, by numbers, with Frank than any of the other respondents. How could this be? Having read each of the interviews several times and finding a connection among the respondents Frank, Mary, and Lorinda in the other categories, led to the hypothesis that there was something in the "Conflict and Struggle" category that would connect Frank with Mary and Lorinda that did not connect Frank with Mark or Alice.

Upon closer examination of each of the transcripts of the respondents, Mark and Alice both appeared to be more open and confident in their interviews on all subjects than did Frank, Mary, or Lorinda. This led the researcher to wonder if in fact this might be the "connection" that binds Frank, Mary, and Lorinda together in one group and Mark and Alice in another.

Frank, Mary, and Lorinda expressed both significant conflict throughout their interviews and conflict in their perceived relationship with their parents. In their individual discussions one finds that the theme of the conflict with their parents is played out in the conflict they experienced in other topics. The numbers in the category "Parents" corroborates the dominance of the perceptions of conflict with the parents of Frank, Mary, and Lorinda. However, this conflict does not appear to be as clearly
corroborated by the number of units of data in the category "Conflicts and Struggle."

The concern was whether or not the conflict that was perceived in the interviews with Frank, Mary, and Lorinda was significantly similar in intensity and focus. There was some conflict in the interviews of Alice and Mark, but it seemed that the conflict was not nearly as intense and did not focus on the parents or on the beliefs of the parents as did the conflict found in the interviews of Frank, Mary, and Lorinda.

The "Self-reflections" category also yielded an image of Alice, who dominated the category, as one who was self-confident. The same could be said of Mark's self-reflections. However, for Frank, Mary, and Lorinda, their self-reflections were bound up in their perceptions of their parents. Again, we find the central focus of a perceived conflicted relationship with the parents in Frank, Mary, and Lorinda's interviews.

Frank was in deep conflict with his parents over their neglecting him because of their work using the word "abandoned"(00025) to describe his feelings. Frank was also in conflict with his father over his father's adherence to Calvinistic predestination. "My dad would like for me to say that I'm a Calvinist"(00054).

It was clear to me that Frank's parents kept a "tight"
grip on him and tried to control him when in high school. "He (father) had a tight watch on me all the time" (00025.)

His father taught at Frank's high school and his mother was the insurance agent who took care of Frank's car insurance. His mother "picked out the kind of car I was to get because it was safer on the insurance" (00025). His father controlled what friends he hung around with and his mother controlled what kind of car he drove.

I mean they didn't trust...it seemed like they didn't trust my friends and that seemed like they didn't trust me...I thought they were over-protective...they wouldn't let me go out with my friends...I didn't have much room to move (00025).

Though Frank claimed that "tension was high," and "...our family started to grow apart," and that while in his early years at high school he "...hardly talked to" his parents, because "I was usually upset with them," Frank claims to have a good relationship with his parents now (00025). However, in the rest of the interview this researcher found Frank often alluding negatively to his parents in his answers to questions on other topics.

In his discussion of God he used the same language he had used in reference to his parents. Frank had said of his parents "...it's just like they had my life covered" (00025) and when talking about God he again said (this he said a day
after he had said his parents had him covered), "He's (God) just got everything covered" (00024). Frank also alluded to the control his parents exercised over him when referring to the power of God. God is "watching me and I need to watch my actions" (00024), not unlike his father who had "a tight watch on me all the time" (00025).

Frank, when interviewed, fit Park's description of "conscious conflict" which may emerge,

as an increasing curiosity, a devastating shattering of assumptions, a vague restlessness, an intense weariness with things as they are, a body of broken expectations, an interpersonal conflict, or a discovery of intellectual dissonance (Parks, 1986, p. 117).

Frank was confused about predestination, he was afraid of being misled by "Christian evolutionist" professors, he sought ways to protect his faith, he was determined to stick with what his parents had taught him. Frank even referred to what was going on inside of him as a "warfare." He was "overwhelmed" by his experience with a "Christian evolutionist" professor.

I had to run back to my room, and sit there and read the Bible, read Genesis and say I got to do this, if not then he's (Christian evolutionist professor) going to have this seed planted inside my head that we evolved, and it bugged me for a long time (00054).

According to what has been presented above concerning
the various developmental theories, the "Christian evolutionist" professor was probably not the only cause of conflict for Frank. What appeared to be dominate in the interview was Frank's concerns about his parents. This researcher would argue that Frank was suffering an inner struggle between his parent's beliefs and what he was hearing and learning at College.

Frank had experienced freedom from his parents upon going to college. Though his parents "come up just about every weekend to see me, and my races, and my events, and I dee now that they love me"(00025) Frank was still on his own during the week. This new-found freedom was both liberating and troubling for Frank. It seemed the tighter the hold his parents tried to have on Frank the more conflicted he was.

Frank had two voices in all of his answers. He had a forceful and confident tone always in accordance with the teachings and traditions of his parents. He also had a voice that was more thoughtful, quiet, and reflective and often in conflict with his perceptions of his father's beliefs.

At one point it sounded as if Frank was close to rejecting the Calvinism of his father, but then he would relent and simply claim that he didn't know very much about it and had to study more before he could decide anything. On the matter of Calvinism, Frank said, "I'm saying I'm
Calvinist because it's like going, the family is Republican, so I'm Republican'(00054). He is beginning to "research Calvinism now...to see if the beliefs are what I can, if I can understand the beliefs"(00054).

However, in the course of the interview I would challenge the Calvinistic doctrine by asking why God had foreordained man to fall, to which Frank responded, "...maybe it was so we could love Him (God) more through faith"(00054). Then I would bring up the obvious contradiction, that if God ordains everything, how can Frank properly say we can love God, would it not be God causing us to love Him, and if that is so, Frank's answer was off the mark. I was careful not to push him too far in introducing the internal contradictions I have found in Calvinism, although Frank seemed willing to deal with the contradictions.

Frank spoke in his reflective voice when he said,

Well, gee, everytime I start thinking about this, taking a shower, or just walking down the street, if everything is foreordained or predestined why is what I do matter because it is already planned, it's going to happen anyway. The question is, if everything is predestined and some people are going to choose God and some aren't and we can't do anything about it, it's just going to happen, then why do we need ministers?(00054).

Following this introspective statement of doubt about his father's Calvinism, he spoke in a more confident and
stronger voice,

Then something told me inside, it could have been God telling me or it could have been me just realizing, it's the fact that everybody needs the chance to hear because they are not going to know unless they hear (00054).

Frank did not hear the apparent contradiction his inner voice gave as an answer to predestination because what Frank said did not answer the problem he had previously raised. The further question could be asked of the above statement from the confident Frank, "why do we have to hear? You just said yourself that if everything is preordained then we have nothing to do with whether we are saved or not. So why do we have to hear?" I wondered at the time if the inner voice was God or his father, or if there was any difference between the two in Frank's psyche.

Frank summed up his state of "conscious conflict" when he said,

Well, the things that I am reading not all of them I like and not all of them do I agree with. And so I don't know what is what I believe there or what I think I believe or what I think I know is exactly right. I'm researching it and it's kind of like a trapped feeling and until I understand it I'm going to feel like I kind of am trapped...it's all messed up inside (00054).

Was Frank trapped by his perception of an over-powering father? Was he trapped by his own fears and anxieties raised
in this new consciousness full of conflict? Frank was a person who seemed to be between things. He was torn between his received beliefs and what he was learning on campus. Frank was the epitome of Parks' description of the college student in conflict. However, for Frank the conflict was apparently one with his parents, and father more specifically, that permeated his perceptions of reality.

Mary also perceived a deep conflict with her parents. In her case it had led to physical violence in the family. Mary had come to college that Fall from a family shelter after having been taken out of the home.

My dad was abusive and my mom was abusive ...and I just got to the point where I started to hit back and to me that was the point where I had to get out right then...it wasn't good for me to be at home (00086).

With the violence that Mary received at the hands of her father and step-mother it was somewhat surprising to discover how much she shared the beliefs she had attributed to her parents. Mary's parents were strong Mormons, a commitment that Mary shared, and her parents had some strong opinions about various moral issues. Mary seemed to share those opinions in her answers concerning homosexuality and abortion. Mary appeared to be homophobic in her response to the question asking for her opinions about homosexuality.
I can sit in the same room with a homosexual if I don't think about it, but then I start to get jittery and I got to get up and move and gotta get away. If you're a brought-up Christian...I don't think you would really have that problem (being homosexual)...I don't think a Christian who was brought up Christian and understands Christianity, you know, completely, I don't think they would do that (homosexuality) (00099).

When asked what she would think if it was ever proven that a person is born homosexual and does not choose to be homosexual, she responded,

They they better get that physical reason fixed! Yuch! You better take a pill or something...I already have my mind made up, it's immoral...(00099).

On questions of morality her reactions were always strong and certain. The apparent conflict in Mary was with herself and whether or not she and her father and step-mother could ever get back together again. She had lived with her step-mother since she was six months old, and referred to her as "mom," however, Mary made it clear that she "hated (my) mom." Mary believed that her biological mother was dead, but her father told her when she was eight years old that her biological mother had tried to commit suicide when Mary was two months old and was paralyzed from the self-inflicted gunshot wound to her mouth. Mary did not elaborate as to why her father left her mother.

I mean, they lied. My mom (step-mom) and I don't get along at all. We never did. I
did feel total hatred for...I couldn't even be in the same room with my mom (step-mom). And, uh, she would just, she would tell me she hated me and I couldn't handle being with her...but I never hated my dad, I never...

Mary's voice trailed off. Though she feels this way toward her step-mother, I never heard her refer to her as her "step" mom, only mom.

Mary had clasped onto her faith with a firm grip in the face of the abuse she had received at the hands of her parents. Mary apparently had no trust in home life, she had no trust in her parents, who had lied to her about her natural mother, and in her conflicted responses, she had little trust in herself.

In addition to her discovery of her biological mother's existence, Mary contracted diabetes while in middle-school. A negative self-image emerged when Mary began to talk about her diabetes. She used phrases like, "I'm less than a person," wanting to be "...normal like everyone else," and "...I'm not superior"(00093). The only other time Mary used such negative terms was in reference to her parents.

This inner conflict was balanced by what appeared to be self-confidence. Though she spoke negatively about her diabetes, she did speak positively about her abilities as a person. However, it became clear to me that she was a perfectionist in everything she did,
I'm very much a perfectionist...(00072).

It appeared to me that perfectionism prevented her from being at ease with herself.

The focus of Mary's discussion came down to her dream of having a wonderful family, one not like hers. She referred to her volleyball team at the college as a "family,"

Our whole team is just a big unit, we never argue and we never bicker...you could say it's like a family, but families argue, fight and bicker, and we don't, we're just like one unit, that's the way it should be (00076).

When asked if her life had a purpose, Mary responded,

Growing up and having a family, being responsible, raising a family, really, just raising a family, not like my parents, I don't want to have a family like they did...I want to have a career and everything...(00093).

With Mary one could say that everything revolved around her coping with the abuse she received from her parents. This did not manifest itself in an angry God, rather in a very loving God who cares and forgives. It seemed to the interviewer that God, for Mary, was most likely the father she never had, or wished she had. However, God is in complete control,

From thoughts we have to why we eat some things, in my mind, He (God) has control over when we sleep and when we eat, everything (00067).
Though God is in control, we do have free choice, a conflict in reasoning that didn't seem to bother Mary.

I believe in choice. He (God) gives us choices, but He also knows what choice we'll make before we make it (00067).

I questioned her as to how it could be that God had complete control and yet we still had a "choice" as to what we would do.

God will give us more than one choice so we can choose so that teaches us and that helps us to become better, you know, and helps us grow as people (00067).

God can be in control and yet we still have free choice. The solid rock in Mary's world is her faith in a loving and yet controlling God.

Mary was very clear in her dualistic views. She was seeking identity in her volleyball team, and believed in the morality of reciprocity. Mary's faith development had clear evidence of a Stage Three structure of meaning-making. Though it appeared that she had traces of Stage Four thinking, in that she had an open attitude toward other religious traditions,

I believe they (Jews, Muslims) can get to heaven so long as they believe in God. Once you get there I think you'll be taught, I believe the Church of Jesus Christ is right...and Mormons will be there in heaven to teach all non-Mormons the truth (00090).
It appeared that Mary was accepting other religions because she believed that they would all conform to Mormonism after getting to heaven. She wasn't as open and tolerant as it first appeared. Again, the conflict in Mary, as it was in Frank, was focused on her parents. Mary's conflict was also focused upon herself almost as if she was part of the cause of the violence she received from her parents, which seems to be the case with victims of abuse. By taking into account the nature and intensity of the conflicts in Mary's interviews one sees that Mary does share something in common with Frank in that her perceptions of her parents and her relationship with them dominates her interviews.

Lorinda was another of the students who appeared to perceive a deep conflict with her parents. Lorinda is the only child in her family. She refers to the "closeness" of her family that "...it's just the three of us" (000162). This closeness does not seem to be a very positive situation because Lorinda spoke of how "controlling" her parents were,

...they, just like, put the bit in my mouth if I'm going too fast and yank back, because they don't want me getting hurt (000162).

Lorinda was quick to point out how much she appreciated her parents and how much they cared for her.

Lorinda also spoke of the tension that exists between
she and her mother. This tension expressed itself in the way
Lorinda perceived her mother trying to control her, even at
college,

I look at it, she'll say if she doesn't
know about it (whatever Lorinda is doing),
God always knows, which I mean, I know
that, but like she'll say it like it's
guilt trip time...and if she finds out
about something I didn't tell her about...
whew, am I in trouble (000162).

Lorinda is supposed to call home so many times a week,
and apparently gets into trouble if she doesn't.

I'm supposed to call home on Monday
night and Thursday night, but it was
spaced during the week and I chose the
weekend, I didn't get to call her
until the sixteenth, ooh, I caught it
(000162).

She also said that she likes to talk to her dad, and
will often not call home if she thinks her dad would not be
home. When asked who she would go to in her family just to
talk she said without hesitation,

If I have to I will go to my dad (000179).

Lorinda has been in a struggle to establish her own
identity while at college. Clearly she lives in two worlds,
college and home.

...and usually at home I am really particular
about what I say, because I'm always afraid
that, it's not that I'm going to say something
wrong, it's just that people can take a lot
out of proportion. When I'm at college,
I'm something that's just my own view. This
is a better school away from home (000161).

Lorinda appears to be happier at college and relishes being on her own and developing her own "reputation." Lorinda made several references in the interview about establishing a new life, forgetting the rough times in high school, being known just for herself (000161).

The conflict with her parents came into clearer focus when she began speaking about her grandmother. She hates her step-grandmother. She became Lorinda's step-grandmother before Lorinda was born, yet Lorinda cannot call her "grandma."

I hate her. I didn't love her, I didn't, she always wanted me to call her grandmother and I wouldn't do it (000163).

Lorinda hated the way her step-grandmother stood over grandfather when he was dying of cancer and said, why don't they just put him out of his misery (000163).

Lorinda admitted that because of high rates of cancer in the family she was afraid someday she might be lying in a hospital bed and she did not want her step-grandmother standing over her saying the same thing.

The conflict with her step-grandmother seemed to also involve her mother. Lorinda's mother was very involved in caring for her grandfather when Lorinda was in high school which led to feelings of resentment from Lorinda toward her
mother,

My mother would fix them breakfast, lunch and dinner, make sure they had something to eat that night, then she would feed him (grandfather) because at different points he couldn't eat by himself, she would help him to the restroom, etc., and she would leave like five-o'clock in the morning and not get home until 9:30 at night...I was young and there by myself, I mean, and I was getting up and going to school by myself...and it takes a toll on me because, you like, where's my mom? Why did she do that when my step-grandmother was healthy and just sat around while she(mom) waited on them (000162).

Her hatred for her step-grandmother caused a conflict within Lorinda. Lorinda knew what she had been taught about loving and forgiving others, but she simply could not do that with her step-grandmother. Lorinda and I had attended a chapel service just before her interview and the President of the college had talked about the duty of Christians to reconcile themselves to those with whom they are in conflict,

Yeh, because he (College President) made the statement that you need to be open and clarify something to people, and I guess I'm wrong because eventually, to be totally correct with God I will need to talk to her (step-grandmother) about it (000163).

Lorinda was very straight forward in her approach to her faith. There is a right and a wrong faith, there is evil and good, there is Satan and God, and God is in control of
everything.

Lorinda appeared to share with Frank an image of God that reflected the image she had of her parents. Just as her parents "put the bit in my mouth," so God has complete control,

He (God) knows everything you do and say, He knows your inner thoughts, and so you don't get away with anything on that part. He will allow things to happen but things, they are under His control (000170).

Lorinda also used words and phrases such as, "get into trouble," "not being disapproved of," "somebody over them," and "He's (God) not going to allow anything to happen to me to brand me," words she had used in reference to the discipline she had perceived her parents exercising on her.

Lorinda also shared with both Frank and Mary a belief in a form of predestination,

He (God) does things the way He wants them done. God's will, the way He sees for things to go is the way things are going to happen. Things may be side-tracked, but eventually what He had intended to happen will happen (000170).

It is interesting that neither Mark nor Alice proposed any form of predestination, rather they both emphasized the "freedom" they each had in their own lives and that the future was not pre-determined, though Alice said, "God could
know if He wanted to."

When asked questions about abortion and homosexuality, Lorinda was not as certain as this researcher had thought. She kept saying that she couldn't judge others. When asked if abortion was wrong in every situation, she said,

Not in every situation (000201).

She wasn't even sure of what sin was, or that anybody could know what sin was. When asked whether homosexuality was a sin or not, she said,

You find it in the Bible saying that it was wrong, but I couldn't prove that it was a sin...I could tell you that it was, but then I would be judging, so I can't do that (000201).

When discussing what made something right, her response sounded like a child in Kohlberg's Stage One level of morality,

What makes an action right? It's when we know that it's not going to be disapproved of (000203).

By whom, she would not elaborate. When pushed on what would be a proper perspective in determining whether or not an action was right, she answered,

Just do things for Christ. Because otherwise you will get into trouble (000203).

Again, the question was raised, "In trouble with whom?" She responded, "Well, you know, with Jesus, God...(chuckle),
Was this another indicator of some kind of connection between her perceived conflict with her parents and how she interpreted everything else? It is not known whether or not Lorinda's views on abortion and homosexuality are those of her parents or those she developed apart from her parents. What is clear is that Lorinda is happy to be away from home developing an identity at college. The conflict experienced and expressed by Lorinda in the interviews seem to find a way back to either her parents or her step-grandmother. That is what Lorinda seems to share in common with Frank.

On the issues of homosexuality and abortion, Lorinda appeared to be much more tolerant of differing opinions than were Frank and Mary. However, that was the only area in the interviews where the beliefs of the three were not in harmony. Even at that, Lorinda did voice a personal objection to abortion and homosexuality, and so one could argue that the three could at least agree on personal grounds on those issues as well.

What stands out in the interviews of Frank, Mary, and Lorinda is the constant thread of conflict with the parents that ran through the entire interview. This may not seem to much of a revelation for many would claim adolescents perceive conflict with their parents as a rule. What is
unique about the perceptions expressed in these interviews is to be found not in the usual conflict between older adolescents and their parents, rather in the similarity of conflict with self, new ideas, moral issues, religious issues, and the similar language used in the expression of this conflict. It appeared the greater the perceived conflict with the parents the more the same language was used in reference to other areas of conflict. Again, what the connection is, even if there is one, can not be conclusively determined by this study. What can come of this study are further questions for research, a subject to be covered in the conclusion.

Alice and Mark, the two that had very few things to say about their parents, seemed, on the whole, to have a more level approach to everything else. Mark showed no apparent inward struggles with his views. He loves his parents and has a deep respect for them.

Well, I have a tremendous amount of respect for my parents. I know a lot of people my age sometimes just now are starting to come through and think that maybe their parents aren't so bad, but my parents, they're, and I mean this when I say this, they're two of my best friends. You know, I can talk to them, I'm really open with them and thy know what I do and I feel real comfortable talking to my parents. And that helps me respect them as just, as people. I get along really well with them (00121).
Mark is devoutly Catholic and goes along with the Catholic stance on all moral issues. He believes that what the Pope says is true and that in church matters the Pope is infallible.

Yeh. I believe that, anyhow, in the course of the Catholic Church the Pope doesn't make mistakes...pretty much for me what the Pope says is kind of what I go by...(00151).

Mark shared whe he likes the Catholic Church,

...because the Catholic Church does take a strong stance on many things, that's what I really like about it, they say, you know, this is wrong and this isn't (00151).

Mark appears to be dualistic and narrow in his understanding of religion. However, Mark seemed well adjusted and certain of himself. The problem was that this certainty also implied a blindness to the beliefs and needs of others, which was demonstrated in his comments about his girl-friend.

The question of birth control was brought up by the interviewer, and Mark commented about his girl-friend's views,

And I know her position before that she didn't really think there there was anything wrong with it (birth control), and now she just respects my position on it...Her biggest problem was that she just couldn't understand it, but I think if she truly loved me, which I think she might, she understands that position and respects
it. And she, I know in the future, that she plans...and she's going to go and talk to him (Mark's priest) just so she can understand not to argue, but just so she can better understand about the church's position (00149).

When discussing the Catholic Church's stand against birth control, Mark made it clear that if his Protestant girl-friend truly loved him she would understand and go along with Catholicism. Apparently that is what Mark meant by "respecting" his position on birth control. Mark seemed firm on issues that involved him or his family and his future family whereas on points that did not directly affect him or his family he appeared more flexible.

Mark conveyed the impression that he felt free to consider alternative viewpoints when presented.

I don't believe I'm perfect. And I have made mistakes in judgment and I think you have to look to something else. When a person thinks he is always right, that is where you get into trouble...(00104).

Even on the question of biblical interpretation, something in which he seemed to take a narrow stand,

...when the church tells me something about the Bible, I pretty much take that as fact (00122),

he continued in a reflective explanation of his understanding of biblical interpretation in general,

Well, on the Bible the one thing I do realize is that it depends on who's
reading it. Because a lot of things
I've noticed about the Bible, I may
not agree with some other people on
this, it can be interpreted a lot
of ways (00122).

Mark never claimed only one true interpretation of
Scripture provided by the Catholic Church. When he spoke of
the Catholic Church being the best religion, he was intending
it to refer for him personally. When asked if he believed
Catholicism was right, he said,

I believe I'm right or else I wouldn't
be in the faith that I am. If I had a
shadow of a doubt, in my opinion, that
I was...then I wouldn't be in that...(00124).

When asked whether that meant his believing in
Catholicism was right and the beliefs of others that
conflicted with his were wrong, he said,

I mean, I couldn't force them, it's
each person's choice. I couldn't
force them to believe what I believe.
I know there are a lot of faiths
that differ greatly from what my faith
is, yet, I don't say that I don't
like that person because they say
they are...like, I won't like a
Jew...I just don't think that's
right (00124).

I did not see in Mark a nervousness or a sense of self-
doubt in the way he approached the tough moral issues of
abortion and homosexuality. He accepted the church's
position on both points,

I personally believe, and I think
this is the position of the Catholic
Church, but I'm not sure, that life begins at conception. If a pregnancy is threatening a mother and you terminate that pregnancy I think you have already killed one life, and if you let it go, at least the mother has a chance to live, I don't think there has ever been a case where a mother has a 100% chance of dying.

I believe they (Catholic Church) are against homosexuality. I don't believe they believe that it is good.

Mark seemed willing to admit his own bias, "I'm kind of biased," and was comfortable in talking about the way he saw things. Mark exuded self-confidence and a willingness to consider other viewpoints, so long as it was understood that when it came right down to it, he would side with the official Catholic position. Mark like everything neatly tied together and Catholicism did that for him.

It could be argued that Mark seemed more self-confident and less conflicted because he was firmly entrenched in his parent's belief system and felt secure and safe in that setting. Mark did appear to "toe the line" of the beliefs of his family more than did some of the other respondents. According to Parks, Mark was well in to consciously accepting a "received" doctrine from his parents as his own (Parks, 1986, p. 86).

Mark clarified for the interviewer how he knew when something was either right or wrong,
I guess I'll have to go back to my judgment of right and wrong as based on what I consider is my conscience and that's probably been formed by a combination of my parents, my church, and in later years, my beliefs.

The primary difference between Mark and Frank, Mary, and Lorinda, was when he was questioning something, he was never questioning his integrity or his competence to make decisions. Mark, as was mentioned above, did not see any problem with admitting his own limitations while still trusting in his own judgment.

This might explain why, though the number of units in the category "Conflict and Struggle" for Mark was second only to the number of units of data for Frank's, leading one to think that Mark and Frank were both deeply conflicted and so were in the same group. However, the conflict Mark dealt with was not with himself, or with questioning his own competence to make decisions, whereas Frank's conflict was as often with himself and his parents as with anything else.

Alice was the one respondent not involved in varsity sports and was not attached to any particular church. Alice also spoke well of her parents and expressed a deep respect and fondness for both her father and mother.

They (parents) are good, I don know, they set a really good example when I was growing up. And they still do. I have always respected them. Me and
my mom have a really good relationship, 
and she helps me all the time (00223).

Alice seem to be the most willing of all the respondents 
to face the tough moral problems with an open mind. Though 
initially she stated she was against abortion regardless of 
the situation, she admitted that perhaps if the mother's life 
was in danger or if she was pregnant as a result of rape then 
abortion might be the thing to do,

Sometimes I believe that if the mom's, 
if the mother's life is threatened, 
yeh, it would be, uh, I don't know 
if it would be better to take the 
life of the baby...I feel abortion 
is murder no matter when it is, 
I don't know...see I'm not sure how 
I feel in regard to rape or if it's 
dangering the mother's life, I'm 
not sure...I don't know how I feel, 
because I have mixed emotions about 
that...(00225).

Alice admitted that she had difficulty dealing with the 
problem of abortion because of her "feelings" about the 
issue. She was convinced that abortion was murder, but as 
convinced as she appeared, she could not close the door on 
the possibility that there might be extenuating circumstancs 
that would make abortion a "necessary evil."

Alice took a consequentialist approach to morality, in 
that she was concerned about the consequences of an action 
rather than whether or not it was a rule that had to be 
followed. That seemed to be the source of her uncertainty
about abortion, how can one know what the eventual consequences will be if one aborts or not? When asked whether an action was right or wrong and how one could determine when an action was moral, she said,

Well, maybe not the action itself, but maybe the consequence of the action is right or wrong... Something is right if it helps better yourself and it doesn't hurt anybody else...(00213).

If the consequences of an action would hurt another person or oneself, then it is probably wrong. She did not interpret what was right or wrong based on what the Bible said, rather what consequences would follow from such an action.

Alice did display some struggle with identity and purpose in her life. She came across as a very independent young woman, yet one who wasn't sure who she was or,

Where do I fit? I don't really know where I fit right now, I just kind of live and just get through...(00245).

She seemed at ease in speaking of her struggle for identity. One could argue that Alice was experiencing the same struggle for identity that all older adolescents face, and in a sense that is true, however, something is different. Alice, in the context of her interviews, was one who appeared to have "permission" to seek an identity. She was not
worried about the search for identity. She exuded a trust in herself that she attributed to the way she was raised by her parents.

Her parents had taught her to make her own decisions and then live with the consequences.

They (parents) always try to show us what's right, you know, they never tell us, like, don't do this because it's wrong, they let us make our own decisions, you know, and we learn from our own mistakes, but they try to guide us in the right direction (00223).

That's something (making decisions) that my parents have always let us (she and her brother) do. They always really, they support us in whatever we decide to do (00223).

It appeared to me that Alice was fairly comfortable with the ambiguity of life for an eighteen year old first-year college student. She had a freedom of choice that was expressed in her interviews that was not present in the interviews of Frank, Mary, or Lorinda. Though she did not yet know where she "fit" in, she was confident that one day she would find her own "niche." This self-confidence reflected the confidence she had in her parents.

Alice took a very personal approach to every question asked in her interviews. She would turn a general question into a personal question. When asked about homosexuality,
she would begin to talk about how she had never been around homosexuals and that is probably why she did not think it was normal. When asked if a homosexual could be a Christian, she said,

Well, see, I don't know, because I don't know all of what the Bible says about that, so I'm not real sure, I don't have any right to say that that's wrong and that's right (00225).

Alice did make it clear that,

Well, I think, I don't think homosexuality is right, you know I think, but that's just my personal opinion...(00225).

When asked why she felt that way about homosexuality, she said,

Probably just because of where I've grown up, I haven't been exposed to it when I was, I mean, I don't know if I've ever been around somebody that's gay, as far as I know I haven't. And it's just one of those things that I haven't been brought up with. I'm sure that if I had lived in a bigger town, you know, it would be common...(00225).

She expressed the same view that how we have been raised and where we have grown up will determine what religion we have, therefore, she was not willing to condemn other religions,

Um, I guess, I mean I wouldn't say, I wouldn't tell them (people of other religions), I'd say you're wrong and I'm right, you know, but, it seems
that Jesus is who we worship but we still all worship God, you know, Jesus is just our symbol, just like their symbols, you know, I wouldn't condemn them for feeling the way they feel, you know...I'd say people are born into their religion. Plus, most of the time, if their parents are religious then they will be religious (00236).

When asked about other religions, she spoke of her limited understanding and experience of other religions and therefore was concerned not to judge too harshly what she did not understand.

Alice took a position on most issues from what Fowler would refer to as a Stage Four level of faith development. Alice looked to herself for permission and depended upon herself for making decisions. All of the respondents were asked who gave them permission to be who they are and do what they do, Frank, Mary, and Lorinda all referred to God, parents, and finally themselves. When Alice was asked who gave her permission to do what she does in her life she quickly said, "Myself" (00245).

It feels good to be your own person. Because that way if you make the right choices, you do, but if you messed up then it's a learning experience and you try to do better next time...it's a good feeling to be able to make your own decisions and know you made the right decisions (00245).

You are responsible for your own
actions (00245).

She desired close friendships but also seemed willing to stand against anyone who would deny her friendship on any other basis than that of taking her for who she was,

If I am friends with someone and they do not want to be friends with me because of what I believe, then they are not much of a friend (00245).

Alice expressed an openness in her approach to the world around her. She was not troubled by different religions, different traditions, different beliefs, or different opinions. Alice probably had the number of units in the "Self-reflections" category because she is at that point in her development where she is discovering herself and finding a new relationship with the world around her. She was conscious of her struggles for identity and her changing relationships. Alice was one who apparently had objectively taken an assessment of herself. Though she personalized much of the interviews, she also was able to stand outside of her beliefs and take a critical look at herself.

There was something in the experiences and perceptions of these five students that involved more than just adolescent rebellion from parents. There was at the base of their perceptions a level of trust that was greater for Mark and Alice than it was for Frank, Mary, and Lorinda. Why? Do the perceptions of their parents give any indication why one
student would have a higher level of self-trust and trust in others?

IV. Do The Perceptions Children Have of Their Parents Affect Children's Perceptions of the World?

This study was based upon a grounded theory approach to a qualitative analysis of the data. Such an approach required that Fowler's theory be set aside so that the data would be allowed to produce categories that would lead to the properties (in this case the perceived relationship the students had with their parents) and the hypotheses (that there is a connection between students' perceptions about their parents and how they perceive their world, and thus how they develop in their faith as meaning-making) (Merriam, 1988, p. 145). Such an approach may result in conclusions having little to do with the original intent of the study.

The study was begun with an effort to further explore the validity of Fowler's theory by investigating whether or not his theory is self-serving, whether it does take into account any gender differences in the formation of the stages themselves, and if church affiliation, or lack thereof, has any bearing on one's faith development. As the study progressed it became evident to this researcher that the data
was leading toward the concern over perceived parental relationships. There appeared to be no other marked difference between the students. It did not seem to matter what affiliation the students had, their faith perceptions of moral issues, other religions, and life on campus appeared to parallel not religious affiliation but parental perceptions.

Each of the students shared a positive attitude toward the college. The only concern that was mentioned was the nature of chapel on Wednesdays. Mary said, "I don't like all of the modern music they use. We just never used music like that in the Mormon church." On the other hand, Alice said, "I wish they would sing happier and bouncier songs during chapel, get some feeling in it!" Mark liked chapel, but being Catholic he was quick to add, "but it doesn't take the place of mass." None of the students objected to attending chapel. Frank seemed to think chapel once a week wasn't enough, "I wish they would have chapel more."

Frank wished the college was more "Christian,"

I don't know why they allow non-Christians here. Maybe it's to provide an opportunity for us to witness to those who don't know Jesus. I wish we would just have, like a Christian commune just for Christians. But, I know they can't turn away somebody just because they aren't Christian.

Though the students seemed to generally share their
attitudes about the college, what was different was the level of inner conflict expressed by each student and the perceptions each student had of his or her parents.

For Frank, Mary, and Lorinda, the focus was on their perception of the struggle they expressed concerning their parents. The struggle and conflict was manifested throughout their interviews. The struggle and conflict with their parents seemed to be paralleled in their inward struggle. The sense of security and trust that was exhibited in Mark and Alice was manifested, not in the absence of any struggle, rather in the confidence with which they each faced their struggles.

I never heard the kind of anxiety about their struggles from Mark and Alice that I did from Frank, Mary, and Lorinda. Before seeing the pattern in the final ten categories I had forgotten about the uncertainty expressed by Frank, Mary, and Lorinda when asked the simple question, "who gives you permission?" In going back through the interviews the fact that Mark and Alice both answered the question with a confident, "I do, myself," stood out.

When looking at the five students it seemed the students who struggled most with their parents were also struggling with what they would commit themselves. On the other hand, the students that had a very close and harmonious
relationship with their parents seemed comfortable in consciously committing themselves to the "received" doctrines of their parents. However, Mark and Alice's loyalty to their parents' beliefs was not blind, nor was it absolute. The same could be said of Frank, Mary, and Lorinda, the significant difference was though they did not necessarily agree with everything their parents believed, they struggled without any perceived permission to do so, rather out of rebellion against their parents.

James Fowler does address, somewhat, the role of parents in the development of faith in the child. In his discussion of Stage Two, Mythic-Literal Faith, Fowler makes the point that the Stage Two structure of faith takes the form of the perspective taking of the parents as the decision-makers, the external authority (Fowler, 1981, p. 141). Fowler also indicates that the image of God takes the form of the child's perceived image of the parent (Fowler, 1981, p. 143). In Fowler's discussion of Stage Three, Synthetic-Conventional Faith, he said,

Authority for Linda's (a person in a Stage Three structure of faith) beliefs, religious and moral, resides principally with her parents. She has strongly identified with their feelings and standards and feels that they are her own (Fowler, 1981, p. 157).

In Fowler's latest book, Weaving the New Creation, he
writes that the adolescent, no matter how good the parenting, will...

...struggle for a sense of assured worth and must come to terms with the deep residues of shame that resulted from the early childhood move into differentiation, first consciousness, and selfhood (Fowler, 1991, p. 79).

Fowler also hints at the importance of a good supportive parenting model,

Experiences of affirmation and the confirmation of worth in adolescence open the way for the movement in young adulthood toward the kind of intimacy in which one can offer the self to others without shame and enter into the full nondefensive love of the other (Fowler, 1991, p. 79).

Fowler includes in his latest book an interview of two parents and their sons. At first it seems he will include in his study the perceptions the sons have of their relationship with their parents. Instead, Fowler focuses on the parents and ignores the sons.

The problem is not that Fowler ignores parents and the influence they may have on the child, he never focuses any of his research on the possible difference the perceptions of the child toward his or her parents might have on how one develops in his or her faith. He does not address the possibility of how a child perceives his or her relationship with the parent might make a significant difference in the
level of struggle and conflict as the adolescent searches for identity. Fowler does deal with the role of the parent in the child's life, but always from the parent's perspective and not from the child's perceptions. Does Fowler, in his eagerness for accuracy, ignore the child's perceptions of the parental relationship in favor of the actual relationships with parents?

I appreciate the importance Fowler gives to the parental role in a child's developmental life, but I would argue for the adolescent child the role of the parent cannot be overemphasized. Does an overly restrictive parent as perceived by the adolescent create an environment of great conflict for the adolescent than does the parent who is perceived as less restrictive? Why would an adolescent perceive a parent to be restrictive if on closer scrutiny the parents were found to be fair rather than restrictive? What about the level of trust the adolescent perceives the parent having in him or her?

It seems, according to the patterns in the data of this study, how an adolescent perceives the restrictiveness of a parent coupled with whether the adolescent believes the parent trusts him or her, is parallel with a similar perception of self-trust and conflict in developing an identity.
The importance of the parent in the adolescent's life has been well documented. D.F. Hardy, T.G. Power and S. Jaedicke (1993) collaborated on a study entitled, *Examining the Relation of Parenting to Children's Coping With Everyday Stress*, in which the claim is made that children with parents who provide a very restrictive structure have a greater difficulty coping with stress than do children with parents who provide loving support with a moderate level of structure. A further conclusion stated that how a parent "perceives" the world greatly affects how children deal with stress. J. Keith Miller, in his recent book, *Compelled to Control*, makes the case for tracing our urge as adults to be in control of everything exhibiting images of perfectionism, lack of self-trust, anxiety about the unknown, back to our perceived relationship with our parent or parents. He states,

> Inside, my shame voices worked me over. ‘After all,’ I reasoned, ‘if my own dad doesn't love me, why would anybody else?’ I became an overachiever. But sealed inside my perfectionism and my compulsive need to achieve, I couldn't receive the very affirmation I was working for (Miller, 1992, p. 41).

How a child perceives his or her relationship with his or her parent determines the child's self-perception. R. Kaestner, C. Franz and J. Weinberger (1990) reported on a
twenty-six year longitudinal study of the family origins of adult empathic behavior. Such behavior was defined as having a concern for others and a willingness to learn from others and broaden one's perspectives. The study indicated a direct relationship between parental involvement with the child and how the child was able to develop empathy as an adult. However, this study did not take into account the perceptions of the children on their relationships with their parents.

We read of parents as the role-models for how the child develops relationships. Virginia Satir states, "Without necessarily knowing it, parents are the architects of their children's romantic and sexual selves" (Satir, 1988, p. 144). She further states,

What we have observed and experienced day after day exerts a powerful influence. Most people will choose the familiar, even though uncomfortable, over the unfamiliar, because of that power (Satir, 1988, pp. 144, 145).

Satir addresses the importance of the parent in the adolescent's self-image. As the adolescent begins to deal with the extreme emotions of a new found self-awareness coupled with all of the excess energy of an adolescent, he or she has a great need for the parent or adult to be supportive.

When parents and adults take a balanced attitude toward what is a wonderful,
exciting, and sometimes a frightening journey, they increase their prospects of being successful guides to their adolescents (Satir, 1992, p. 314).

Satir brings up a point Fowler implies when she states, "Through conducting hundreds of repair processes between parents and teenagers, I learned most parents have not completed their own adolescence" (Satir, 1992, p. 317). Fowler provides, in his own research, a position corroborating Satir's perception. Fowler states, "evidence suggests that the majority of adults in our society arrest or equilibrate in either the Mythic-Literal or the Synthetic-Conventional stage" (Fowler, 1991, p. 21). Both of these stages are commonly found in the adolescent's experience. If the parents has such a marked influence on the development of the adolescent, then further study of the adolescent and his or her perceived relationships with his or her parent or parents is all the more important.2

---

2 For other information on the influence of the child's perception of his or her relationship with his or her parent see Chapter Eight in Lillian Rubin's book, Intimate Strangers; also pp. 80, 81 in Margaret Farley's book, Personal Commitments; also pp. 67, 68 in Harriet Lerner's book, The Dance With Anger. See also G.B. Parker, E.A. Barnett and I.B. Hickie, (1992), From Nurture to Network: Examining Links Between Perceptions of Parenting Received in Childhood and Social Bonds in Adulthood, The American Journal of Psychiatry, Julu, 149, pp. 877-85. The significant argument of this article is that children who perceive a level of trust and love from their parents toward them go on to develop strong and more intimate relationships in adulthood. Also R. Kaestner, D.C. Zuroff, and T.A. Powers, (1991), Family Origins of Adolescent Self-Criticism and its
How a child develops his or her perceptions of the world has a lot to do with the development of self-trust which comes from, according to Erik Erikson, the child's intimate environment (Erikson, 1982, p. 79). Why does a child perceive a parent as loving or not? Why does a child perceive a parent as being restrictive or not? Why does a child perceive a parent as being trusting and supportive? Is there a connection between these perceptions and how one makes meaning? Are these perceptions an indicator as to how or whether one will move through Fowler's stages of development?


...the perception of conflict within the family and not the family structure itself may be the dominant factor influencing adolescent autonomy (p. 316).

*Continuity into Adulthood, Journal of Abnormal Psychology, May, 100, p. 191-7.*
Autonomy is an important quality of a Stage Four type of faith (Fowler, 1981).

Dennis Haggray (1993), in his dissertation which focused on his recent faith development study of five students at a church-related college, concluded that "...the values and beliefs that the respondents subscribe to in their lives were passed on from their parents" (p. 157). He also made the following recommendation,

9. Interested researchers may desire to study the impact of family values upon a student's faith development...

Though Haggray does not stipulate a study of the "perceptions" of the student of what family values are, it is clear from the context of his study that one could make such a stipulation. Haggray's study does not provide the clear evidence of the students' perceptions of parental relationships as dominating the data. He used Fowler's theory to define and interpret the data rather than using the grounded theory approach of this study. What his study does indicate is a connection between the beliefs of the parents and the beliefs of the students (see also Maria-Rizzuto, 1980).

These considerations lead to a proposal for further study. These questions need to be asked, "What significance do the perceptions of an adolescent concerning his or her
relationship with his or her parent(s) have on how the adolescent moves through Fowler's stages of faith development?" and "Are the perceptions of an adolescent an indicator for understanding how the adolescent will make meaning out of his or her world?"

Perceptions are extremely important regardless of whether or not they are based on fact or on misunderstandings. How a person perceives the world and makes sense of the world seems to be at the heart of that person's faith (Fowler, 1981, pp. 10-12). Would it not make sense to study more closely those perceptions and especially in connection with the parent(s) given the accepted importance of the role of the parent in the development of the adolescent?

V. Conclusion

Adolescents being in conflict with their parents is not unusual (Pardeck and Pardeck, 1990). This study does demonstrate what appears to be nothing more than the usual conflict adolescents have with their parents. Entering college and being on their own for the first time, experiencing the freedom to make their own decisions, one would expect there to be some conflict with beliefs received
from their parents. What appears to be significant in this study are the two students who did not suffer any perceived conflict with their parents and the way either the absence of or the presence of a perceived conflict with parents paralleled the absence or presence of conflict in making meaning out of the students' experiences.

It is not just the matter of perceived conflict with parents at issue, what is of greater interest to me is the apparent similarity between perceptions of conflict with parents and perceptions of other topics. Conflict in one seemed to parallel conflict in the other. Absence of conflict in one appeared to parallel absence of conflict in the other.

If faith development is about how one makes meaning out of life, then how one perceives his or her relationship with the world will make a great difference in how one will make meaning. If, as Fowler claims, faith gets its start in the early months of infancy in a trust relationship with the parent(s), then it would seem that faith precedes perceptions of the world (Fowler, 1981, pp. 119, 120). How one perceives the world is an indicator of the level of trust and thus faith development of the individual. The perceptions children have of their parents appears to be the formative process for perceptions of all else. Therefore, it would be
irresponsible to simply dismiss the adolescent's perceived conflict with parents as being common so as to ignore the greater affect such perceptions have on the adolescent's view of the world.

The following are the conclusions of this study,

1. There is evidence to suggest a relationship between the perceptions an adolescent has of his or her relationship with his or her parents and how the adolescent perceives all else, and a body of literature in the social sciences may imply support for this conclusion.

2. Because faith formation precedes one's perceptions of the world how we perceive the world indicates the level of one's faith development.

3. Not all adolescents have a perceived conflict with their parents. In the case of the two adolescents of this study the absence of perceived conflict with parents appeared to be paralleled by the presence of self-confidence in dealing with conflict.

4. The three adolescents of this study who had a perceived conflict with their parents appeared to also suffer from self-doubt, uncertainty, anxiety about what to believe, and an identity confusion.

5. Present faith development theory does not adequately address the perceptions of the adolescent regarding his or her parent(s).

6. Though faith development theory provides descriptions explaining many of the perceptions of the adolescents in this study, what it did not explain was the pattern of the data that pointed to the absence of a dominate concern about parents in two of the respondents.

The implication of these conclusions is for further
study in the area of adolescent perceptions of parents and family and whether or not there is a connection between those perceptions and perceptions of all else in and adolescent's life, and what significance such a connection has in understanding an adolescent's level of faith development.
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GENERAL CONCLUSION

I. Introduction

The human being is an interpretive instrument in that we cannot know anything in its own pure state. That is not to say we cannot know anything; it is to say what we do know we have received through a complex process of interpretation. How we perceive the world and understand anything is affected by our prior experiences, level of maturity, sophistication of mental processes, and a faith in something that grounds and centers our self-image. When faith is defined as meaning-making it is in reference to the most fundamental quality of being an interpretive instrument, why one perceives or "sees" "this" rather than "that," and how one understands and makes sense out of what he or she has seen. Our faith will greatly determine what we "see" in our world. That is why understanding faith and how it develops in the college student is as important as understanding moral and psychosocial development.

Faith, as defined in faith development theory, is the very process of making meaning out of the world that is at the core of higher education (Fowler, 1981; Myers, 1991; Rudolph, 1962). Professionals in higher education who work with college students avail themselves of the theories of
human development so that they might be better able to understand the student and what the student is experiencing while in college (Pascanella and Terenzini, 1991). These theories are also important because through human development administrators and developers of curriculum can do a better job of providing the social and educational environment that will maximize the positive experience of intellectual and psychological growth (Barr and Upcraft, 1990).

II. Implications

What has been presented in these four papers is that: 1) faith, as understood in James Fowler's theory of faith development, is not only compatible with the purposes of higher education, it is at the center of that purpose; 2) faith, so understood, does develop in ways that can be measured through the structure of other developmental theories; 3) if that is the case then it would appear that faith development can shed some new light on the other theories as well as how one understands the struggles of the college student; 4) first year entering college students are going through some struggles that can be described through faith development theory; 5) when the first year college student enters college he or she is going through a
transition in his or her relationship with his or her parent(s) that will greatly affect how the student responds to experiences on campus; 6) our level of faith development greatly affects how we perceive the world, but more importantly, what we "see" or perceive as opposed to what we do not "see"; 7) a student's perceptions of his or her parent(s) has some affect upon how the student will develop and what kind of adult the student will become.

III. Research Methodology

The research that supports conclusions 4 and 5 was made up of interviews taken from each of the respondents. These interviews were made up of questions from James W. Fowler's research manual and extemporaneous questions that came up in the interview as a result of the direction the respondent's interests took the interview (see Fowler's questions in Appendix G). Grounded theory and unitizing the data were the qualitative forms of analysis used. When using qualitative research methods the researcher has to involve the respondent in looking at each phase of the analysis to insure that the researcher is accurately reporting what the respondent said. The researcher also needs to have a peer debriefer read through the data and the analysis to further insure accuracy.
and consistency. This procedure was followed in the analysis of data.

IV. Recommendations for Further Research and Higher Education

There are two recommendations for further research and for higher education. First, though the relationship between parents and the college student has been recognized in the literature, what affect that relationship has on the student's perceptions of life on campus has not been given adequate study (Hardy, Power and Jedicke, 1993; Kaestner, Franz and Weinberger, 1990; Pardeck and Pardeck, 1990; Parker, Barnett, and Hickie, 1992). Research needs to be conducted that deals with the perceptions of the student of his or her relationship with his or her parent(s). A focus on such perceptions compared with how that student responds to experiences on campus might yield important information for the higher education professional. Such a study might demonstrate that it would be vital for colleges and universities to seek out a clearer understanding of the perceptions of the student concerning his or her relationship with his or her parent(s). Such perceptions might provide an important indicator on how the student will generally respond to campus life and exposure to the college classroom.
How a student perceives his or her parents might indicate the source of conflict the student experiences beyond being an adolescent. These perceptions might also indicate why a student will perceive some things and not others. Why some things are important to a student and others are not. These perceptions may indicate why a student responds the way he or she does to some groups or experiences. If these perceptions do provide such indicators, then it would be important for student services practitioners to know these indicators to better plan ways of involving the student in the life of the campus in a positive manner.

A second recommendation would be to include in the preparation of Residence Hall Directors, Deans of Students, curriculum writers, and professors at least a course on faith development as well as a course on the various contemporary religions in this country. Many students come to campus from a religious background that often goes unnoticed. By ignoring the student's religious background the college is ignoring a very important part of that student's growth in perception and meaning-making. Even if the public university is not interested in what relationship a student had with an organized religion, it is still important to understand better how that student makes meaning out of his or her
world. To find that out would require faith development theory to be included in the curriculum of the graduate departments of Colleges of Education, Higher Education.

How any given college student will react specifically in any given situation is not ultimately predictable. However, what human development theory provides is a contextual profile of a student that establishes certain boundaries within which the student will most likely operate. Knowing what those boundaries are enables the holder of that knowledge to prepare a setting that will benefit the student by anticipating the levels of understanding, mode of perception and interpretation, and moral expectations of that student. Faith is one of those boundaries that can be known.

In this study the reader has been presented a detailed summary of the text of the interviews with five first-year college students from a Christian college. This study has also provided a detailed analysis of those interviews relying on the grounded theory approach. What was found in those studies provides the foundation for the first three chapters.

What was reported in the interviews gives support to the relationship of Fowler's theory to the theories of other human developmentalists. This relationship, and the nature of faith as discussed in Fowler's theory, fuels the argument found in chapters one and two, that faith development is on a
par with the theories of Piaget, Kohlberg, Erikson, Chickering, and Perry in regard to understanding the human development of the college student. In chapter one, the focus of the entire study is presented with the conclusion that faith development theory not only belongs in the curriculum of higher education, but the faith in Fowler's theory is the faith at the center of the "humane tradition" which understands reality as requiring more than bare fact for meaningfulness. This meaningfulness is expressed in the search for truth, presumably at the core of higher education (Boyer and Hechinger, 1981). A truth not contained solely in fact, but in meaningfulness as well. A truth expressed as much in a sonnet as in Einstein's special theory of relativity. Pragmatists we all may be, but how we became pragmatists in our perceptions is a mystery not to be completely uncovered by the world of fact, rather, to the world of meaning we will ultimately turn.
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APPENDIX A

FAITH DEVELOPMENT INTERVIEWS OF FIVE FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS AT A CHRISTIAN COALITION COLLEGE: A CRITICAL SUMMATION

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to provide a critical review of data gathered from three women and two men, all entering students at a Christian Coalition College. The interview design was based on James W. Fowler's interview questions used in his faith development research. The approach of this study differed from Fowler's interpreting the data through the pre-formed theory. This study used grounded theory methodology which puts aside any previous theories and allows the data to guide any conclusions. There is a "thick" description of each respondent's interview. This paper provides no theories or hypotheses, rather it is intended to be a resource for those interested in a detailed description of the beliefs, feelings, fears, and anxieties of five first-year college students and how that relates to their faith development.
I. Introduction

An invitation was extended from a member college of the Christian College Coalition\(^1\) to do a qualitative study focusing on the faith development of entering students. The Vice President of Student Affairs was the contact with the students for the researcher. The researcher chose to interview three women and two men for the study. Five students would provide both a manageable data base a somewhat composite profile of the traditional entering student. Three women were chosen to address the possible male bias of faith development theory and to see if the faith development of the two men chosen greatly differed from the women. All of the students but one was eighteen, the other was going to have her eighteenth birthday about a month after the interviews, age similarity was important for consistency in the data patterns. In addition, each student came from a different Christian denominational background. This was done to

\(^1\) A group of colleges that identified themselves as fully accredited liberal arts colleges firmly committed to Christ in purpose, operation, and academic excellence, formed a coalition in 1976. For more information see, J. Dellenback, (1982), *Purpose and Goals of the Christian College Coalition*, available from Christian College Coalition, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
prevent any denominational bias in the content of their interviews.

Each student was contacted individually by the Vice President of Student Affairs, their identities being held confidential by the researcher and the Vice President. None of the students knew who the other participants were in the study and each adopted a pseudonym. The name of the college has been withheld to protect the identity of the respondents.

The research design included a list of questions taken from James W. Fowler's *Manual for Faith Development Research* (1986). The list of questions was intended to initiate the interviews, not determine its boundaries (see Fowler's questions in Appendix G). The interviews of each of the respondents went in the direction dictated by the answers of the respondent. Fowler's theory of faith development was not used to interpret the data, rather the data generated patterns and hypotheses. For a further discussion of the methodology, site selection, patterns found in the data, see Bolen, J., (1994), *A Case Study of the Faith Development of Five First-Year Students at a Christian College* (also see Merriam, 1988, pp. 48,49 and Marshall, 1989, p. 54).

This paper has as its primary focus a detailed analysis of each of the respondents and their interviews. The five respondents chose the following pseudonyms respectively:
Frank (F-1), Mary (F-2), Mark (F-3), Lorinda (F-4), and Alice (F-5). The (F) refers to First-year student, the (1) refers to the order in which the respondents were interviewed.

Before conducting the first interview I spent some time on campus visiting all of the buildings, looking in on a class in session, going to the cafeteria, attending chapel services, in short, getting a "feel" for the place. What I observed I would compare to a "church camp." I say that with all due respect for the college. I observed students praying before eating, a packed chapel (each student has to attend so many religious functions on campus and attendance is taken), prayer before class, several students carrying Bibles (but most don't), signs posted on the bulletin board in the student union having to do with Bible study groups, a Christian Rock group "Petros" coming to campus, announcements for "Campus Crusade for Christ," "Fellowship of Christian Athletes," along with the usual volleyball games, softball games, etc. What struck me as unusual was that for every announcement about a secular event there were two for a "Christian" function. Add this to an all around polite atmosphere and you have a very elaborate "church camp." I can not comment about the academic side of the campus, although I was told that the college is duly accredited and seeking to expand the library.
I observed the campus to be very neat and noticed students and adults policing the litter as they were walking along by picking up wayward cups, straws, or the occasional gum wrapper. The buildings are all within easy walking distance on a table-top flat campus. Most of the buildings were older, in that they had not been built in the last thirty years, but were well cared for. There are many towering maple trees, oaks, and pine lining the sidewalks. I had a very peaceful feeling standing on that campus in late autumn.

The building where I conducted the interviews was one of the women's dormitories and where the guest room was located. The room I used for the interviews was just two doors down from the guest room in which I stayed. The interview room was small, 10 feet by 12 feet. The door into the room was on the south wall of the room in the east corner. As I walked in I could see to my right a five foot tall grey metal book case with several of the college's yearbooks, two Bibles, a dictionary, several magazines (Look, Life, Reader's Digest). Immediately to my left I saw a three foot tall wooden bookshelf that appeared to be damaged, a couple of hymnals supporting the northwest corner of the shelf. Above the little shelf was Salmon's "Head of Christ." Beside the broken shelf was a chair that looked as if it came out of the
fifties. In the southwest corner of the room was a blonde oak table with a lamp that looked like it came from the Salvation Army. Above the lamp, curiously enough, was a crucifix. I was somewhat taken by that because this was clearly a protestant Presbyterian college.

Still standing in the door looking into the room I saw over on the west wall that which gave this space its name, the piano room. On the piano was an old electric typewriter. The only windows in the room were in the north wall. Below the windows were two chairs separated by another blonde oak table. Behind the table was the source of heat for the room, an old cast iron radiator. The room was quite hot so I opened the window.

I sat down in one of the fifties chairs to the east of the table under the window and set up my tape recorder on the table. I looked at the wall-to-wall rust carpet and thought, "My, with the poor lighting in here, this broken down furniture, its depressing!" This was one time I hoped that the immediate environment would not have an undo effect upon the interviews. Thankfully, each day I interviewed in this room it was a bright and sunny day outside which helped to illuminate the room.

Having adjusted to the campus, the people, and the room, I was ready as much as I could be for the first interview.
With questions in hand I began the interviews by seeking as much logistical information as I could. I wanted to find out where the student came from, what religious affiliation, if any, whether he or she lived with both parents or one or none, whether he or she had any siblings, in an attempt to better understand the student. The background of the student can provide a "safe" topic of discussion for the student to help get them "warmed up" to the interview process. When the student discusses his or her background it will often reveal how that student makes meaning out of his or her life which in turn helps the interviewer to be alert to what is meaningful to the student.

Often I found that we did not get to the list of "Fowler" questions for thirty minutes because many of the students would start talking about their families and relationships in the families and what they believed, etc. Once those questions would run their course I would then enter into asking questions from the list I had. I was able to get through all of them with each of the respondents. I was also able to ask several questions on different points that seemed to be of great interest or concern to the respondent. The two one-hour-interview format provided the student with an opportunity to reflect on the first interview and come back the next day to continue and clarify what was
said in the first interview. The only information the students had prior to the interview was that they would be asked questions about their faith and religion in general.

After having conducted each of the interviews I then proceeded to both work on typing the transcripts myself and hiring a special secretary to help finish them. After each interview was completed it was sent back to the appropriate student for him or her to read over and either delete, correct, add to, clarify, or approve what he or she read.

After receiving permission from the students I then began to unitize the data, that is, I began to read through the transcripts carefully and picked out units of data that could stand on its own. I separated these, and in the first-year student interviews came up with 254 categories. Each unit of data was attached to a separate 5x8 notecard and a color coded sticker was placed in the upper right corner. Then each card was individually numbered to correspond with the category. The first number was in black ink, which indicated that was its category after the first reading. The second reading brought many of the categories together, and these new categories were numbered in red ink. The third reading was marked with blue numbers. Such a coding process made it easy to look at any card and immediately know what road it traveled (for a more detailed description of
unitizing the data see Bolen, J. (1994), *A Case Study of the Faith Development of Five First-Year Students at a Christian College*, see also Merriam, S.B. (1988), *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*). The next step was to go back over the card a fourth time and begin to pull together an image of each respondent, which follows.

Respondent F-1, Frank

Standing at 6'4" I towered over "Frank" as I stood up to greet him. Frank looked to be about 5'7" tall, with the build of a long-distance runner. He was wearing a shirt and tie, his hair short and neatly trimmed. His eyes were nervously flitting about the room. I noticed that he never maintained much eye contact. He appeared to be very nervous and so I suggested that we have a seat (so that we could be on a more equal level). He sat down but remained tense and sitting near the edge of his seat.

As I was explaining the procedure to him I noticed that he held his hands rather tightly together. I tried to speak in as soothing a tone as I could and emphasized his freedom to remain or leave the interview at any time. It appeared that he was going to stay when he signed the release form and selected the pseudonym now being used.
Frank has one brother, 2 years his senior, and one sister, 6 years his junior. Frank said that he could remember back before his sister was born and how he resented his sister who, as Frank said, "...took the youngest part from me, because I mean I wasn't the baby of the family" (0007). He does say that he has always thought of himself as the middle child, and that it had its drawbacks, "always getting hand-me-downs, being the brunt of everybody's... I mean my brother's jokes and stuff" (0007).

He has always lived with both parents in a suburb of 10,000 outside a major Kansas city. Frank comes from a "Calvinist" Presbyterian background. "My dad would like for me to say that I'm a Calvinist" (00054).

His parents both work very hard and long hours. I had the impression from Frank that his parents were not around very much during his late middle-school and high school years. This difficult working schedule of both parents created in Frank an impression of being "abandoned."

When I asked him about his parents Frank took the interview into a new direction. In category 00025 entitled, "Relationship with Parents" there are 61 separate notecards, which is the second largest category in either of his interviews. Seven times Frank mentioned "tight" and "tension" when describing the family setting. He refers to
the busyness of his parents as beginning when he was in the eighth grade. His father was laid off from his job and got a computer to work with at home. His father, being accomplished as a programmer, spent long hours at his computer. Frank even mentioned once that, "I used to think that computer was from...by the devil, it had to be" (00025).

Frank identifies the beginning of the tension at home as the time his father brought the computer home. His father's extended hours spent at the computer scared Frank, because he "didn't know what would happen." His father became a teacher at Frank's high school and Frank's mother sold insurance along with her other job as an office manager at a "rehab." It seemed that his parent's work intensified during his high school days so much so that Frank said, "I mean it's just like where are my parents?"

And then when my mom got the new job and she started working really late, you know, there isn't supper ready so we had to start fixing supper for ourselves, and my dad was busy so we kids had to do it, and for a senior in high school that didn't do it (00025).

Frank even recounts a time when his mother was going through a "lot of changes" and "more or less left us." He felt "like she abandoned us."

Frank furthered explained that while in high school his
dad was a teacher there and knew all of the kids Frank knew and knew with whom Frank was hanging around. "He had a tight watch on me all the time." Because his mother sold insurance she "picked out the kind of car I was to get because it was safer on the insurance." "I mean they didn't trust...it seemed like they didn't trust my friends and that seemed like they didn't trust me." "I thought they were over-protective. They wouldn't let me go out with my friends." Frank summed it up when he said, "I didn't have much room to move."

Then Frank said, "...it's just like they had my life covered." I saw this phrase reemerge during his discussion of the nature of God. As a matter of fact, I found many parallel statements between his discussion of his parents and God.

Though Frank claimed that "tension was high," and "...our family started to grow apart," and that while in his early years at high school he "...hardly talked to" his parents, because "I was usually upset with them," he has a very close relationship with them now (00025).

Frank states, "I appreciate my parents more now." His parents "come up just about every weekend to see me, and my races, and my events, and I see now that they love me." "I know they would do anything for me, and I see that now more than before..." It is clear that Frank has a deep and
abiding respect for his parents. He looks up to them for guidance, support, advice, and encouragement (00025).

I noticed, however, that out of sixty-one notecards, only one referred to him loving his parents, only two referred to his parents loving him, and only one referred to his parents loving each other. I do not know quite what to make of that, except to say that Frank was much more comfortable talking about "tension," "abandonment," discipline, respect, proper doctrine, etc., then about matters of love. I can conjecture that Frank deeply respects his parents, looks up to them, tries to do that which will make them proud of him, wants to be obedient, and does love them. However, it seems his love for his parents is bound up in respect, obedience, boundaries, and control.

It is no wonder that he refers to God as he refers to his parents. Just as his parents "had everything covered" so God, "He's just got everything covered" (00024). Of the categories in Frank's interviews, his discussion of the nature of God ranks third of the largest with 45 notecards. In his references to God Frank mentions that God is "watching me and I need to watch my actions" (00024), not unlike his father who had "a tight watch on me all the time" (00025).

Frank saw God as, "powerful, and He's all knowing, present and past and future." He also saw God as, "well,
big." Frank admitted that "there are a lot of child views coming when I talk about God." It would seem that the "child views" are influenced by his experiences of his parents (00024).

As was the case with his parents, Frank rarely referred to God's love. Out of forty-five notecards one refers to God's love for him, one refers to his love for God, and one refers to God's love in general as "undying." On the other hand eight of the notecards refer to the "wrath" of God and God's anger. "I sometimes picture Him as being an angry God." It was in this context that Frank spoke of fearing God. The only time Frank mentioned anything about God's forgiveness was near the end of this part of the interview when I asked him in response to his comment about the wrath of God at the Hebrews during the Exodus if God did not in fact continue to forgive the Hebrews? "Yes, He did, He is very forgiving."

What seemed clear to me was that God was first all-powerful, all-knowing, judgmental, wrathful, watchful, something to be feared, and only secondarily loving and forgiving. I do not believe I am stretching the connection between his view of his parents and his view of God. I found the issue of control, power, authority, and something to be feared emphasized in his comments about his parents and about
God with the sense of love and forgiveness a distant second place.

I do not believe that Frank would agree with this assessment simply because Frank associates the love his parents have for him to their efforts to control and influence his life. When I say that Frank respects and loves his parents, I believe he truly does. Frank also respects and loves God. What is important, however, is that love and forgiveness are given meaning through the prism of power, authority, control, judgment, and obedience.

In this sense James Fowler's theory does provide some insight into what is going on with Frank. Fowler claims that early in our lives (0-5 years) we think of God through the experience of our parents or those who nurture us. We see God as "big" because our whole world is viewed as "big" from our perspective as a little child. We see God as powerful and controlling because we are so controlled and over-powered by forces outside us. From there we describe God based upon our image of our parents (Fowler, 1981, p. 133).

That is why it is so interesting to see such similarities between the way Frank talks about his parents and about God. It was clear that Frank was not to question his father on religious matters, and likewise it is not surprising that Frank has such an attitude toward God. We
are not to question God's plan. I got the feeling while listening to Frank that every time he thought of some religious question he had to run it by his "father" in his head.

Frank's father does reside in Frank's consciousness. That point is made the more convincing when looking at the largest of the categories in this interview with seventy notecards, that of category 00054, Predestination. In the second interview I began with the question, "Does life have purpose? Is there a plan for our lives?" We had gone over that the day before after the prolonged discussion about parents and God. I wanted to come back to it because the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination seemed to really bother Frank in the first interview. I could tell there was some struggle there because it was what his father believed, "My father would be proud if he heard me say I am a Calvinist." However, Frank did not seem to be totally comfortable with Calvinism. It wasn't so much in what he said, not having said very much, but in the way he said it. He said, "My father would be proud if he heard me say I am a Calvinist," with a sarcastic tone to his voice. It seemed that for Frank Calvinism and his father were very closely linked. I thought if I could better understand what his struggle was with predestination I might better understand
his feelings and struggle with his father and God.

I am familiar with several apparent internal conflicts with the doctrine of Calvinistic predestination. The Calvinistic doctrine of double-predestination simply stated is that all people, before the beginning of time, were either predestined for Hell or for Heaven and nothing could happen to change that. Further, the theory of predestination also claims that God is in control of everything we do, that our individual actions are foreordained (Kerr, pp. 34,35). Fowler claimed that one of the characteristics of a struggle in the movement from Stage Three to Stage Four was a growing awareness and uneasiness with apparent contradictions that simply had not been seen before (Fowler, 1981, p. 173). I thought that by presenting certain contradictions for Frank to consider I could observe how he would handle them. By struggling directly with the doctrine in a supportive and confidential setting Frank would be freed to deal openly with his beliefs, fears, doubts, and feelings toward his father and God.

Because I was concerned for his well-being, I remained mindful of the fact that dealing with too many contradictions within one's belief system could be extremely traumatic for the respondent, I was careful to be supportive of the direction, whatever it might be, of the respondent's answers.
What followed made up the bulk of the second interview. Frank was ready to talk.


The internal contradictions in predestination that I sought to bring before the respondent included the problem that if every act, every thought, every deed, even whether or not a person is saved or damned, was set before the beginning of time, then why did Jesus have to die on the cross, and for whom? The already saved? Another problem was that of responsibility. If it is true that all of my actions, thoughts, feelings, sins, etc. have been set since before the beginning of time, how could I personally be responsible for anything I do? If that is true, then what is sin? If sin is going against God's will, then no one sins in that everyone is simply doing what has been determined by the will of God to do. If there is no sin then there is no need for
salvation, therefore the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ is unnecessary. Another problem is that one's conduct does not determine whether or not that person is saved, what determines one's salvation was what was foreordained before the beginning of time, so is it possible for a person to be totally immoral but still be predestined for heaven? What about infants that die?

There are indeed many problems with the theory of predestination. Frank wants to be a Calvinist, yet there is a distinct hint of doubt about the whole thing. At the time of the interview Frank stated, "I'm saying I'm a Calvinist because it's like going, the family is Republican so I'm Republican"(00054). But he is beginning to "research Calvinism now ...to see if the beliefs are what I can, if I can understand the beliefs." In the course of the interview it was clear that Frank spoke of "man's" relationship to God as wholly "man's" responsibility as if there was no predestination. For example, in answering the question as to why God planned for "man" to fall, he responded, "...maybe it was so we could love Him more through faith." I quickly pointed out to him that if God has already foreordained what we would believe and what we would think and what we would do, how could we properly say that "we" love God, is it not in fact our doing what we are destined to do anyway? He
responded, "I guess it's, wouldn't it?" I then asked him if we could please God? Frank answered, "yes." Then I asked, but is it proper to say that "we" please God, or is it not in fact God pleasing Himself through us? Frank responded immediately, "Yes, that is what I wanted to say, God pleasing Himself through us."

In response to the problem of why Jesus had to die in the light of predestination Frank responded that Jesus died "...for those who are predestined to go to heaven, to love Christ, I think it was just that man needed the Christ figure to give a pathway to God to open the door to God, and to mediate for us to God...and uh, I don't know." When I reminded him that if we are foreordained to believe what we believe, to think what we think, to do what we do, why would we speak of needing a mediator? A mediator for what? What decision would "we" make? All decisions are made for us, are they not, in predestination?

Then Frank began to speak in a "reflective" tone, "Well, gee, everytime I start thinking about this, taking a shower or just walking down the street, if everything is foreordained or predestined what is what I do matter because it is already planned, it's going to happen anyway. The question is, if everything is predestined and some people are going to choose God and some aren't and we can't do anything
about it, it's just going to happen, then why do we need ministers?" Frank then answered his own question, "Then something told me inside, it could have been God telling me or it could have been just me realizing, it's the fact that everybody needs the chance to hear because they are not going to know unless they hear..." I wondered what spoke to him, God, himself, or his father? Undaunted, I asked again, "hear what?" I asked him why it would matter, because in fact if a person hears or not it was foreordained that it would happen as it did. If Frank decided to not do any preaching at all it was foreordained that he wouldn't.

Then we began the section of the interview where Frank spoke of his struggle with predestination. "I'm sorry, but on a lot of these questions I'm still very curious..." It was apparent that this has been bothering him for quite some time, "It's racked my brain, because I'm asked (by other students) if I'm in a basic Christian beliefs class and writing a paper for that, and I say, no, I'm just doing this for myself. They just look at me and go, why?" This interchange and others like it led me to believe that Frank was a very serious and thoughtful person when it came to his beliefs. He has been reading a great deal on predestination and admitted, "Well, the things that I am reading not all of them I like and not all of them do I agree with." "And so I
don't know what is what I believe there or what I think I believe or what I think I know is exactly right." One of the must stunning and revealing comments he made exposed a great fear, "I'm researching it and it's kind of like a trapped feeling and until I understand it I'm going to feel like I kind of am trapped." When asked what he meant about being trapped, he responded, "I don't know." I wondered then if it might be a reference to his father's over-powering presence in his life.

After about thirty minutes of dealing with difficult questions concerning some contradictions in predestination Frank said, "you're setting me back and I'm trying to figure, right now I am questioning a lot of this too." I immediately backed off for two reasons, first, I could tell that he was becoming more nervous and upset over the questions and second, I did not want him to transfer his need to please an older male authority figure, myself, by telling me what he thought I wanted to hear. I wanted to change the questions being asked, but he volunteered the following, "It's all messed up inside, like I said, I'm not even sure about the Calvinism. These are questions that are helping me try to understand and look into it better." He then went on to talk about what was going on inside of him over this issue as a form of "warfare." I asked him how he felt about it all.
His simple response said it all, "overwhelmed."

Frank answered every question I asked about predestination in two voices, one self-assured, dogmatic, authoritative, the other, questioning, probing, wondering, unsure. Even the tone of voice was different. I could hear a firmness in his dogmatic voice and in his questioning voice I heard hushed tones, a lowered cadence. Was I listening to both Frank's father and Frank?

I do not believe that this interview started Frank's questioning of predestination. Frank responded in ways that indicated he had been struggling with this for some time. I believed I was witness to what many researchers have called a typical entering college student's struggles over accepted dogma and doctrine and his or her discovery of something about the dogmas and doctrines that don't make any sense. Perry would claim that Frank was experiencing the very uncomfortable feeling of moving from a simplistic "dualism" to the more complex "multiplicity".

That was demonstrated in a conflict he had with a professor in the History of World Civilization class. The professor stated in class that he was a Christian evolutionist. That statement sent Frank into a panic about his faith. "I had to run back to my room, and sit there and read the Bible, read Genesis and say I got to do this, if not
then he's going to have this seed planted inside my head that we evolved, and it bugged me for a long time." Remember, at the time of this interview Frank had been in college only two months. Frank sought out support for his fears by going to other people and talking about it, reading his Bible, until, as he said, "my strength is renewed and I could rest assured that God was the creator and He created man and he didn't evolve, it was kind of tough." Frank confirmed that he did take the Bible literally.

Frank then commented that he thought now he would be better prepared for whatever would come at him in class because he knew what he had to do, go to his room and pray, read the Bible, get support from others of like mind, and ask God to renew his faith. I thought, my, he is going to shut himself off from anything that challenges his faith in any way. Yet, I remembered how thoughtful he was in his considerations of predestination. True, he still very much wants to believe in predestination, but he is at least looking into it and not necessarily agreeing with everything he reads. Once again, I heard two voices, one, self-assured, authoritarian, closed-minded, narrow, focused, centered, and the other, thoughtful, questioning, wondering, afraid, struggling. You could, as I said before, hear the difference in his voice.
The voice that I appreciated most from Frank was what I will call his "thoughtful" voice. The thoughtful voice would always follow in sequence the "dogmatic" voice. In his discussion of his impressions of this college he began by saying "now I was a little disappointed when I first came here, because I thought it would be more...I was expecting more from a Christian college, that would be more firm"(00002). He elaborated that he thought that people in a Christian college would be "more firm in what they believe, and firm in how they stand." He appeared to be disappointed that there were people on campus that he felt were not "Christian." He even went so far as to say, "sometimes I wished it was, they could have a commune for Christians and we could all just be together."

His tone changed, he became more thoughtful, there wasn't as much urgency in his voice, and his voice became quieter, his cadence slowed, and he said, "I think that having the non-believers here on campus is good for everybody because they have an opportunity to understand, to hear the word..." He realized that it may be a Christian school, "but it wasn't just for Christians." He then said that it gave him a chance to witness to non-Christians. He thought that this was a way the college staff was trying to expose Christian students to the secular world to help prepare them,
"So it's kind of a ready spot of real life."

Though a bit naive, I think I understand what he was getting at, that by being around people who do not think or believe as he does, in a safe environment, he will have a greater chance to experience other beliefs. However, I was impressed with the idea that he would not learn anything from non-Christians, rather the non-Christian would learn from the Christians.

He then went on to speak of other aspects of life on campus. He was happy to be on the cross-country team, and spoke with pride about his coach. His coach is "a strong Christian." I asked him what that meant, Frank replied, "Well, he's strong in what he believes, I mean, he won't back down..." (00002). Not backing down and being "firm" in what one believes is what Frank means when he talks about growing in his faith. He does not see his own struggling, doubting, and uncertainty, as the sign of a strong faith. Rather, a narrowly focused, maybe even closed-minded, self-assured approach to what one believes is the sign of a strong faith.

Frank recounts the day the coach came to practice and told the team, "I love Christ and because of my love for him that is why I coach, that is why I run, to glorify his name, so, and that is why anything that I tell you to do I do so that you may glorify his name too." Frank admires his coach
very much and apparently agrees with his spiritual approach to athletics.

Frank then spoke of the many opportunities on campus for Bible study "almost every night." There is "FCA," Fellowship of Christian Athletes. "I mean, there is always a chance, always an opportunity to just praise God when you are here on campus"(00002).

When asked why he came to this college, "It was for the people." Frank liked the openness on campus and the sense of family that exists among the students. I have to admit that I found a very friendly atmosphere on campus, but of course I find that to be true on many campuses I have visited, whether they are private or public.

Frank concluded by saying that he was very happy he had come to this college. He loved the spiritual atmosphere, the chapel services, the opportunities to participate in theater, sports, and other extracurricular activities. Though he had only been on campus two months, he has already gotten so deeply involved on campus that he began complaining of the load he was carrying. I saw him later that day in a play production at the college auditorium. He did a rather good job as a "mounty" in a musical about the Canadian mounted police, a spoof on the old musicals.

Perhaps nowhere is his thoughtfulness in more evidence
then when we discussed some very controversial social issues, one being abortion. I expected that he would be totally against abortion, calling it murder, and that it should never be allowed regardless of the situation, based upon his religious background. Initially I wasn't disappointed, "...I'm saying that I feel that abortion is wrong, and if it was possible, then abortion would be done away with, so that every life would be a new one and life would be treasured again, and not for some people to discard as some inconvenience" (00014).

Again, "I just think that abortion clinics should be done away with, it should not be open for people to just go in and have it done." Frank even brought in birth control and said, "...birth control is in effect abortion, it's the same as abortion. Because that's what it is, abortion is birth control, who lives and who doesn't. And I think that as a business it should be done away with"(00014).

Then, in response to his complaint about "inconvenience" being a primary reason for abortion, I asked him if a mother's threatened life was an "inconvenience." Then I heard the thoughtful voice come back, a slowing in cadence, a lowering of tone, "I was thinking of inconvenience as 'I don't have the time.'" Then he began, "With the health of the mother, I think then it might be OK." Granted, he still
was not comfortable with saying abortion in any situation was acceptable, but he said it would be understandable, even in matters of rape and mental distress for the mother.

So I asked him, for further clarification, if he considered people who had an abortion, or people who supported the right to choose an abortion were Christian. Frank replied, "Yes, I do, and you know, if it comes down to making the decision, if they believe in abortion...I don't think that decides who's a Christian." He said that he had heard others say that people who support abortion are not Christian and his response, "...that's not right."

I then asked him about the apparent irreconcilable differences between Christians who support a right to choose whether to have an abortion or not and those who oppose abortion as murder. Frank then began to relate his experience at the now famous Wichita anti-abortion marches and protests a few years ago. "...I protested the abortion clinics and I was standing up for pro-life but I can see how that separated brothers and sisters for Christ." He shared how that he was just standing there on the street holding a sign but was "...staying on the street away from..." the anti-abortion protesters that were shouting at the pro-choice supporters. He made it clear, "...I didn't have anything to do with that..." "They were very hostile
toward one another, and I think the way the two organizations confronted each other was wrong."

He was clearly upset even thinking back about the experience. "...the other people ...were arguing and yelling scripture back and forth to each other, that's not the way to resolve conflict between Christians"(00014). "I saw this and this really upset me..." He then began to discuss a very thoughtful approach to resolving the conflict between the two groups, "If I could run everything I would have it one-on-one where the Christians got together and got to know each other, they don't take time to understand each other..." He commented how that everybody is on "each other's throats" and have never taken the time to know each other. "...it's not something that should be argued over in public in an outside public debate by screaming at the top of your voice..."

He then provided the discussion with his own invented term, "conception prevention." He said that "birth control" needed to be distinguished from "conception prevention." He was all for conception prevention, but had trouble with birth control because birth control implied conception had already taken place. We concluded this part of the interview with Frank still holding onto the belief that abortion was not acceptable in most cases, and though he was uncomfortable about it, agreed there would be circumstances that would make
abortion acceptable.

I was curious about how he viewed his personal religious life. I asked him what he thought it meant to be very religious and if he was very religious. "At times I feel very religious..." "I can say, yes I am a Christian, and yes I do believe in Christ..." (00013). But then he said, "...it's hard for me to say that I am a religious person, all the time...because that means to me to be a really religious person means you spend a lot of time in the Bible, you spend a lot of time with Christ, and at times I can't say that..." He used the concept of "warfare" again in this context, "...but it's a warfare for me, because I'm going one way and He's (Jesus) going the other..."

Frank then expressed a grave concern of his, "I feel like the Spirit is moving inside of me, other times I don't...it's not that I feel the Spirit has left me, I feel that I've spread myself so thin that I don't have time..." But then he apparently realized that he was making excuses, so he quickly added, "I have the time, but I don't spend the time doing those things (prayer and meditation and Bible study) with Christ..." (00013). Frank was not giving himself much grace in this matter.

Apparently, being very religious for Frank is as much a "feeling" as anything else. "...and when I bring myself back
to Christ then I feel real religious again" (00013). So much of what Frank discussed in his understanding of God and religion was wrapped up in "feelings." It seemed to matter more that a person "feel" religious than whether that person "did" religious things. Whether or not certain actions and words were "religious" depended, apparently, on whether or not they made one "feel" religious.

The interview seemed to be going in the direction of Frank's concern for whether or not a person was "saved." I then asked him what it would take to get into heaven.

"...unless a person has confessed Christ, unless they believe in the resurrected Christ, then I don't think they can get to heaven" (00055). To clarify what Frank meant, I asked him point-blank if that meant that all other religions in the world that did not believe in Jesus as the resurrected Christ were not going to make it into heaven. "I don't think so" (00055). I then asked him about the Jews, and his immediate response was, "Well, those who are Jewish Christians, or the Christian Jews, they have confessed Christ..." I asked him then about Jews that have not confessed Jesus as Christ but rather as a great prophet. He reiterated that a person must confess Jesus as Christ. So, that means the Jews don't make it. I then asked about Mahatma Gandhi, and the same answer, no, unless he confesses
Christ. Frank then clarified, "...good deeds are nice, it's not the works that save us, it's not the good deeds that save us, but faith in Christ that saves us, and the love for Christ" (00055).

Frank remained "dogmatic" in this part of the interview. I did not hear the "thoughtful" voice of Frank at all on this matter. Frank was clear and adamant about his position. By his own definition, Frank was a strong Christian when it came to the criteria for entrance into heaven.

I would like to close my summation of the interviews with Frank by discussing Frank's ethical views. I asked Frank if he believed actions were either right or wrong, he agreed that there is a right and a wrong. I then asked him what made something either right or wrong. "I think an action is right because God says it's right, it's right in the Bible, it's a right action" (00039). "It's a bad action when you go against His (God's) will" (00039). I asked him to define sin, "...it's not obeying what God, the laws of God that he set forth" (00039). I then asked him if there was ever anything that was always wrong, "I think that pre-marital sex is something that is absolutely wrong." He then offered that "...love is probably the safest or the most right thing, I mean because you can love your enemies, you can love your neighbor, the greatest of all things is love."
We then discussed how it is that, because of predestination, we can claim to go against God's will if God has ordained all things. "Because it's not the actions of God, it's not the actions of God what you do..." "He isn't doing the bad, I am doing the bad, I mean it's my human nature, my human will, to lean toward doing the bad..." (00039).

In discussing what makes an action right or wrong Frank seemed to be unwilling to remain consistent with predestination. Frank emphasized our own responsibility in following and obeying the will of God, as if we had a choice in the matter. He spoke in absolutes, which means that never did he mention concern for the consequences of an act having anything to do with making it right or wrong. He also never spoke of the situation or circumstances having anything to do with whether an action is right or wrong. The rightness or wrongness of an act was determined by the will of God as found in scripture. Because Frank interprets scripture literally, one would have to guess as to how he would determine what God's will was.

There is much in the interviews with Frank that would be addressed by Fowler's Stages Two and Three. There is much that would also be explained by the insights of Perry, Chickering, and Parks. What none of them have done, however,
is to address the apparent multiplicity of "voices" that appeared in this interview. I heard the dogmatic, self-assured voice of tradition and what he had heard from his parents and church, then I heard the more pensive, reflective and "thoughtful" voice of someone trying to look at the situation on his own. It didn't seem to matter how intense the interview got, sometimes he would be in his thoughtful voice and sometimes in his dogmatic voice. On the discussion about the criteria for passage into heaven his thoughtful voice rarely appeared, it was dominated by his dogmatic voice. It was something to witness the two voices coming and going during his struggle with pre-destination and his discussion of his parents and God.

I see the struggle Fowler referred to in his discussion of the transition from Stage Two to Stage Three and then to Stage Four. I could also see the struggle with "multiplicity" in a "dualistic" mind. What I also saw and heard was the two distinct voices. It was as if the thoughtful voice was the sound of a person finding their own way.

I agree with Parks, there is more going on in this period of a person's life then mere stage shifting (Parks, p. 86). Erikson was right to point to the central importance of seeking identity at this age (Erikson, p. 70). What I see is
a young person whose beliefs cannot be easily categorized, whose view of the world is in a "liquid" state of development. The fecundity of his psyche is such that anything could "grow" into being his paradigm of meaningfulness. Does he move on to Stage Four? Does he remain at Stage Three? What happens? No developmental theory can predict which way he will go, there are simply too many variables.

There is one thing for certain when considering Fowler's Stages, Frank is not a Stage Three, he is not a Stage Four, he is not a Stage Two, and I am not even sure he is a combination of the three. He is a person in search of himself.

Respondent F-2, Mary

"Mary" came walking into the interview room, and as I stood to greet her I noticed immediately her height. She must have stood at least 5'10" or perhaps even 6' tall. She looked athletic, and as I came to find out later, did participate in a varsity sport. Mary had an angelic face, the kind of face that is a bit rounded but not enough to call it plump. She had the face of innocence. With her short black hair combed around her face I thought I could still see
the face of a five year old.

Mary was 17 years old at the time of the interview but would be 18 a month later. She had been raised by her natural father and her step-mother since she was six months old. Her sister by her natural mother is a year and nine days older. She has three older step-sisters and an older step-brother. Mary’s father and step-mother have never had children together.

Mary proved to be a very interesting respondent for this study. Fowler and Parks support the view that personal crises bring about stage movement in the life of the individual (Fowler, 1991, p. 20; Parks, p. 24). Mary proved to be a person who, in her short life, had already experienced many great personal crises. The longer the interview carried on the greater interest I had in her story. I found myself becoming very concerned for her and almost forgot to pay close attention to the matter at hand.

Mary had a difficult life as a child. When I unitized the data onto separate notecards and re categorized them I found that the category 00086, entitled "violence in the family," had no fewer than 58 notecards. The nearest category in the number of notecards was her moral views with 38 notecards. Clearly, the violence she had experienced in her family dominated the interview.
In addition to the family violence, Mary had also become a diabetic, just five years before this interview. Besides the diabetic condition, she and her family moved to Kansas just three years before this interview from California. She was used to living in a city in California and moved to a house six miles from a small town. In addition to this stress was added the fact that Mary and her family are Mormon, and living in Kansas had proved challenging.

These are but a few of the "crises" that have faced Mary in the last five years. I will review each of them in greater depth with her own words and then present her views on religion, morality, family, etc.

Before discussing much of the violence in her family I asked Mary if she felt comfortable talking about it, she said, "Oh yes, I'm fine." She told me that on the day before her seventeenth birthday she went into a shelter home in Hutchinson, Kansas because, "it wasn't good for me to be at home". She came to college from that shelter/foster home. She offered more detail about the nature of the violence saying, "My dad was abusive and my mom was abusive....and I just got to the point where I started to hit back and to me that was the point where I had to get out right then". The courts had ordered her into the home
in Hutchinson and to go for counseling in Hutchinson.

When she talked about her father and step-mother I noticed that she always referred to her step-mother simply as "mom." However, she also said, "My mom and I don't get along at all. We never did" (00086). "...but I did feel total hatred for...I couldn't even be in the same room with my mom" (00086). "And, uh, she would just, she would tell me she hated me and I couldn't handle being with her" (00086). Then she related how that her mother began abusing her and her father also abused her but not as often. Interestingly, she stated..."...but I never hated my dad, I never..." (00086). She hates her mother, but her father who had also been abusive and, according to Mary, was an abusive drinker until eleven years ago, she does not hate.

Her older sister, Michelle, appears to be the anchor in Mary's life. Mary and Michelle have clung to each other through these rocky seas. The seas were made rockier when Mary found out that her natural mother was not dead, as her father had told her, but was actually alive. This news she received when she was "around eight or nine years old."

She and Michelle had been outside playing kickball when her father called them into the house because he wanted to tell them something. Apparently her step-mother came up the stairs to the room where the father was telling his daughters
about their natural mother and the step-mother says, "...did you get the belt out?" (00086). The father explained to the mother that the girls had done nothing wrong, he had just told them about their natural mother.

About four years later the father told the girls that their natural mother had shot herself in the mouth in an attempted suicide when Mary was two months old. Her natural mother survived the attempt but it left her paralyzed. The father divorced her, and according to my calculations must have married again within four months because Mary said that she had had a step-mother since she was six months old. Mary now corresponds with her natural mother but has yet to meet her.

Mary stated, "So, I'm kind of like starting three new relationships, because I'm just meeting my new mom...and my dad, I'm beginning to open up to him, but I'm having a really hard time with my mom, but I'm trying to do better at that" (00086). In talking about her step-mother Mary was understanding of her Step-mother's attitude toward moving to Kansas. Apparently, she had lived in California for twenty-five years and left behind all of her grown children, a good management job, and a new grandchild. But I got the feeling that the tension and conflict between Mary and her step-mother began a long time before they moved to Kansas. Mary
did not seem very optimistic in her efforts to get along with her step-mother. "My (step)mom and I don't get along at all. We never did" (00086). She does feel, however, that she is making progress with her father, "I'm beginning to be more open and friendly" (00086).

In the midst of all of this uncertainty is her relationship with her sister, Michelle. "...she's like always been there for me, she is one person that I can really be confident in" (00086). With such a strong bond between them I found it interesting that Mary decided to go to College by herself rather than join Michelle at Wichita State, sixty miles away. Her decision demonstrated a strength Mary's from within. She made up her mind to go to this college, though she has to be separated from her sister who has been an anchor for her in the rocky seas of her life, and she made the decision while staying in a shelter. I was impressed by the fortitude of Mary's determination in the face of such odds.

In our discussion of how she viewed herself as a person came her concerns about her diabetes. "...I'm an athlete, but, I always have in the back of my mind, I can't do this because I have to stop in the middle of the game and eat something because my blood sugar is low, I'm less than a person" (00093). She talked of just wanting to "be regular,
normal like everyone else" (00093). She plays volleyball for Sterling and will often have to sit out as much as half of a game. "Like yesterday, I had a game and I had to do that, it just, well it upset me, just like I'm not superior...my hands shaking and my reactions getting slow, and other people don't have that" (00093). Her voice carried with it the sound of disappointment and anger. The only other time I heard that sound in her voice was when she was talking about her (step)mom and the conflict in the family. Other than her feelings toward her diabetes, Mary seemed to be rather self-confident.

I found it interesting that when I asked her the question about whether there was a purpose to life, most of the other respondents mentioned something about serving God, Mary, on the other hand, mentioned what dreams she had for her own future. Her direct response to, "Does life have a purpose? What is the purpose of your life?" Mary said, "Growing up and having a family, being responsible, raising a family, really, just raising a family, not like my parents, I don't want to have a family like they did,...I want to have a career, and everything..." (00093). She spoke of being a graphic artist for Disneyland Studios but saw that as a "once in a lifetime" opportunity. The need for a loving family atmosphere, self-fulfillment, hope, love and acceptance in
the family, was Mary's "purpose" in life.

It seems appropriate to move to Mary's discussion of her relationship with the volleyball team at college. It is appropriate because Mary appears to view her team as the family she never had. "...our whole team is just a big unit, we never argue and we never bicker...You could say it's like a family, but families argue, fight and bicker, and we don't, we're just like one unit, that's the way it should be" (00076). Her coach is filling a parental role for Mary. Mary thinks so much of her coach that she chose her coach's first name as her pseudonym for this interview.

When asked where she looked for authority in her life, Mary responded, "...not my parents...I would say it would have to be coach Mary because she is my coach, but between the two of us, we would talk..." (00076). Mary goes on to describe her coach, "...she's wise...I can accept her for just believing enough in me..." (00076).

Mary is coping with her life the best way she can and finding support from her team and from her coach. This is not to suggest that Mary has replaced her parents with her coach, it is to say that Mary is seeking the kind of acceptance and support she needs from a parental figure.

Mary's faith is extremely important in her efforts at coping with her life. Being a Mormon, she feels self-
conscious at college because she knows that there are many
who do not accept Mormonism. Again, she finds strength in
her coach. "With coach Mary, she's really, really, you know,
God's with her all the time, Jesus Christ is in her, I think
I see that in her" (00076). Her coach has never brought up
the subject of Mary's Mormonism, but Mary feels confident
that her coach, though "...she probably would not agree with
it (Mormonism)" (00076) that she would accept Mary for who she
is and know Mary for the highly moral person she is. Mary
feels unconditional acceptance from her coach. This is
probably one of the most important relationships for Mary
right now.

When asked about how she got along on campus as a
Mormon, she said that the only thing she didn't really like
about the college was the chapel services. She just isn't
used to singing the kind of songs they sing at chapel, to her
they "are not religious enough" (00075). She likes some rock
music, but not for church. Otherwise she said she loves the
college.

As Mary discussed her faith the certainty and commitment
to it were evident. She is a Mormon and, at this point in
her life, believes she will always be a Mormon. For Mary the
Mormon church is the "only true church on earth" (00097).
Mary has a focused understanding of morality, right and
wrong, and what makes an action either right or wrong, and it is based upon religion. "...if you follow other things besides your religion like in TV shows or books or, I don't think that's very moral" (00072).

Her faith as a Mormon has been severely tested by those who believe Mormonism is a cult. She attended a volleyball camp that apparently had a "Christian" stamp on it because the participants were expected to get up every morning and read their Bible. She remembered standing in a large prayer circle on the last day of the camp and a woman in the middle began to pray, "...to help me get out of this Mormon cult, and it might have been rude of me....the first thing that ran through my mind was get out of there, because this isn't right, she's praying for you to get out of your Mormon cult and the Mormon church isn't a cult..."(00077). So Mary immediately left the room in the middle of her prayer. Regardless of that experience, Mary remains a steadfast Mormon.

This gives the reader some background on Mary before dealing with the questions concerning her image of God, morality, making tough ethical decisions, and attitudes toward other religions. When it came to her views on religion and God she was self-assured in her beliefs. Her certainty was such that one could conclude that Mary's faith
provided the only certainty in her young life. According to Fowler and Parks this is not unusual (Fowler, 1981, p. 156; Parks, p. 24). Studies have shown that when a person's physical and social life is tenuous their spiritual life will often be one of unquestioned orthodoxy, that is, in agreement with the accepted doctrines of whatever organized religion to which the person is dedicated.

Mary is convinced that God has control over everything, "From thoughts we have to why we eat some things, in my mind, He has control over when we sleep and when we eat, everything" (00067). Though God has complete control, Mary apparently wants to believe that she also has a choice in what she does, "I believe in choice. He gives us choices, but He also knows what choice we'll make before we make it" (00067). I questioned her as to how it could be that God had complete control and yet "we" still had a "choice" as to what we would do. She explained that God will "...give us more than one choice so we can choose so that teaches us and that helps us to become better, you know, and helps us grow as people" (00067). In her mind, God is in control, but we can have free choice without any contradiction in God's role. The solid rock in Mary's world is her faith in God.

The warmth and certainty came through as she talked about her relationship with Jesus Christ. "I believe that
Jesus Christ is here with me all the time and God's watching me" (00093). The crises in her life have apparently led Mary to a narrowed focus in her faith that corresponds to the teachings of the church. When asked if she would ever stand opposed to the church in any possible situation Mary responded that she could never imagine her beliefs conflicting at all with the church (00093).

As narrowly focused as her faith is she had a remarkably open attitude toward other religions. To get at her attitude toward other religions I asked her how one could get to heaven and if those who didn't agree with Mormonism could get to heaven. Mary believes that if a person believes in God, not necessarily Jesus Christ, that they can probably get to heaven. She saw no reason that the Jews would not be in heaven, "I believe they can get to heaven..." (00090). It seemed that Mary was willing to let anyone in so long as they believed in some form of deity, idols excepted. Then she said something I had never heard before, "...once you get there I think you'll be taught, I believe the Church of Jesus Christ is right..." (00090). She went on to explain that Mormons would instruct people after death in the proper doctrines so that people would be ready to live with Jesus and God in eternity. So, we may not all be Mormons when we die, but we will be after our death.
Mary's views on morality were equally clear and straightforward. There is a Satan, evil, sin, immorality, and they are each related to the other. Her certainty that there is a Satan was once again related to the pain in her family, "...and that's why I'm convinced Satan lives because everytime we tried to do something that tried to keep our family together something always comes up to tear us apart, you know, it's never one person, it's all of us, something always happens to all of us, and that...."(00072). She then distinguished between sin and evil, "Sin is a noun and evil is to me an adjective." Therefore, "sin" is some thing and "evil" is a trait. Satan is evil. Sin is something that we know to be wrong when we are doing it, sin, therefore, is always a "conscious" act.

Mary determines what is right or wrong based upon her own views of what is right or wrong. "To me, it's what I think, not what someone else thinks is right or wrong"(00072). She further explained that it is what she had been taught is right, not that she "makes up" as she goes along what is right. She was not a relativist in that sense, though she admitted that people will have varying ideas as to what is right and wrong. When trying to explain how people can differ in their ideas as to what is right or wrong she used a very subjective example of artistic appreciation,
"...if I draw a picture of a person...in an abstract kind of way someone else might think that that was totally wrong, but I can think that was right because I taught myself or I had been taught in some way that I can do that" (00072).

Apparently, Mary was implying that people may vary in their ideas of what is right or wrong because people have varying levels of understanding of a situation, what is possible, what is different, perhaps even a broader understanding of different ways of seeing things.

When asked what she considered to be immoral she immediately said, "...like pre-marital sex, not even just pre-marital sex, just the messing around, I mean not even having sex..." (00072). All of the respondents seemed to equate sexual activity, especially outside marriage, with immorality.

Remembering that she defined "evil" as an adjective, it was interesting to see what adjectives she used regarding herself. "I'm very much a perfectionist..." (00072). She sees as her responsibility being as perfect or at least "half as perfect" as Christ by the time she is thirty-three years old, the accepted age of Christ at the end of his earthly ministry. That helps to explain why Mary gets easily upset with herself. "...I'm really mad at myself, I usually get mad at people when I'm mad at myself. I'm really mad at
myself and someone tries to help me, I can't be helped when
I'm mad at myself..."(00072). This also reflects back on
what Mary said about herself in regard to her diabetes.

Mary's views on morality became clearer when two tough
social issues were discussed, homosexuality and abortion.
One could describe her attitudes toward homosexuality as
"homophobic." When referring to homosexuality she would use
terms like, "ugh!", "jittery," "gotta get away," "oooo,"
screwing up the face in a sour expression, "I don't like it,"
(00099). She is convinced that no homosexual could possibly
be a Christian because, "...if you're a brought up
Christian...I don't think you would really have that
problem...I don't think a Christian who was brought up
Christian and understands Christianity, you know, completely,
I don't think they would do that (be homosexual)"(00099).
When given information that some believe homosexuality might
be a biological problem rather than simply a matter of choice
or preference she responded, "Then they better get that
physical reason fixed! You better take a pill or
something..."(00099).

She can sit in the same room with a homosexual if "I
don't think about it," but then she starts to get "jittery"
and "I got to get up and move and gotta get away"(00099). It
is no wonder that she does not believe a homosexual has a
right to be a minister, let alone be in any church. Mary was immovable on the issue of whether homosexuality is immoral, "...I already have my mind made up, it's immoral..." (00099).

Mary was equally clear in her dislike of abortion. "I don't agree with it at all, not at all" (00099). When pressed on the point whether abortion is permissible when carrying the baby threatens the life of the mother Mary was clear that only if "...it's going to kill both the mother and the child and if by having the abortion the mother can live, I think maybe that would be all right, I'm not too sure, I don't like abortion at all" (00099) (italics mine). In any other situation Mary believed abortion to be wrong.

Mary's life has seen one crisis after another. Her homelife with her parents is tenuous, she is separated physically from her sister, she has never met her natural mother, she is overcoming a history of family violence, she struggles with diabetes every day, and she is beginning her college career. Her religious faith is as rock-solid as her family life is uncertain. Her views of other religions is patronizing in that there is only one true religion, Mormonism, and everyone else will be taught the right way after death. She does not question her church. She has nearly a relativistic view of morality until pressed on the issues of homosexuality and abortion. With those specific
issues she sounded much more absolutistic in her views. She has high expectations of herself and admitted to being a perfectionist.

Mary is not in a developmental struggle. She is firmly established in her belief systems about religion and morality. She sounded much more confident when discussing those issues than when talking about her personal life. Fowler might argue that Mary has taken refuge in a Stage Three form of faith, one in which she is non-critical of her beliefs, certain of their correctness, absolutistic on specific issues, and suspicious of anyone who disagrees with her. Mary has displayed each of those characteristics. What she has not displayed is the tension inherent in a move from Stage Three to Stage Four that Sharon Parks emphasized (Parks, p. 27). The only struggle I heard from Mary had to do with her family. I would suggest that Mary has put aside a developmental struggle with stage movement in order to devote her energies to dealing with her family situation. I do not see a stage move or shift until her family situation is resolved one way or the other. This is perhaps a case in which too much crisis has paralyzed stage movement. Mary is a very intelligent person and will undoubtedly resolve her family situation, and when she does will begin to use her psychological energy to deal with stage movement. In Mary's
case it can be said that the human psyche will channel its energies and resources to deal with that which provides the greatest threat to stability.

Respondent F-3, MARK

Mark shared that "athletic" look with the other two respondents I had already interviewed. Mark was tall and as I found out later played for the varsity basketball team at college. Mark is the youngest of two brothers and two sisters. Mark has lived his entire life with his family in a small community "...kind of in between two towns, but where I attended school was a small rural farming town" (000110). Mark loves his parents and can't remember a time when he didn't. Mark is a Catholic from a devoutly Catholic family. Mark appeared to be quite devout himself in his attitudes toward the church and the Pope. Mark is dating a non-Catholic at the time of the interview. Mark is the image of the well-adjusted, first-year student with talent, intelligence, and athletic ability.

The break-down of the categories of data for Mark's interviews showed the largest of the categories was entitled "I am a religious person," category 000110 with 49 notecards. In that category is everything that center's on Mark's
personal identity. The second largest category was one entitled "Catholicism is the best...," category number 000151 with 39 notecards. There were only two other categories that came close, "Tough Social Issues," category 000111 with 39 notecards, and "Right and Wrong," category 000104 with 36 notecards.

I found no apparent inward struggle for Mark as we discussed his views. I found instead someone who was certain of who he was and what he believed. Confidence was the first quality that met me at the door of the interview room as Mark walked in.

Mark calls himself a religious person, "...maybe that's kind of conceited. I go to church, but that doesn't make someone religious" (000110). Religion for Mark is "the study and the belief of God" (000110). "But I try to use religion in my everyday life and incorporate it into my thinking and the way I act" (000110). Apparently, religion is best expressed through Catholicism for Mark.

Mark goes on to explain that he loves the sacraments of the Catholic church and when asked what he would like everyone to do, he responded, "Confession is something that I think that, it would be good for everyone to experience...going in and look in somebody's eyes and say what you've done and truly being sorry for it...you just feel
so much better, and knowing that you can start fresh" (000110).

Mark further explained that his Catholic faith...influences the way I act, and it influences the way I think, and it influences some of my actions" (000110) because "being religion means to me, it has an effect upon things that I do every day" (000110).

Throughout the interview it was apparent that Mark accurately described the influence his faith has on what he thinks and does. When asked about the inerrancy of the Pope and whether the Pope really does speak directly for God Mark responded, "Yeh. I believe that, anyhow, in the course of the Catholic church the Pope doesn't make mistakes..." (000151). Mark made it clear that he stuck to the teachings of the church on all matters, "pretty much for me what the Pope says is kind of what I go by" (000151).

Mark shared why he likes the Catholic church, "because the Catholic church does take a strong stance on many things, that's what I really like about it, they say, you know, this is wrong and this isn't" (000151). When reviewing Mark's views on moral issues the influence of his straightforward faith came out. It was clear that Mark believed things were either right or wrong and that the church could tell which was which.
On the issue of abortion, "I personally believe, and I think this is the position of the Catholic church, but I'm not sure, that life begins at conception. If a pregnancy is threatening a mother and you terminate that pregnancy I think you have already killed one life, and if you let it go, at least the mother has a chance to live, I don't think there has ever been a case where a mother has a 100% chance of dying". I asked Mark, for clarification, if he went along with the Catholic position that abortion is wrong in any situation and he responded, "Yes, I do".

On homosexuality I asked Mark what the Catholic position was on homosexuality and he responded, "I believe they are against homosexuality. I don't believe they believe that it is good". For further clarification I asked if that meant homosexuality was a sin, "I guess so, I'm not real sure, but I think so". When discussing this issue Mark said, "It doesn't feel natural to me, I just don't know. That's another position where you could try to judge but I'm just not in the position at all...It's just something that I don't think is right. I mean, if I find somebody that is homosexual I'm not going to go out and kick the crud out of them. I'm not going to do something like that, but I won't feel comfortable if somebody just comes out and tells me...I just won't, but that's just me". Mark did not find
himself as certain in his views on this issue as he was abortion. However, when Mark wasn't sure of his position he would always invoke the authority of the Pope's decision on the issue.

With the certainty of the church behind him Mark came across self-assured on his positions regarding "moral" issues. Such certainty came through in a narrow approach to right and wrong that was blind to the feelings, beliefs, and situations of others. An example of this "blindness" came through in Mark's discussion of contraception. The Pope is against it and so is Mark. He mentioned that his girl friend is very much in favor of birth control to which Mark responded, "Her biggest problem was that she just couldn't understand it, but I think if she truly loved me...she understands that position and respects it." (000149). Mark was going to send her to a priest he knows so that the priest can explain it to her. "And so she's going to go and talk to him just so she can understand not to argue, but just so she can better understand about the church's position." (000149). I thought to myself, Mark, she may understand and respect your position, but she is the one who will bear the children and raise them.

In a moment of self-reflection Mark revealed, "I'm kind of biased." (000110). With this self-understanding Mark
realized that he consciously adhered to the teachings of the church on all issues, but he preferred it that way. Perhaps the reason I found self-confidence and a lack of inner struggle for Mark is because he has chosen his foundation for how he views the world and it is the Catholic church. Granted, he comes across in his views as rather close-minded and blind to the beliefs and needs of others, but he is certainly confident of where he stands.

When asked directly if he thought there were any absolute laws or rules Mark surprised me when he said, "Absolute?...well, no...I just have to say not..."(000104). In the question of whether one should always tell the truth, Mark demonstrated a great deal of sensitivity and thoughtfulness, "...sometimes you can tell the truth with the intent of hurting someone and that's not good...I'm saying tell them something that is true or tell them nothing at all"(000104).

When asked how he knows when something is right or wrong, "I guess I'll have to go back to my judgment of right and wrong is based on what I consider is my conscience and that's probably been formed by a combination of my parents, my church, and in later years my beliefs"(000104). He went on to say, "What makes it right or wrong is, in my opinion, how God kind of sees it"(000104). "I think sin is something
that offends God"(000144). When asked how he would know how God saw things Mark admitted, "You don't know for sure, I guess. Because nobody, unless you die or something, knows for sure"(000104). I had thought Mark might say that if the Pope says it is right or wrong it is the same as God's judgment, but he never made such a claim.

In pursuing his image of evil and sin I asked what the difference was, "...evil seems like satanic rituals and stuff, and then sin just seems like doing something wrong"(000144). When asked if there is a devil and what influence the devil has on us Mark responded that there is a devil and that the devil never makes us do anything, "...it's up to our free will again to choose whether we fall for the temptations or not"(000144). Mark rejected the notion of foreordination and insisted upon the concept of free will.

This direction of the interview was unexpected because when discussing abortion and homosexuality and his views on his faith and church one would have the impression that Mark was a hard-line Catholic who believed in the inerrancy of the Papacy. However, what happened was that when discussing morality in general and whether or not there are absolutes I found Mark much less self-confident and far more reflective. In this part of the discussion Mark stated, "I don't believe I'm perfect. And I have made mistakes in judgment and I
think you have to look to something else"(000104). What that something else was involved generally family, parents, church, and God. Mark even went on to say that he believed that when a person thinks he is always right, "...that is where you get into trouble..."(000104).

What I saw emerging as the interview went on during the second day was a bit more evidence of an inner struggle. Where he was self-assured the first interview, in the second he became far more introspective and cautious in his words. What helped me understand what was going on in Mark was his view on biblical interpretation. As I expected he said, "...when the church tells me something about the Bible I pretty much take that as fact"(000122). Mark did not stop with this view but went on to express a rather open-minded approach to biblical interpretation, "Well, on the Bible the one thing I do realize is that it depends on who's reading it. Because a lot of things I've noticed about the Bible, I may not agree with some other people on this, it can be interpreted a lot of ways"(000122). I never heard Mark claim that there was a Catholic interpretation, or that the only proper interpretation of scripture would come from the Catholic church. It was clear that when Mark spoke of being in agreement with the Catholic church doctrine on any given subject he was referring to its application only to himself,
and not to the rest of the world. Mark was able to recognize that there were other opinions out there and that, by the nature of his remarks, he had respect for them.

When asked whether or not Mark thought his beliefs were right he responded, "I believe I'm right or else I wouldn't be in the faith that I am. If I had a shadow of a doubt, in my opinion, that I was...then I wouldn't be in that..." (000124). But when asked whether that meant his beliefs were right and the beliefs of others that conflict with his were wrong, he said, "I mean, I couldn't force them, it's each person's choice. I couldn't force them to believe what I believe" (000124). "I know there are a lot of faiths that differ greatly from what my faith is, yet, I don't say that I don't like that person because they say they are....like I won't like a Jew...I just don't think that's right" (000136).

Catholicism is right for Mark and he believes it is the truest of all religions, but he acknowledges that it is not the only religion or that religious differences should be a barrier to relationships. At this point Mark was struggling with some of the issues but never for long. Just when it seemed that Mark was having difficulty making up his mind he would fall back on his church and his faith. He spoke honestly about other religions by simply saying that he
didn't know that much about other religions, only Catholicism. Mark retained his stolid agreement with Catholic dogma, but remained open-minded when it came to other people and their beliefs. Though he wanted this to be the case it was still clear that in the case of his girlfriend he knew she would come around to his own position. Apparently, Mark was far more tolerant of people he did not know or who were not particularly close to him than those closest to him.

I asked Mark what it was like being a Catholic on a conservative Protestant Christian college campus. "Well, it's a little different for me..."(000138). The greatest difficulty he has is with chapel services, "...it never comes close to taking the place of going to Mass...Chapel doesn't replace that, but it doesn't really bother me"(000138). For Mark he simply does not see a problem with being on a Protestant campus. He seemed rather pleased that he had selected this particular college.

In reviewing the data from Mark's two interviews it can be claimed that Mark is self-assured in where to look for guidance on any issue. He is only uncertain when dealing with general concepts of morality or the truth of various religions. He is tolerant of those who are not close to him but not so tolerant of those closest to him. He believes he
is right, but does not believe that what is right for him is necessarily right for others, unless of course they are close to him. In Fowler's terms Mark is a comfortable Stage Three. He is patronizing in his views of the beliefs of others which makes the tolerance he expresses for the beliefs of others ring a bit hollow (Fowler, 1991, p. 108).

Mark is also struggling in some minor ways with moral and religious issues. My impression of Mark is that he is not one who will struggle much, but will quickly revert back to his church or family for guidance. Mark is firmly rooted and knows it, and expects to remain rooted.

Respondent F-4, LORINDA

"Lorinda" came walking into the interview room with a straight back, firm chin, and determined look. She stood about 5' 6" and had a stocky, though athletic build. I found out she was a pitcher for the varsity softball team at college. I could tell that Lorinda would make quite an imposing pitcher. Lorinda is an only child from a farm in Texas raised by two devoutly religious parents. Her religious background is Assemblies of God.

Upon review of the data from the two interviews with Lorinda the categories that stood out were 000203, "Sin and
Evil," with 52 notecards, 000156, "Church," with 42 notecards, and 000170, "God," with 32 notecards, and 000188, "What's it take to get to Heaven," with 28 notecards. A related category that had not appeared in any of the other respondents' interviews was 000164, "End-times," with 13 notecards. These categories combined added up to the majority of notecards in the data. The second major topic was her relationship with her step-grandmother and her parents.


Lorinda, at the time of the interview, lived in two worlds, that of her parents and family in Texas and her life at Sterling College. Her religious beliefs were found woven into both of those lives and provided a link between them. In discussing Lorinda's interviews, her life with her parents and grandparents will be discussed first followed by a discussion of life at Sterling. Her religious views, which dominated both interviews, will be examined as each of her lives is reviewed.

When describing her relationship with her parents
Lorinda said, "...it's a very close bonding family, it's just the three of us" (000162). That sense of "just the three of us" summed up the closeness of the family as being both a sense of comfort for Lorinda and the feeling that her parents were always trying to control her. Her parents want her to tell them everything she does, "...they get irritated whenever they do find out about something, why I didn't say something about it" (000162). "I found that if I didn't tell them something that's when I got into trouble" (000162).

"...she'll (mom) say if she doesn't know about it, God always knows, which I mean, I know that, but like she'll say it like it's guilt trip time" (000162). The most telling reference Lorinda made to her parents came as she was discussing this need to know everything and control her, "...they, just like, put the bit in my mouth if I'm going too fast and yank back, because they don't want me getting hurt" (000162).

Lorinda has a great respect and love for her parents, for all of their controlling behavior with her, Lorinda knew it was out of their desire that she feel free to talk with them about anything, "...because they expected me to tell them, be able to tell them, if something happened I should be able to say, well Mother, such and such happened or something" (000162). "When we're younger you look at your parents as these adults that are just telling you what to do,
and when you come back, you realize, hey, they really care, they're helping me..." (000162).

Lorinda commented on how her parents stressed responsibility with her and that as a result Lorinda had always been the responsible one when a group of young people were out doing anything, "...the parents knew that I was the responsible one in the group..." (000168). But having such a sense of "grown-up" responsibility did take its toll on Lorinda. She reflected back on her high school days and realized that she "...didn't like them...I mean...as just high school kids..." (000168). She distanced herself from young people her own age and felt more comfortable with older adults. "I mean by the time I was aged thirteen they (her parents) treated me like an adult because I was the only child, and I could have conversations with adults where a lot of teenagers could not" (000168). As a result Lorinda felt that she was in the position of responsibility when with youth her own age, "...and it put me in the position where I had to handle the situations..." (000168).

Lorinda is grateful to her parents for bringing her up in the church, "I look at it that I'm lucky that both my parents were raised up in church and that I may do something wrong but a lot of it is that I know what I did and I learn from my mistakes" (000162). From the rest of the interview
data Lorinda's preoccupation with religion and the church became clear. Lorinda was raised in an atmosphere in which the church was at the center of her family life.

Lorinda also shared some of the conflict she had with her mother. Lorinda was in the eighth grade and her Mother's father was dying from cancer and her mother would get up every morning at 5a.m. to help her father and not get home again until 9p.m. Lorinda expressed a very distressed feeling about that memory, "...I was young and there by myself, I mean, and I was getting up and going to school by myself....and it takes a toll on me because, you like, where's my mom?" (000162). Her father would not get home from work until 9:30 a.m., too late to be with Lorinda. Apparently Lorinda had never quite forgiven her mother because it was clear that she had a much closer relationship with her father than she did with her mother. When discussing how she went about making difficult decisions she said, "If I have to I will go to my dad" (000179).

One of the sources of distress for Lorinda in this portion of the interview was the demands her parents made on her to call them at least three times a week. She felt indignant that her parents placed such a demand upon her. "I look at it that if I'm making it on my own, and they (parents) taught me to be responsible to know what decisions
to make and stuff, I mean, I don't, hey, call, but I'm still trying to catch up and keep things in order here at school and it's different than high school"(000162). She believes her parents are afraid that she will have a "down-fall" and that they are not going to be there to pick her up. One does not get the sense that Lorinda wants picked up. She even admits that she may be "in over her head," but "...they have to understand the fact that I am away and I'm trying to be responsible"(000162). Lorinda appeared to be fiercely independent, "...I'm not going to live with my parents the rest of my life. That is a definite no no"(000168).

Lorinda related an incident when it was her mother's birthday and Lorinda did not get around to call her mother until eight days later only to find out that Lorinda's mother had been telling people that she had called her on her birthday. It was also clear that Lorinda would not call home unless she thought her dad would be home. He leaves for work at 10:30p.m. and so Lorinda will not call any later.

Lorinda referred to college as "This is a better school away from home"(000161). She had mentioned that her parents liked the school but did not like the distance from home. When listening to Lorinda you have a sense of a person who is starting out new. College is a new life for Lorinda who apparently had "a rough high school"(000161) experience.
Lorinda seemed freer in her expression when she was talking about Sterling. It was no surprise when she said, "...and usually at home I am really particular about what I say, because I'm always afraid that, it's not that I'm going to say something wrong, it's just that people can take a lot out of proportion"(000161). When Lorinda is at college, "...I'm something that's just my own view"(000161).

Perhaps the most disturbing element of the interviews was when we hit upon the subject of her relationship with her step-grandmother. Lorinda's speech pattern changed when she talked about her step-grandmother. Lorinda began speaking in erratic phrases never completely finishing a sentence before stating the next point. Her voice sounded irritated and tense. Physically Lorinda tensed up, leaned forward and clasped her hands tightly together.

Her dislike, even hatred, of her step-grandmother was readily apparent. Lorinda claims it stems from an incident at the time of the last days of her grandfather's life. Lorinda tells the story:

When my grandfather was in the hospital, she (step-grandmother) made comments and I was fourteen at the time when she was making the comments, and like I was very close to my grandfather, and I'm sitting there in his room and she said "why don't they just put him out of his misery," and they wouldn't do it and he could hear it and he knows what's being said, he's not to the point yet, and she and I are not close. I had not been rude to her, but I was
nice to her (000163).

Lorinda's hatred toward her step-grandmother was expressed in several ways throughout the interview. "I hate her. I didn't love her, I didn't, she always wanted me to call her grandmother and I wouldn't do it..." (000163). "I ignore her a lot. I don't talk to her, I stay away from her..." (000163). Lorinda has even requested that any pictures of her step-grandmother be removed from her parent's bedroom, to which Lorinda's mother replied, "you don't sleep in here..." (000163).

Lorinda must have been very close to her grandfather because in the interview she kept coming back to what her step-grandmother had said at his deathbed. Lorinda even claimed that at another time before her grandfather died the step-grandmother had said, "why don't they put a gun to his head and do it..." (000163).

At this point in the interview I had assumed that the step-grandmother had married Lorinda's grandfather when Lorinda was old enough to remember her natural grandmother. To my surprise the step-grandmother had married the grandfather before Lorinda was born. Lorinda has known no other grandmother, yet she could never call her "grandmother." Apparently she had learned from the rest of the family what attitude to have toward the step-grandmother.
How Lorinda deals with her hatred toward her step-grandmother raises a faith struggle that Lorinda suffers. Lorinda had been to chapel the morning of this interview. She asked me if I had gone and I said that I did. She admitted that the college president in his speech had touched her, "Yeh, because, he made the statement that you need to be open and clarify something to people, and I guess I'm wrong because eventually, to be totally correct with God I will need to talk to her about it" (000163). Lorinda's motivation for making amends with her step-grandmother has nothing to do with the step-grandmother but everything with getting "right with God." "People say you have to give it to God, you have to forgive, and you wonder how can you, you have to know what the lady said...and I'm supposed to forget about it?" (000163).

Lorinda finally admitted what she really feared. She spoke of the fact that because cancer ran in the family that her mother might have it someday, "and I look at it, hey, if they, if she doesn't get it, I'm still in contention for it..." (000163) and she wouldn't want her step-grandmother standing over her hospital bed saying the same thing about her. She also admitted that her mother was leaving early in the morning to take care of her grandfather while her step-grandmother did nothing, implying that because of the
laziness of her step-grandmother she had to give up her mother.

This part of the interview disturbed me because Lorinda was extremely conflicted about what was going on inside of her. I suggested that she talk with the college chaplain for some guidance and counsel. This was the issue that brought out her inner faith conflicts that the literature claims all late adolescents are going through. For Lorinda she wanted to be a good Christian, but with her feelings toward her step-grandmother she was afraid that she could not be the Christian she should be.

This leads to the prevalence of religion and the church throughout the interviews. The related categories: "God," "Church and Religion," "What's it take to get to heaven?," "Sin and Evil," and "End-times," work together to provide a fairly clear view of the form and content of Lorinda's faith.

In her image of God she describes God, "...He is this magnificent supernatural power, and a supernatural being, and He is there to take care of us, He takes care of me...He's not going to allow anything to happen to me to brand me"(000170). "He does things the way He wants them done"(000170). "God's will, the way He sees for things to go is the way things are going to happen. Things may be side-tracked but eventually what He had intended to happen will
happen" (000170). God has complete control over everything.

Though Lorinda believes in a powerful Satan, God still has a greater power over evil and will one day overcome all that is evil. Satan's power over a person is "psychological" (000203). We can be tempted but it is still up to us, yet somehow God has complete control even of this decision. This is where some confusion seemed to exist in her thoughts about God's control. At one point she said, "He knows everything you do and say, He knows your inner thoughts, and so you don't get away on that part" (000170), and "...God made us to have our own mind and body, that He could control us, everyone, but He wants it to be our choice" (000170). Lorinda wants it both ways, she wants free-will and she wants God to have total control. It finally came down to a point she made that "...There's always going to be someone who doesn't agree to points because God made each and everyone different and unique and I guess to make life interesting" (000170). "He will allow things to happen but things, they are under His control..." (000170). Because God is in total control, God is somehow behind everything we do. She was unable to see the contradictions in such a view. We have free-will to choose but God is behind our choices, or actually causes our choices. Yet, she is not willing to say that either.
Lorinda's response to the question of whether God is male or female led to an interesting discussion. God is male, but she hesitated, "but I can't say, because they always imply He". We then talked about whether women could be ordained ministers, "If they are chosen and God calls them into ministry, they're going to do ministry". Lorinda continued the discussion by explaining that she believes men and women are equal and not equal. Her explanation was confusing, for example, "What I was going to say was about people who are lowering themselves that women are subservient to men, and they are lowering themselves against the man, but it didn't say that there was anything against the women, and that's the only time I look at it they are considered very unequal, otherwise we are in God's reign".

In review, God is in control, God works in both men and women, both are equal yet unequal. Apparently men should have dominion over women in some cases. The image of God emerging is that of a very powerful, benevolent dictator who wants us to make our own choices, yet chooses for us. It seems that her images of God and God's ways mirror her images of her parents and her parents' ways.

The relationship between Lorinda's image of God and her parents became more pronounced when discussing what made
something either right or wrong. "What makes an action right? It's when we know that it's not going to be disapproved of"(000203). When asked what the right perspective would be to determine whether an action was right, Lorinda said, "Just to do things for Christ. Because otherwise you will get into trouble"(000203). She chuckled to herself after making this statement. When asked why there is evil in the world, "Because people reject God and they don't want Him, they don't want to know that somebody is over them, teenagers rebel because parents are over them..."(000203). Notice the language she used in describing right and wrong, "get into trouble," "not being disapproved of," "somebody over them," words usually used in reference to the discipline parents attempt to exercise "over" their children.

Lorinda went on to explain that one could never know for certain whether anything was a sin, "...you can't, I don't think you can define it (sin), you can look it up in a dictionary, it probably says something wrong by the will of God or something, I don't know, but if you study on it, the Bible gives you all these examples, don't do this and everything, and you really don't know besides what it says don't do..."(000203). "...Because sin is so broad and you cannot say exactly what sin is, honestly, He's never defined
what a sin is, and so honestly we don't know until He let's us know by conscience" (000203). Apparently, knowing you have sinned is a matter of conscience, because, according to Lorinda, there is nothing else to tell a person whether an action is sinful or not, not even the Bible.

I was somewhat confused by this approach to understanding sin. The implications are staggering. She then said, "You can't just choose to sin" (000203). At this point I realized that she was more consistent then I had at first realized. If God is in complete control, then it would be the case that one's conscience would guide one on whether something is a sin if one understands the conscience to be God's mouthpiece. If God is in complete control then it would be true that we "can't just decide to sin." Yet, now it is confusing, if God is doing all of this who is doing the sinning? Lorinda seemed oblivious to this contradiction or that if was even a problem. She was totally noncritical of her own views.

Lorinda did make an interesting point on the notion of sin. When asked whether there would ever be a situation in which one could lie, she said, "probably" (000203). In using the example of Nazi storm troopers coming to one's door to ask if there are Jews inside, and if you had Jews inside, would you lie? Lorinda said yes, but implied that it
wouldn't really be a sinful lie, because, "...you are not lying under God, you are lying under Satan...it's sin, but the thing about it is, that's sinning to evil"(000203). If we "sin" to evil then in fact we are being obedient to God and therefore not sinning. That is the most inventive explanation for how one can lie without lying.

Lorinda had a rather broad image of morality claiming that not only was there not a single morality for all to follow, but that not all would follow it anyway even if there was such a global morality. "...actually if you take go down to the inner person, you go down on the moral person, all morals are alike except there are a lot of things I wouldn't do..."(000203). Morality was a matter of heart and conscience, and Lorinda seemed content to leave it at that.

With this point of view it seemed that Lorinda had a rather inclusive view of humanity and morality. A good example of this was in her views concerning abortion. I expected that she would be against abortion without exception. However, when asked if abortion was wrong in every situation, her reaction was, "Not in every situation"(000201). She went on to say that in the case of endangering the mother's life or rape that abortion was acceptable, a position far more open to pro-choice than the other respondents in this sample. Her biggest complaint with
abortion was that it was too easy to get and people were using it for birth control.

When approached with the subject of homosexuality Lorinda at first claimed that it was wrong and probably a sin, but then true to her previous comments about sin she said, "You find it in the Bible saying that it was wrong, but I couldn't prove that it was a sin....I could tell you that it was, but then I would be judging, so I can't do that"(000201). When asked if a homosexual could be a Christian she said, "I don't know because then you're asking whether homosexuality is a sin, and...."(000201). She didn't like homosexuality, but as to whether it was a sin or not, she left the door open. Lorinda's view of homosexuality was as open if not more so than the rest of the respondents, however, this is not to say that Lorinda accepts it as a valid sexual orientation.

This inclusiveness stops when discussing how one gets into heaven. It seems clear that for Lorinda one can be perfectly moral without the slightest chance of getting into heaven. When asked if anyone who was outside Christianity had any place in heaven, her response was, "no"(000188). When asked if that included the Jews, she said, "He has chosen them so we would look at them as He sees"(000188). When asked directly about other religions she responded, "I
don't know because I'm not familiar with their religion"(000188). Pressed again on the point, she continued to maintain that only people who confessed Christ would be in heaven. She has no problem being inclusive in her views of morality, but in matters of religion and right doctrine there is no question which doctrine is right.

Lorinda's image of the "End-times" was very vivid. She saw the future of humankind as summed up in the word "destruction"(000164). In a literalistic interpretation of "Revelation," she believes one can, "...take the Bible and you can know exactly where we are at right now pretty much, I mean, you have to read the Old Testament and go back to Revelations and in the New Testament"(000164). Part of this "End-time" imaging involves the "Rapture," "I look at it I don't want to die but I'm going to go in the rapture and I look at it that people will be thinking, 'Oh, she's gone,'"(000164). The "Rapture" refers to a doctrine held by many Christians based upon the passage in I Thessalonians 4:16,17, in which the true believers will be caught up in the air with the resurrected and with Jesus before the final "conflagration" or destruction of the world. Lorinda believes that not only is this an important doctrine but that this doctrine "is pretty much throughout the whole New Testament and Revelations"(000164). In fact, other than the
I Thessalonians passage there is some indirect reference in Revelation to the rapture, the rapture is based upon only one clear passage mentioned above.

Lorinda clearly sees and interprets the Bible as her church sees and interprets the Scriptures. The Assembly of God churches uniformly believe in the accuracy of the prophecy in Revelation as predictions of current events and that all true Christians will be Raptured.

Lorinda's image of her own future was a brighter one. She said, "I'm going to try to be open-minded, I will try my best to grow in Christ". The open-mindedness she was speaking of was not a matter of being inclusive in accepting the thoughts and ideas of others outside the faith, rather being open to the leading of Christ. By being open-minded to Christ one is close-minded to the world, and presumably everything else.

To conclude this review of the interviews with Lorinda I would like to mention again her involvement at college. There are three important groups in this college town that holds Lorinda's life together, her church, her softball team, and her friends. Lorinda is not a member of her home church in Texas yet feels loyal to that church. The Assembly Of God church she attends in this college town has become a true church home for her. She plays the drums in worship every
Sunday, she teaches Sunday School, she is a youth sponsor, yet she is not a member. She wants to be a member, and one can tell that she likes this church better than the one in Texas, but her parents are involved in the church in Texas. She is conflicted about what to do. It is clear to me that she wants to be a member at the Assembly of God church in the college town.

The other important group is her friends. She felt at ease at college because of the people. She has roommates with whom she is close. When asked if she would chance losing that friendship over her beliefs her response was surprising, "I don't know because their friendship I cherish, and I wouldn't want to change them, because I love the friendships that I have..."(000179). At that point she wondered off from the subject and never clearly answered the question.

Her relationship with her softball team: "I'm a softball player, a pitcher and catcher, and I look at it to be a good team member, it's like a relationship one-on-one, but a team instead and you have to have that bond there because otherwise there's no respect and no team, you have nothing"(000161). She is a team player and will do nothing to "rock the boat."

She also mentioned that she liked the college because
she felt that she was respected and not seen as an "I.D." number, "in class they call you by name"(000161). "People care (at Sterling), and I don't think I could hack going to school if I was just a computer I.D. number, because....I am an individual and I have my own beliefs, which everybody does, and don't knock me because of my beliefs, but accept me for what I am"(000161).

Lorinda is a determined, frightened, somewhat immature, strong, courageous, talented, stubborn, lonely, confused, young woman struggling to become who she is. The following quote said volumes to me about what is in her heart, "And you have to look at things with open eyes and you can't with open arms because there's no angel welcoming things to you..."(000203). Lorinda has felt rejection and is seeking acceptance. For that reason her developmental profile parallels very nicely with Fowler's understanding of Stage Three faith(Fowler, 1981, p. 167). The struggle that is most evident in Lorinda's interviews was a seeking for identity. Her relationship with her parents, her step-grandmother, her teammates, her roommates, her God, her churches, all reflect a struggle of a young woman torn between two worlds, Texas and college.

This struggle includes the hunger for acceptance. She, as is the case in Fowler's description of Stage Three, is
loyal to her friends, her church, and her parents (Fowler, 1981, pp. 172, 173). She will not question those institutions but will cling tenaciously to them as an anchor. Yet, she is also struggling to be independent and her attitudes toward the various faiths represented by her friendships is one that grows ever more inclusive. The exclusivity of her Assembly of God faith may give way to a more moderate image of religion. If it does it will come as a result of her setting herself free from her parents and her hatred of her step-grandmother. However, because her loneliness is so apparent and her need for acceptance so great, she could also go the way of whatever group or individual most clearly accepts and embraces her.

Lorinda demonstrates what Parks was describing in critique of Fowler's theory that allows for such a leap from Stage Three to Stage Four. Lorinda has accepted as inner authority the external authority of her parents. That external authority, however, is increasingly being tested by her growing autonomy (Parks, pp. 86, 87).

Respondent F-5, Alice

Alice is the youngest of two children, her older brother was a senior at the same college at the time of this
interview. Alice is of medium height, blonde hair, medium build, and as far as I know the only first-year student that was interviewed not involved in varsity sports. Alice was also the only respondent that had no clear church ties, though she made it clear that she believed in God and was a Christian.

In reviewing the data cards from her interviews the most dominant category was 000245, "Personal Reflections, Self Perceptions," with eighty-three notecards. The number of notecards in 000245 came as a result of the personal approach Alice took to every question asked. She focused on herself for most of her answers in both interviews. She had a form of what I would call "identity myopia," she couldn't see much beyond herself. Though this was somewhat the case with the other respondents, it was far more noticeable with Alice.

The next two categories were 000236, "Religion," with forty-two notecards, and 000213, "Right and Wrong," with forty-one notecards. Her discussion of "Abortion and Homosexuality," category 000225, yielded twenty-three notecards, followed by her discussion of "God," 000214, with twenty-one notecards. The four remaining categories were 000223, "Parents," with thirteen notecards, 000209, "College," and 000218, "Future of Humanity," each with eleven notecards, and category 000251, "Country, Right or Wrong?",
with seven notecards.

The dominance of category 000245 suggests that we begin here in this interpretive review of the data. Why was Alice so focused on herself and why did she tend to bring all discussion of the various topics back to herself? The answer to these questions may best be found by looking closely at category 000245.

"How would I describe myself? I don't know, I just guess I'd say that I'm the type of person who cares what other people thinks, you know, I care for other people, you know, I don't purposely hurt them, you know, I try to, you know, I try to give a fair chance, you know, I don't discriminate, and I am a Christian, I do believe in God, and I feel firmly about that..." (000245).

In describing herself Alice was consistent in four qualities about herself, 1. she cares very much about what others think, 2. she is fair, 3. she is a Christian, and 4. she listens to what others have to say. "A lot of my friends, I've had a lot of people come up to me that don't hardly even know me here and, you know, ask, tell me about their problems and stuff. And I try to help them and be there to listen" (000245).

When asked what she thinks others think of her? "I hope they think that I'm a caring person, you know, that I care
what they think, and that I'll always be there for them to listen, that I'll listen to them and try to help them as much as I can and stuff"(000245).

When asked what sets her apart from everyone else she replied, "Just the fact that I'm me, you know. I'm just myself, nobody else is just like me"(000245). She sees herself as unique, not in what traits or characteristics she demonstrates in her personality, rather the fact that no one else is "her."

Alice came across in the interviews as an independent young woman. She mentioned that she liked being on her own and "...being able to do, you know, what I want...I don't know, for the past eighteen years I've had to answer, where are you going, when are you going to be home, what are you doing..."(000245). Does she miss not having to report in to someone all the time? "Sometimes, but more often not"(000245).

She was the quickest of the first-year respondents to answer the question, "Who gives you permission?" She quickly responded, "Myself"(000245). She clearly enjoys her freedom and responsibility. She elaborated on what a good feeling it was to make her own decisions.

As clear a sense of herself that Alice had along with her sense of independence, there was still the hint of an
inner struggle with who she was, her life, her future, her purpose in life, her hopes and dreams, and her religious faith.

In response to the question of whether her life has meaning she said, "I think my life has meaning, I'm not sure what it is right now, but, I don't know..." (000245). Unlike the other respondents in the first year group Alice was ambiguous about such things as ultimate purpose or meaning to life. She seemed somewhat confused when thinking about her purpose in life, "My purpose, I think is that, I can, through me, I can help aim...and God can help me help others better themselves, and stuff like that" (000245). She stopped at the word "aim" and went on with another thought. I am not certain what she meant, or if she even knew what she meant.

She did not refer to her purpose and meaning in life in the kind of "religious" terms the other first year respondents used, "to glorify God," "to worship God," "to witness for Christ," "God's plan for us," etc.

It could be that Alice tended to answer the questions without so much "religious" rhetoric as the other first year respondents because she had never been deeply rooted in any one church or denomination of the church. When asked what her religious background was her response was revealing, "I went to a Baptist church, to the Methodist, I don't know, I
went to the Baptist quite a bit" (000245). When asked if she had a church home here in Sterling her response was, "Not yet, no. Even early when we were going to different churches and stuff, I don't know, I just don't get the same feeling..." (000245). She was referring to a feeling she had once when she was in high school and a Christian Rock group from California visited the Baptist church she was then attending. She felt more loyalty to the group and her personal experience than to the church. Alice's religious focus is very much on herself and her own feelings.

When asked who she relies on..."Myself, well, and God, because He helps me make the right decisions...when I was growing up...I would go to my parents when I needed advice...because they were...my authority figure...but now I'm my own person and I make my own decisions, and stuff and not to rely on God on somethings" (000245). She moves from relying on God and parents to mostly relying on herself, even to the point of stating that she does not rely on God for somethings.

Alice seems to be clear on how she sees herself but somewhat confused on matters of religion, beliefs, etc. She knows what she believes she should believe, but it is clear she has never fully thought it through. As is typical of young people her age she simply does not see the
contradiction in many of her beliefs. She apparently does not understand what it means to take the Bible literally. When asked if she takes the Bible literally as the inerrant word of God, she replied in the affirmative.

We started then to talk about family and husbands and wives. Alice claimed to believe what the Bible called for, "...I think the man should be the head of the household, yeh. And I think that the wife should obey him..." (000245). When asked if because the Bible is the inerrant word of God if it should be obeyed, again she said, "Yes" (000245). Then I asked her if she would still be obedient to a husband that verbally abused her, "Verbally abusive? Yeh, uh, I don't know, I'd just say, yeh, you still need to obey, but, um, ask God to forgive him, you know, ask Him, ask God to show him how, you know, what to do" (000245).

Alice drew the line on wifely obedience when it came to physical abuse, "...see if I was being abused physically, I don't think I'd be obedient, you know. Because, I mean, you don't have to take that..." (000245). I then pursued the family question by pointing out to her that many Christians will cite scripture as a reason women are to remain in the house and have children and not work outside the home. Alice, surprisingly, had no trouble with that, but then went on to say, "see, I feel that when I get married and I have a
family that I want to be there to raise my kids until they start school, and then I want to have, I want to have, you know, my own career, have a teaching job, or do something...I feel like that you need to do something to feel fulfilled, or otherwise...If I wouldn't do something, if I'd just stay home all the time I'd feel empty and feel that my life wasn't doing anything, wasn't worth anything" (000245).

In describing her background she made it clear that her mother worked outside the home, her aunts, her friends, nearly every adult woman she had grown up around worked outside the home. I asked her, that according to some churches, they would be considered as being disobedient to the scriptures. She said, "it's not intentionally...disobeying the word...it's just because you need that to feel fulfilled or you need that to help the family" (000245).

Alice then gave a rather interesting critique of the Bible, "That goes back to when the Bible was written that that's what, you know, how everything was, but, times, I guess, you know, times change, you know. I don't know, I've always grown up knowing that...in the generation that I grew up not many wives and mothers stayed home" (000245). She concluded that maybe she didn't take the Bible so literally after all. I am not certain she fully appreciated the
implications of her critique of the Bible.

Alice also claimed to be a religious person. When asked what it meant to be a religious person she said, "Uh, just to know God and believe in Him and trust Him and..." (000245). What does a religious person do? "They read the Bible, they pray, they share with others...they go to church, I mean, just because somebody doesn't go to church doesn't mean that they can't be religious, and just because someone goes to church doesn't mean they are religious" (000245). Being religious, for Alice, is apparently an intensely personal affair.

She claimed that if people did not want to be her friend because she was Christian then they weren't friends worth having. However, this is in contrast to her several responses citing the importance of friends and being accepted. Whether she would be able to stand opposed to her friends, even if it meant losing them, is hard to tell.

With all of this independence and sense of self Alice still did not know where she fit in. "Where do I fit? I don't really know where I fit right now, I just kind of live and just get through..." (000245). She appears to be a young woman who shares many similar qualities with others her age. She is independent but confused. She wants to belong, but doesn't know where. She believes in God and the Bible but
isn't sure what that means. She knows she has a purpose in life and that her life has meaning, but she cannot put it to words. She sees herself as being religious, but is loyal to herself and not to any one religion. A certain religious feeling seems to be her criteria for whether something is truly religious or not.

The focus on herself and her own feelings does direct how Alice views the world. She appears to be a very "inward" person who looks to herself for guidance and for permission. Her independence is qualified by a sense of confusion and anxiety concerning life and her place in the world. She shows the signs of a struggle for identity, but is clearly going to struggle on her own.

Why such a focus on herself? Her independence brings about a focus on her "self," she wants to be responsible for herself and is in the process of learning how do to that. As a result she has to spend her energy toward getting to know herself better.

A source of this independence probably comes from the way Alice was raised, according to Alice. "They (parents) always try to show us what's right, you know, they never tell us like don't do this because it's wrong, they let us make our own decisions, you know, and we learn from our own mistakes, but they try to guide us in the right
direction"(000223). Alice said that her parents have been an
excellent example for her and her brother. When she was in
high school, "...they were more like an equal...I mean they
treated me more like an adult...started letting me make my
own decisions, stuff like that"(000223). One gets the sense
from Alice that she trusts her parents and feels comfortable
around her parents. She talks about her parents with a
respect that one can sense from a warmth in her voice. She
apparently has no difficulty in talking to her parents,
especially her mother, about what ever she has decided.

This kind of support and mutual respect between daughter
and parents has established a level of trust that has
probably helped Alice focus on learning more about herself.
Alice seems at ease to struggle with beliefs and traditions.
I did not sense from Alice an anxiety that new found
contradictions in her beliefs would have a devastating effect
upon her. She was not overly concerned about whether or not
she got the "doctrine" right, only with how she felt about
something. She clearly trusted her own senses. She seemed
closer to looking to herself for authority than did any of
the other first year respondents.

With this understanding of Alice I would like to look
closer at her views concerning religion and morality. These
categories formed the second largest categories in the data.
Alice considers herself a religious person, and in the initial interview it seemed that Alice was going to be fairly narrow in her perspective concerning the different religions. In an attempt to understand how the respondent feels toward other religions I asked them about what it would take to get to heaven. If a first year college student between eighteen and twenty years of age is as Fowler claims, a Stage Three in their faith development, then it stands to reason that the respondent would have a very narrow and somewhat negative view toward other religions seeing her own religion as superior to all other religions. This would be manifested in a response that claims all religions counter to one's own have no place in heaven.

In response to the question, "What's it take to get into heaven?" Alice said, "You'd have to, you'd have to ask the Lord to come into your heart, and then don't, once you do that then you can't say, you can't deny that, I mean, you can't deny that you know Him..."(000236). To clarify who she meant by "Lord, Him," I asked if she had to believe in Jesus to get to heaven. "Yeh, I think you do, I mean, I've always grown up with that, I think, yeh"(000236).

Up to this point Alice seemed fairly confident of her answers until I asked if that meant all people who weren't Christian would not go to heaven. Alice seemed confused when
she answered, "No, well...". Alice was not willing to say that every non-Christian was not going to heaven. She began searching for an explanation of how someone could be other than a Christian and still get to heaven. She began to speak beyond a Stage Three's grasp of this problem when she said, "...it seems that Jesus is who we worship but we still all worship God, you know, Jesus is just our symbol, just like their symbols, you know, I wouldn't condemn them for feeling the way they feel...". When asked specifically about the Jews' future in heaven Alice said, "Yeh. Well, OK, in the universe...in God, they are because Jesus is God, yeh". Therefore, anyone who believes in "God" is going to heaven because for her Jesus is God and therefore those who believe in God actually believe in Jesus. "Who's heaven for? People who believe in God...and they just...I don't know...they have it in their hearts and so...".

Alice did not want to include people who worship idols as heavenly prospects, and so for her that was the criteria, the God they worshipped had to be an invisible monotheistic spirit. At this point she was still uncertain about other religions. I told her that based upon her explanation of who God really was that Muslims and Jews had a place in heaven but not Hindus and Buddhists. She did not respond except to
say, "I guess, I mean, I really never thought about that..." (000236). I questioned her, knowing that at Sterling College she would come across several students who would strongly disagree with her saying that her ideas were too liberal based upon my interviews with other first year students, how she would respond to someone who disagreed with her views. "...I would probably get real defensive, you know. And I, because I mean, I don't know, just because you don't know everything there is to know about the Bible or religion or anything doesn't mean that you're not going to go to heaven, I mean you're not a Christian" (000236).

Alice wanted to have a broader view toward other religions, she did not want to verbally condemn all non-Christians to hell. However, she was also reluctant and confused about what she did believe on this point. She believed that her problem was that because she was not a strong church goer that she did not have the Bible knowledge that others who disagreed with her would have. That did not stop her from claiming that she did have a right to her views or that it meant she was any less a Christian.

She went on to discuss her view that most people are born into their religion and because of that she did not understand how anyone could claim one religion to be better than another. She does not expect people of other religions
to believe what she believes. "I mean, I don't expect them
to believe, or think the same way I do, but I would always
leave that option open for them to..."(000236).

I found Alice to have the most open attitude toward
other religions than most of the other respondents. However,
Alice's attitude was based upon the belief that Jesus is
simply the Christian's view of God and that so long as others
believed in a spiritual, monotheistic God, then they too were
acceptable. Alice took a view that Hans Kung called
"patronizing," in that she believes non-Christian religions
are really Christian, they just don't know it yet (Kung, p.
81). One other first-year respondent had much the same view
in that all religions will eventually lead to Mormonism,
whether in this life or in the next. In this sense Alice was
just as narrow in her view of her own religion and as
negative toward the validity of other religions as anyone I
interviewed. The difference was that for Alice at least
there was the possibility that people of other faiths had a
place in heaven, for whatever reason.

Alice's views on morality appeared to be advanced for a
person of her age (18 years). When asked what made an action
right, the other first-year respondents said something about
whether it was within God's will, or obedient to God's law.
Alice said, "Well, maybe not the action itself, but maybe the
consequence of the action is right or wrong"(000213). Rather than take an absolutistic approach to morality, Alice took the consequentialist argument. What made a consequence wrong was whether "it hurt somebody else"(000213). Something is right if, "...it helps better yourself, and it doesn't hurt anybody else..." (000213).

In the entire discussion of morality, the only time Alice talked about God or the Bible was when abortion and homosexuality was discussed. When discussing morality in general she was more concerned about making right decisions based upon whether or not the consequences of that decision would hurt anyone. At this point it seemed that Alice was a consequentialist until she brought up a point about murder.

Alice's view was that, "taking someone else's life is always murder"(000213). "I mean, first degree murder is just the same as any other kind of murder," "I'd like to say that...sometimes murder is right and sometimes murder is wrong, but that's not the case, because murder is murder" (000213). Even in the case of self-defense Alice said, "I mean, sure, if somebody was threatening my life and it would be either me or them, you know, I'd hope it would be them, (but) I'd still have this guilt"(000213). It did not seem that any consequences could make murder right for Alice. Because she categorized the taking of human life, regardless
of the situation, as murder she could not see the possibility that not taking the life of another might result in hurting people more. On this point Alice didn't seem to mind that she was not consistent.

This position on murder led to her discussion of abortion. For Alice abortion is wrong, regardless of the situation. I found Alice to be more narrow on this position than some of the other first-year respondents. "Something is wrong there because it (Bible) says you're not supposed to murder and abortion to me is murder, you know, so..." (000225). It makes sense if one categorizes all taking of human life as murder regardless of circumstances that abortion would therefore be wrong. She did admit that, "sometimes I believe that if the mom's, if the mother's life is threatened, yeh, it would be, uh, I don't know if it would be better to take the life of the baby...I feel abortion is murder no matter when it is, I don't know...see I'm not sure how I feel in regard to rape or if it's endangering the mother's life, I'm not sure..."(000225). When asked if she had to choose between the fetus and the life of the adult woman Alice said she would save the adult woman. She was not certain of the reason. She finally said, "I don't know how I feel, because I have mixed emotions about that..."(000225).

Alice was opposed to abortion because it was murder,
however, she was open to considering whether or not she was right. Her uncertainty indicates to me that she is openly considering both sides of the issue, something that a Stage Three mentality would not do. Her struggle is with ambiguity and the realization that right and wrong are not so easily determined.

Alice had the same attitude about homosexuality. She saw it as wrong but then when asked whether a practicing homosexual could be a Christian she replied, "Well, see, I don't know, because I don't know all of what the Bible says about that, so I'm not real sure, I don't have any right to say that that's wrong and that's right"(000225). When asked why she felt that homosexuality was wrong she attributed it to where she was born and how she was raised, not to any biblical doctrine. "And it's just one of those things that I haven't been brought up with"(000225). She then used an argument against homosexuality that did not make much sense, 

"...if God had wanted us to be like that He would have created us all (emphasis mine) like that...He would have created two Adams...I just feel like it's wrong"(000225).

When asked if it were shown that people are actually born "gay" if that would make a difference, she said that she felt it would still be wrong because, "...People can choose, you know..."(000225).
Continuing the discussion on morality, Alice said that the one moral law that she wished everyone followed and that she would impose if she had the power was, "Pre-marital sex" (000213). "I strongly believe that you shouldn't have sex before you are married. And I wish a lot more people felt that way, because that would make the world a whole lot better, it would eliminate a lot of problems... teenage pregnancy would go down and abortion would probably... go down drastically, AIDS would go down" (000213). Alice included extra-marital sex to the moral law against pre-marital sex.

All of the first-year respondents lifted up extra-marital and pre-marital sex as taboo. For these respondents sex outside marriage was something they all believed to be the most important moral law that should be followed. The reason given by Alice for this taboo was because of the consequences when there is sex outside marriage. The reasons given by the other respondents was that extra-marital sex was against God's will. Alice continued to take the consequentialist's approach to moral issues.

Another important moral law for Alice was never to be prejudiced against others. "It really bothers me when somebody really doesn't know me but they don't like me, you know, they have judged me without getting to know me, that really bothers me so I try not to do that with people, I try
to give them a fair chance"(000213). The care and concern Alice has for others was very evident in the interview.

Alice believes there is a Devil, but she also believes that "Who made evil? We did..."(000213). Alice believes that no one can blame the Devil for making us do anything we do not want to do. "...You can't say that the devil made me do it, you can say that the devil tempted me to do it..." (000213). "You are responsible for your own actions..." (000213). "Everybody is responsible for doing evil" (000213). The role of the Devil is to tempt us by making, "...evil things look appealing, and just makes it seem like the right thing to do"(000213. Alice believes there is evil, but again she believes that each of us is responsible for it, that we are not caught in some cosmic war between good and evil.

Her image of God was typical in that she viewed God as, "...just this big giant..."(000214). "I never thought of God as a woman, in my life men have always been dominating, you know, and so it's just logical for Him to be male" (000214). Her image of God as male she attributed again to the way she was raised, not that that is what the Bible said, or that it was just right. She was very insightful about her beliefs and was aware of the fact that "men dominated" her life.
She believes that God created all things, including evil. She does not believe in predestination. "I think He knows what choices He's going to have for us in life, I mean...He doesn't know what decisions we're going to make...but He gives us those options and choices..."(000214).

She then went on to describe God as all powerful, and I asked her what that meant. As she thought about it she said that maybe He does know everything about us, maybe He does have a plan for us. She seemed more confused as she continued to discuss God's power.

She continued to believe that God does both good and bad in that we will sometimes judge what God does to us as bad. She continued to believe there is a Satan, but that Satan did not have the power of God. However, "He doesn't have the authority to say, 'no don't do that,' to Satan... but He does have the authority to tell us, show us what's right and what's wrong, and then it's up to us to make the right choice"(000214). The purpose of Satan was apparently to tempt us into choosing against God and doing the wrong thing.

When asked about the future of humanity, unlike the other first year respondents, Alice never mentioned God or the "end-times," or biblical prophecy. "...the world has problems, that's for sure, but...it's just, seems like, well since I was a little kid it seems like it's gotten
worse...And I don't know, I think people are realizing that and they are starting to do something about it. And trying to help make it better, instead of it getting worse" (000218). Though the future sometimes scares her, she still believes that the future is hopeful. She is clearly not grounded in the "end-time" theology of some of the other first year respondents.

When talking about her decision to go to this college, the fact that her brother was a senior here and her mother had just graduated from this college was important but not the only reason for coming. She had originally made up her mind to go to another college, but when she went back to the other college after a camp experience there no one knew her. When she came back to this college everyone called her by name. "Like I was welcomed (at the college), like I was actually a person, not just a number..."(000209). The effort to know Alice by name and to be open and accepting toward her made all the difference in her decision to go to this particular college.

She loves the chapel services but "I wished we would sing a lot more...upbeat songs...I like Christian rock..." (000209). When asked if there was anything the college could do on campus that they were not already doing, she said, "Not really, I'm pretty happy with everything..."
Alice was clearly pleased that she had come to this college.

Alice came across to me as a person who is concerned for others, focuses a lot of attention on herself, cares deeply what others think of her, sees herself as a Christian first and an American second, listens intently to others, is certain of what she believes but is also confused on many of the details. She is struggling as she gains a broader sense of herself and the rest of the world. She did not seem nearly as anxious in her struggle as the other first year students I interviewed. She was more willing to bend on her beliefs, but that may have been because she did not have as much emotional energy invested in her beliefs as those who were more firmly grounded in a particular church.

Alice was a person who had reached Perry's level of "multiplicity," but was not fully a Stage Four in Fowler's language. Alice fit the developmental process Sharon Park's alluded to when she said that there should be a stage between Fowler's Three and Four. Alice was comfortable with accepting the external authority of her parents for her internal authority. From Alice's description of her parents, she is exercising the values of her parents who happened to value diversity and autonomy (Parks, p. 86).
Conclusion

The five narratives reviewed provide a profile of five entering first-year students at a Christian College Coalition institution. Each of the five shared many beliefs, moral decisions, and attitudes toward other religions and traditions. What emerges from these interviews is an apparent distinction among the students concerning felt relationships with their parents. Fowler's faith development theory provides a fairly broad description of the entering student, what it does not do is account for distinctions of perception among the students.

The students were close together theologically, but far apart in other areas. Frank, Mary, and Lorinda shared a similar theology, moral beliefs, and attitudes towards their parents. They also had similar levels of expressed conflict. Mark and Alice expressed conflict, and even shared many of the theological beliefs of the others, however, Mark and Alice seemed to have a stronger sense of self-identity when dealing with the expressed conflicts.

The conflicts of Frank, Mary, and Lorinda were
characterized by statements referring to their inability to decide, understand, or stand for or against their parents. Mark and Alice, on the other hand, seemed secure in their self-confidence when expressing any conflict in beliefs or ideas. There was not any apparent conflict with their parents.

The five narratives provide more data for the researcher interested in learning about the faith development of five first-year students in at a Christian college. The narratives also provide some information concerning the conflicts, confidence, and perceptions of the students.
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APPENDIX B

Unitizing the Data

After the interviews were transcribed the narrative was carefully read and divided into individual "thoughts" that stood alone. In reading a paragraph of narrative if there was a phrase or a statement that stood out in the paragraph that statement was separated from the rest of the paragraph. This process is called "unitizing the data" and is done in order to get at the key thoughts and points made in the interview.

By taking these thoughts and phrases as separate "units" of data one is better able to determine the frequency of certain ideas or thoughts or subjects as they appear in the interview. Another purpose is to determine what subjects most interest the respondent and thus better understand the direction the interview followed. Such a determination is crucial in the Grounded Theory approach to qualitative analysis. Such an approach begins with a set of questions but allows the respondent to ultimately determine the direction of the interview. Such direction informs the interviewer of what interested the respondent and how the respondent interpreted the questions. This method allows the data to develop the theory and not the theory determining the
data.

After the transcriptions have been unitized each "unit" of data is then placed into a category. Categories are determined by gathering units of data that relate to each other. Because both transcripts of both interviews of each respondent are unitized, there may be units of data gathered from both interviews into one category. Categories were developed for each respondent from the two interviews taken from each respondent. The categories were reformed after a third reading of the data units. The categories were gathered into a second set of categories for each respondent. This second set of categories represented a compacting of categories into fewer categories. Such a process was determined by looking at more general topics that would include several categories. This process helped the interviewer determine what the major topics of interest really were for each respondent. Such a compaction of several categories into a few helped to define the direction the interview went for the respondent.

When that was completed a critical study was written for each respondent and the results of that critical review sent to the respondents for their comments. Having received confirmation of the accuracy of the critical reviews a third step in categorization took place. All of the categories
from all five respondents were studied to see if there were even more general topics emerging from all five. Having found such general subjects, a third set of categories were gathered, this time made up of the categories of each respondent to form ten final categories producing somewhat of a composite view of the five students.

This final categorization, along with the individual critical reviews, provided the background for the final report written on all five students in response to Fowler's theory of faith development. This final report was then read by a peer debriefer.

The following is a graphic display of the categorization process. Each category received a number in sequence from 00001 to 00252 and a descriptive title. Each of these categories was then gathered into more general categories and finally collected into ten general categories that included all five respondents.

Categorization of Unitized Data

Step #1: First Categories for Each Respondent

Respondent F-1: Frank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Category (# of units of data)</th>
<th>Name of Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00001 (3)</td>
<td>College Team Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plusses and Minuses at College

The Cross in My Pocket and giving

Satan in the World

The future Apocolypse

Abortion: Conception prevention vs Birth prevention

Logistics and Purpose

Tough Decision-making

Parentally "installed" caution with new people

Former girl friend who drove him crazy

The importance of good friends

How Christ and Holy Spirit work through him

Being very religious.

Resolving conflict over abortion between Christians

Future vocational hopes

Reaction against having his faith challenged

Pleasing God, or God pleasing Himself through us

Meaning and purpose in life both personally and generally

The difficulty of serving God
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00020 (3) A faith conflict with a professor
00021 (2) Estimation of the state of the world
00022 (4) Conflict with a Christian evolutionist
00023 (17) Important symbols and rituals of the church
00024 (39) The nature of God and my worship of Him
00025 (62) Changing relationship with his parents: The Tension
00026 (7) Learning to use his head and be more cautious in relationships
00027 (2) A belief in the literal interpretation of scripture
00028 (1) Deep feelings after being rejected by a girl friend
00029 (1) A break down in communication with former girl friend
00030 (4) A follow-up on relationship with girl that dropped him
00031 (4) Having a strong faith: his coach
00032 (21) Predestination
00033 (1) Some things should be morally equal
00034 (1) An experience at camp
00035 (3) Pre-marital sex is absolutely wrong
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00036 (4) Love is the one thing that is always right
00037 (3) What makes an action right?
00038 (2) Why we do good and bad things
00039 (8) What makes an action bad?
00040 (1) Over-involvement in college activities (stressed out)
00041 (6) Sibling placement and rivalry
00042 (4) Relationship with girl who dumped him
00043 (1) Mission trip
00044 (1) Dilemmas in decisions concerning college involvement
00045 (1) No trust in girl that dumped him
00046 (1) A personal belief in a meaning in life for himself
00047 (1) Confusion over predestination
00048 (5) Growing confidence in handling future challenges to his faith
00049 (5) A sense of growing in his ability to make tough decisions
00050 (3) Heaven
00051 (7) Confusion over experiencing and affecting God
00052 (6) A struggle with guilt over not spending enough time in prayer and meditation and Bible study
00053 (5) Regret over not being allowed to go to parties during high school
It's all messed up inside about Calvinism and predestination: a real conflict

Strict criterion for getting into heaven

God and society

Being led by his heart

Would I be arrested for my beliefs?

Bible?

Decision to do interview

God and country

Bible addresses everything

What I've heard

Break the law if it goes against God's law

Death and heaven

Respondent F-2: Mary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Category (# of units of data)</th>
<th>Name of Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00066</td>
<td>Praying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00067</td>
<td>God controls everything, even the way it will end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00068</td>
<td>Affected by a power beyond: the rapture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship with her coach and her authority figure

A struggle with prayer

A homophobic response to homosexuality

Personal reflections on morality, death, and moral standards

Prefers the city, but prefers small town people in Kansas

Living in "nowhere" Kansas

Reflections on coming to college

Her volleyball team is like a harmonious family

Negative experience at a volleyball camp

Information about family and where she came from

Hatred for step-mom: some reference to abuse from both parents

Relationship with her father (who drank at one time)

Her biological mother (an attempted suicied)

Response to the church here and how it compared to the church in San Diego

Concern about other's misunderstanding Mormonism

Why are we here?
00085 (6) Relationship with her sister
00086 (9) Violence in the family, moving to a shelter
00087 (1) Re-building relationships with all of her parents
00088 (8) Diabetes
00089 (2) Family life falling apart
00090 (13) How to get to heaven
00091 (3) Peace signs of the devil?
00092 (3) What is my future and purpose?
00093 (1) Mary
00094 (2) The heavenly father is watching me
00095 (13) Mormon rituals that are meaningful (I will always be a Mormon)
00096 (1) My faith took a fine leap down
00097 (5) Mormon church is only true church
00098 (3) It's important that people like you, I'll go on my own belief, but it would not conflict with the church)
00099 (8) Abortion
00100 (6) Evil
00101 (15) What makes an action right?
00102 (3) Where and what is moral guidance?
00103 (2) Me being me
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Category (# of units of data)</th>
<th>Name of Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00104 (20)</td>
<td>Right and wrong: Are there absolutes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00105 (5)</td>
<td>Sacraments that are important to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00106 (1)</td>
<td>An important relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00107 (6)</td>
<td>There can be shared moral values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00108 (3)</td>
<td>Conscientious objectors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00109 (6)</td>
<td>Beliefs and moral uprightness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00110 (7)</td>
<td>I am a religious person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00111 (16)</td>
<td>Abortion (wrong no matter what)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00112 (14)</td>
<td>Euthanasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00113 (8)</td>
<td>Changes in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00114 (6)</td>
<td>Purgatory and indulgences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00115 (4)</td>
<td>What's it take to get into heaven, purgatory and indulgences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00116 (3)</td>
<td>Important groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00117 (3)</td>
<td>Roman Catholic to the core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00118 (15)</td>
<td>Women and the church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00119 (4)</td>
<td>Logistical and family data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Misc.

A close relationship with his parents

Biblical interpretation

Why can't priests get married?

A religious conflict: is one right and the other wrong?

What about change in the Catholic church? (he follows the Pope!)

A major change, wanting to go to church

Homosexuality

Decision to play basketball over football and people's reaction

Today's morals...

A hope for the future

Making a tough decision

A difference between church law and God's law...the pope is infallible

I'm kind of biased

We have free-will/no predestination

We are never 100% self-sufficient

Differences over religion

Chapel

College experiences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00139</td>
<td>(4) Shortage of priests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00140</td>
<td>(8) Birth control is sinning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00141</td>
<td>(3) What the Pope says goes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00142</td>
<td>(5) What is God?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00143</td>
<td>(2) God: a He or a She?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00144</td>
<td>(20) Satan, the devil, evil, sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00145</td>
<td>(5) Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00146</td>
<td>(2) The purpose of human life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00147</td>
<td>(6) Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00148</td>
<td>(3) What it means to really repent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00149</td>
<td>(4) His girlfriend's views on birth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00150</td>
<td>(6) What's it take to get to heaven?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00151</td>
<td>(14) Catholicism is the best, but others can get to heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00152</td>
<td>(4) Can the rich get to heaven?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00153</td>
<td>(7) I don't know if God has absolute rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent F-4: Lorinda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Category</th>
<th>Name of Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00154  (4)</td>
<td>People abuse the holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00155  (2)</td>
<td>Not a member of a church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
00156 (12) Involvement in church at College

00157 (3) Purpose of life

00158 (5) Missed childhood, being adult

00159 (2) Joke about Catholicism

00160 (2) I hate her (step-grandmother)

00161 (20) Views being at college as starting over, a new life

00162 (23) Where's my mom? Parents

00163 (23) Relationship with her step-grandmother

00164 (8) End-time, the future, destruction

00165 (8) God's will, people will not all believe the same thing, how can I forgive her?

00166 (4) Out of proportion

00167 (5) Softball team as a family

00168 (2) How about your future? To be open-minded

00169 (5) A pastor's family out of control

00170 (5) A description of God

00171 (6) The cross as a symbol

00172 (6) Logistical information

00173 (3) Do not deny Christ in the end-time

00174 (5) Trust, unwilling to do or say anything that would jeopardize her friendships
I won't die, I'll be raptured
Debating with self or others
Thank you
Homosexuality
Personal reflections
Differences and conflicts over religion
Morality you can't do anything about
False Christians
Am I religious?
An abusing friendship?
Making decisions is hard!
Mormons and an atheist friend
I can't judge other religions, then I would be judged
What it takes to get to heaven
What is a meaningful life?
Getting married
God does not approve drinking
Satan
Literal approach to Bible
Death
Churches not living up to God's standards
An action is right when you know it isn't disapproved of

Values/do's and don't's

Inner destruction

President's chapel address and her step-grandmother

God moves in both men and women

Abortion

Any absolutes?

Sin and evil?

Lying

God's plan for us and why God allows evil

You can't just choose to sin

God is a He

<p>| 00208  | 9 | Scriptural responsibilities of wives to husbands and families |
| 00209  | 11 | Why I came to college |
| 00210  | 6 | My personal future |
| 00211  | 5 | Going through change |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00212</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>A religious family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00213</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>What makes an action right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00214</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>The nature of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00215</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>Satan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00216</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>An important value: not to be prejudiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00217</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>What kind of town she comes from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00218</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>The future for humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00219</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>I want to be a good example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00220</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00221</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>God is a He and a big giant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00222</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>Friends are very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00223</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>Relationships with parents, especially mom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00224</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>A plan for life, a purpose, the meaning of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00225</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>Abortion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00226</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00227</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>A listener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00228</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>False Christians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00229</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>A close friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00230</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Against war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00231</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Helping her out as an interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00232</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>Making one's own decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00233</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>pre-marital sex absolutely wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00234</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Would still feel guilt in hurting another out of self-defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00235</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Being a religious person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00236</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>What it takes to get to heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00237</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>After death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00238</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ghosts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00239</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Differing beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00240</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I don't know any non-Christians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00241</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Homosexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00242</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All killing is murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00243</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Biblical interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00244</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Born into your religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00245</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I'm me (self-description)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00246</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Can't always trust the minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00247</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A spiritual high with a Christian rock group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00248</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yeh, I have rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00249</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mormons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00251</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is your country ever wrong? Oh yeh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00252</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>An elementary school career</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step #2: Recategorization of Categories
For Each Respondent

Below will be the more general categories selected by combining several categories into one that shares a common theme. The first category number will be the general category that will have previously been one of the categories already listed but that provides definition for other categories which have been added to it. The parenthetical numbers are the categories that have been added to the more general category. Only the title of the general category will be given, the reader may refer to the complete listing above for the titles of the individual categories added to the general category. The total number of units of data now in the category are listed in brackets beside the general category number and title.

Respondent #F-1: Frank

00002 Plusses and Minuses at college [27]
   (00031, 00001, 00040)

00004 Satan in the world [1]

00005 The future apocolypse [6]

00007 Logistics and purpose [10]
   (00041)

00008 Tough decision-making [6]
   (00017, 00044)

00010 Former girlfriend who drove him crazy [13]
   (00028, 00029, 00030, 00042, 00045)

00011 The importance of good friends [5]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00013</td>
<td>What it means to be religious</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00014</td>
<td>Resolving conflict over abortion</td>
<td>[36]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00015</td>
<td>Future vocational hopes</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00016</td>
<td>Reaction against having his faith challenged</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00018</td>
<td>Meaning and purpose in life</td>
<td>[15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00021</td>
<td>Estimation of the state of the world</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00023</td>
<td>Important symbols and rituals</td>
<td>[17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00024</td>
<td>The nature of God</td>
<td>[45]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00025</td>
<td>Changing relationship with parents</td>
<td>[61]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00026</td>
<td>Learning to use his head</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00027</td>
<td>A literal interpretation of Scripture</td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00034</td>
<td>An experience at camp, misc.</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00039</td>
<td>Good and Bad: What and Why</td>
<td>[21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00049</td>
<td>Growing confidence</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
00051 Confusion over experiencing and affecting God [7]
00053 Regret over not being allowed to go parties in high school [5]
00054 A conflict over Calvinism and predestination [70]
    (00017, 00032, 00047)
00055 Strict criterion for getting into heaven [31]
    (00050, 00065)
00058 Would I be arrested for my beliefs? Cautious. [12]
    (00064)
00060 Decision to do interview [2]
00061 God and country [1]

Respondent F-2: Mary
00060 Praying [3]
    (00070)
00067 God Controls everything [12]
    (00068)
00072 Personal reflections on morality [38]
    (00100, 00101, 00102)
00075 Reflections on College [13]
The volleyball team like a family [13]
(00069)

Negative experience at volleyball camp [11]
(00083)

Why are we here? [3]

Violence in the family [58]
(00078, 00079, 00080, 00085, 00087, 00089)

How to get to heaven [13]

Are peace signs of the devil? [3]

Mary [26]
(00073, 00074, 00088, 00092, 00094, 00098, 00103)

Mormon church is the only true church [29]
(00082, 00095)

Tough moral issues [19]
(00071)

Respondent F-3: Mark

Right and wrong: Absolutes? [36]
(00107, 00109, 00129)

I am a religious person [49]
(00105, 00106, 00113, 00116, 00119, 00121, 00126, 00130, 00133)

Tough moral issues [39]
(00108, 00112, 00127)
00118  Women and the church  [15]
00120  Misc.  [2]
00122  Biblical interpretation  [12]
00124  Religious conflict  [7]
00131  Making a tough decision  [18]
      (00128)
00134  We have free-will  [13]
      (00135)
00136  Differences over religion  [6]
00138  Going to college  [12]
      (00137)
00142  What is God?  [12]
      (00143, 00145)
00144  Satan & Evil/Sin  [20]
00146  The purpose of human life  [2]
00147  Death  [6]
00148  What it means to repent  [3]
00149  His girlfriend's views on birth control  [4]
00150  What it takes to get to heaven  [20]
      (00114, 00115, 00152)
00151  Catholicism is the best  [39]
      (00117, 00123, 00125, 00132, 00139, 00141)
Does God have absolute rules? [15]

Respondent F-4: Lorinda

Involvement in church at college [42]
(00154, 00155, 00159, 00166, 00169, 00171, 00182, 00183, 00195)

Views Sterling as a new start [25]
(00167)

Where's my Mom? Parents [23]

Relationship with Grandmother [28]
(00160, 00165, 00199)

End-times, the future, the destruction [13]
(00173, 00175)

Lorinda's future: to be open-minded [11]
(00157, 00158, 00198)

A description of God [32]
(00165, 00191, 00200, 00205, 00207)

Personal reflections [23]
(00172, 00174, 00176, 00177, 00184, 00185, 00189, 00190)

What it takes to get to heaven [28]
(00180, 00186, 00187, 00193, 00194)
Abortion and homosexuality

Sin and evil

Respondent F-5: Alice

Why I came to college

What makes an action right?

The nature of God

The future of humanity

Relationship with parents

Abortion and homosexuality

Offering assistance to respondent

What it takes to get to heaven

I'm Me...a self-description
Step #3: Composite Recategorization

The final recategorization brings together all of the categories from the five respondents into general topics shared by all of the respondents. Therefore, what began as 252 categories was reduced down to 81 categories and now is reduced down to ten categories. These final categories provide a composite view of the respondents. These are the ten topics that emerged from the data as being important to the five respondents. These categories indicate a general view of the experiences and concerns of these entering students.

The number in the left column is that of the new category, beside the number is the descriptive title of the category and in brackets is the number of total units of data in that composite category. Below the title is a list, by respondent, of the categories included in this larger composite category. The category number from each respondent refers to the second step categories, and so include all of the other categories that went with this numbered category. See above for details on what sub-categories are in each of the respondent categories listed under each composite category below.

00253 Parents [191]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00025</td>
<td>F-1 Conflict</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00086</td>
<td>F-2 Violence</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00121</td>
<td>F-3 Close relationship</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00162</td>
<td>F-4 Where's my mom?</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00163</td>
<td>F-4 Conflict with Grandmother</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00223</td>
<td>F-5 Close relationship</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

00254 Morality [188]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00039</td>
<td>F-1 Good and bad: What &amp; Why?</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00072</td>
<td>F-2 Personal reflections</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00104</td>
<td>F-3 Right and wrong</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00203</td>
<td>F-4 Sin and evil</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00213</td>
<td>F-5 What is a right action?</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00255</td>
<td>Abortion and Homosexuality</td>
<td>[132]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00014</td>
<td>F-1 (36) Abortion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00099</td>
<td>F-2 (19) Tough moral issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00111</td>
<td>F-3 (39) Tough moral issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00201</td>
<td>F-4 (15) Abortion and Hom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00225</td>
<td>F-5 (23) Abortion and Hom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>00256</th>
<th>God</th>
<th>[137]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00024</td>
<td>F-1 (45) The nature of God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00067</td>
<td>F-2 (12) God controls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00142</td>
<td>F-3 (12) What is God?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00153</td>
<td>F-3 (15) God's rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00170</td>
<td>F-4 (32) A description of God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00214</td>
<td>F-5 (21) The nature of God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>00257</th>
<th>How to get to heaven</th>
<th>[173]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00055</td>
<td>F-1 (31) Strict criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00090</td>
<td>F-2 (13) How to get to heaven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00150</td>
<td>F-3 (20) How to get to heaven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00151</td>
<td>F-3 (39) Catholics are best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00188</td>
<td>F-4 (28) How to get to heaven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00236</td>
<td>F-5 (42) How to get to heaven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>00258</th>
<th>Self-reflections</th>
<th>[158]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00026</td>
<td>F-1 (12) Used his head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00049</td>
<td>F-1 (10) Growing confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00093</td>
<td>F-2 (26) &quot;Mary&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00133</td>
<td>F-3 (1) I'm kind of biased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00135</td>
<td>F-3 (3) Never self-sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00179</td>
<td>F-4 (23) Personal reflections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00245</td>
<td>F-5 (83) I'm me!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00259</td>
<td>Being Religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00260</td>
<td>Conflict, Struggle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00261</td>
<td>College Experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00262</td>
<td>Satan, Evil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

CATEGORY DESCRIPTIONS

In the final categorization of the data ten categories emerged. The following are short descriptions of each of those categories.

00253 Parents (191)
A collection of all units of data in which the respondent referred directly to his or her parent(s) in any way including: relationships; characteristics; personality traits; perceived conflicts; perceived similarities between self and parent(s).

00254 Morality (188)
A collection of all units of data in which the respondent referred to his or her perception of right and wrong, what made something morally wrong, sin and evil, what makes an action right, and in general the respondents views on morality.

00255 Abortion and Homosexuality (132)
A collection of all units of data gathered from the discussion of morality in which the respondent specifically dealt with the issues of abortion and homosexuality. These two "hard" issues were used to help the respondent define in his or her own mind what he or she understood as being morally right or wrong.

00256 God (137)
A collection of all units of data in which the respondent referred directly to God in his or her discussion of a relationship with God, a description of God, the traits of God, an explanation of how God works in the world, and the respondents general reflections on God.
A collection of all units of data gathered in a discussion of religious tolerance. The question was raised as to what it takes to get into heaven in order to better determine how the respondent thought of other religions not Christian. The respondents described in detail what they believed was required for anyone to get into heaven.

A collection of all units of data in which the respondent referred to his or her perceptions of his or her own personality, how others saw him or her, how he or she saw him or herself in the world, and a general opportunity for each respondent to reflect on him or herself.

A collection of all units of data gathered in a discussion of what the respondent believed constituted being religious. Each respondent was given the opportunity to define what he or she meant by "being religious."

A collection of all units of data in which the respondent referred directly to occasions in which he or she struggled over a decision, exhibited self-doubt, wasn't certain what to believe, questioned his or her own understanding of a belief, talked about not being certain, saying, "I don't know," talking about not having enough of the right information to make a decision, realizing that a position he or she may take might alienate him or her from friends and family, and pointing out that he or she has not yet made up his or her mind about a particular belief.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00261</td>
<td>College Experiences</td>
<td>A collection of all units of data in which the respondent spoke specifically about the College, how he or she feels about going to college there, what he or she likes or does not like about the college, descriptions of various programs and classes on the campus, and a general impression of the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00262</td>
<td>Satan, Evil</td>
<td>A collection of all units of data in which the respondent spoke specifically about satan or evil when discussing morality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Title of Project: Case Study of The Spiritual Development of Freshmen and Seniors at Sterling College, Sterling, Kansas.

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to ensure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are protected. I will report any adverse reactions to the committee. Additions to or changes in research procedures after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review. I agree to request renewal of approval for any project continuing more than one year.

John H. Bolen
Typed Name Principal Investigator
Higher Education
Department
Campus Address
Campus Telephone

3. Signatures of other investigators

4. Principal Investigator(s) (check all that apply)
   □ Faculty □ Staff □ Graduate Student □ Undergraduate Student

5. Project (check all that apply)
   □ Research □ Thesis or dissertation □ Class project □ Independent Study (490, 590, Honors project)

6. Number of subjects (complete all that apply)
   □ # Adults, non-students □ # ISU student □ # minors under 14 □ # minors 14 - 17 □ other (explain)
   10 students from Sterling

7. Brief description of proposed research involving human subjects: (See instructions, Item 7. Use an additional page if needed.)

   SEE ATTACHED SHEET

(Please do not send research, thesis, or dissertation proposals.)

8. Informed Consent:
   □ Signed informed consent will be obtained. (Attach a copy of your form.)
   □ Modified informed consent will be obtained. (See instructions, item 8.)
   □ Not applicable to this project.
9. Confidentiality of Data: Describe below the methods to be used to ensure the confidentiality of data obtained. (See instructions, item 9)

The respondent must sign a "release form" (attached) before they will be accepted as a subject. No one will have access to the audio-tapes except the interviewer. The audio tapes will be kept under lock and key. The subject will see every report written concerning his/her interview(s). No subject will ever know who the other subjects are. No subject will ever see the data gathered from other subjects. Every subject has the right to terminate their participation in the study at any time and take all tapes and written materials pertaining to their interviews with them.

When the study is completed in September, 1992, all audio-tapes will be erased.

10. What risks or discomfort will be part of the study? Will subjects in the research be placed at risk or incur discomfort? Describe any risks to the subjects and precautions that will be taken to minimize them. (The concept of risk goes beyond physical risk and includes risks to subjects' dignity and self-respect as well as psychological or emotional risk. See instructions, item 10.)

The possible risk involved is psychological. In asking questions that have to do with spirituality, faith, life, death, etc., it may hit some sensitive nerve in the subject. The interviewer will not probe when the subject shows that they are uncomfortable by their actions to insure that the subject is not uncomfortable by their actions. To insure that the subject is comfortable answering each question. They will not have

11. CHECK ALL of the following that apply to your research: to answer any question that makes them

☐ A. Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate uncomfortable.
☐ B. Samples (Blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
☐ C. Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
☐ D. Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
☐ E. Deception of subjects
☐ F. Subjects under 14 years of age and/or Subjects 14 - 17 years of age
☐ G. Subjects in institutions (nursing homes, prisons, etc.)
☐ H. Research must be approved by another institution or agency (Attach letters of approval)

If you checked any of the items in 11, please complete the following in the space below (include any attachments):

Items A - D Describe the procedures and note the safety precautions being taken.

Item E Describe how subjects will be deceived; justify the deception; indicate the debriefing procedure, including the timing and information to be presented to subjects.

Item F For subjects under the age of 14, indicate how informed consent from parents or legally authorized representatives as well as from subjects will be obtained.

Items G & H Specify the agency or institution that must approve the project. If subjects in any outside agency or institution are involved, approval must be obtained prior to beginning the research, and the letter of approval should be filed.
Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule

The following are attached (please check):

12. **Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:**
   a) purpose of the research
   b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see Item 17)
   c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research and the place
   d) if applicable, location of the research activity
   e) how you will ensure confidentiality
   f) in a longitudinal study, note when and how you will contact subjects later
   g) participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject

13. **Consent form (if applicable)**

14. **Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)**
   This letter will arrive shortly from Dean Curston, Sterling College

15. **Data-gathering instruments**

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Contact</th>
<th>Last Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>September 18, 1991</strong></td>
<td><strong>September 1, 1992</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

   **September 1, 1992**

18. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer Date Department or Administrative Unit

19. Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee:
   - Project Approved
   - Project Not Approved
   - No Action Required

   Patricia M. Keith
   Name of Committee Chairperson Date Signature of Committee Chairperson

GC: 1/90
APPENDIX E

RESPONDENT RELEASE FORM

Date __________________________

You are being asked to participate in a one-on-one interview process to study the level of faith development of traditional aged college students. You are being asked to submit to two interview sessions within a one week period. Each session is not to exceed 90 minutes. The interview will be tape recorded. You have the right to refuse to answer any question, and you have editorial control over any information used in the interview report. Your name will never be published in the report or the interpretation of the interview. Your interview will be used in a doctoral dissertation. You will have the opportunity to look at any and all reports and interpretations before they are published. You will have the right to make corrections or deletions as you see fit. You may withdraw from the interview process at any time. You will also be given the audio tape of your interviews after the dissertation has been written. (probably September 1992) The final dissertation will be made available to Sterling College. Who is selected for the interviews will be kept confidential between the interviewer and Dean Cureton.

I, ____________________________ (respondent) agree to answering the questions asked of me in as clear and honest a way as possible. I understand that any and all information I give in this interview is subject to my approval before it is used in any report. I also understand that I have the right to refuse the use of any information at any time before it is used in a report. I also have the right to review any interpretations that the interviewer makes of my answers to his/her questions. I understand that the information I give will only be seen by the interviewer and his/her doctoral committee. The results of the dissertation will be made available to Sterling College. If this information is to be used outside this particular study I will be informed and given the opportunity to refuse its inclusion.

Signed: __________________________

I, ____________________________, (interviewer) agree to the above conditions placed upon my interview of the subject. I will honor the confidence of the respondent and will seek his/her approval of any and all uses of the information he/she shares with me. I also agree to let the respondent review my interpretations of the interview, giving the respondent the right to edit and make corrections in my interpretations.

Signed: __________________________
TO: Prospective Subjects
FROM: John H. Bolen, Principal Investigator
       Alan Cureton, Dean of Students, College
RE: Participation in the Study

Dear ____________________________:

You are being asked to participate in a one-on-one interview process to study the level of spiritual/faith development of traditional college aged students. You are being asked to submit to two interview sessions within a one week period. Each session is not to exceed 30 minutes. The interview will be tape recorded. You have the right to refuse to answer any question, and you have the editorial control over any information used in the interview report. Your name will never be published in the report or the interpretation of the interview. You will be given an identifier code and that code will be used instead of your name. The code will be simply F1, F2, F3, F4, F5 (for Freshman 1, Freshman 2, etc.) or S1, S2 for Senior 1, Senior 2 and so on. Your interview will be used in a doctoral dissertation. You will have the opportunity to look at any and all reports and interpretations before they are published. You will have the right to make corrections or deletions as you see fit. You may withdraw from the interview process at any time. You will also be given the audio tape of your interviews after the dissertation has been written. (probably September 1992) The final dissertation will be made available to Sterling College. Your selection to this study is held in confidence between myself and Dean Cureton.

Participation is voluntary. You will be contacted three times following the interviews as a form of follow up and giving you the chance to see your interview and the report of your interview. You will never see the reports and interviews of any of the other subjects. You will not be told who the other subjects are. All interviews will be conducted on campus at Sterling College. To insure confidentiality, all tapes and reports will be kept under lock and key. All tapes will be turned back to their subjects following the completion of the study. Codes instead of names will be used in the report and the dissertation. Sterling College will receive a copy of the dissertation upon its completion. Dean Cureton will hold the names of all the subjects in strictest confidence.

If you agree to participating in this study please plan to meet with me on:
DATE__________________ PLACE__________________

Sincerely,
John H. Bolen
APPENDIX G

B. RELATIONSHIPS

1. HOW DO YOU THINK OF OR REMEMBER YOUR PARENTS AT PRESENT? WHAT STANDS OUT TO YOU NOW ABOUT YOUR FATHER OR MOTHER? CAN YOU DESCRIBE THEM FOR ME? HAVE THERE BEEN ANY CHANGES IN YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF YOUR PARENTS OVER THE YEARS? WHEN? (Aspects: B, D)

Interviewer: This question will yield data on the respondent's social perspective taking (aspect B) and relation to authority (aspect E). It is important for you to get a sense of whether or not your respondent is able to construct the interiority of his/her parents, i.e., has some sense of how they think or feel, and can describe things as they might have seen them, etc. Also, probe to see how the respondent constructs the relation of self to parents. Does she have the sense that parents also have an image or impression of her? To what extent do parents still function as authority figures for the person, at least in her own mind? These questions can be probed by paying particular attention to the respondent's perception of changes in the relationship. What made these changes come about—changes in the parents, changes in the person, or both? It is not necessary that the respondent talk about his/her physical parents if there were other primary caretakers involved. The question applies to both.

2. ARE THERE CURRENTLY ANY RELATIONSHIPS THAT SEEM IMPORTANT TO YOU, EITHER WITH PERSONS OR GROUPS? WHY DO YOU THINK THAT THESE ARE IMPORTANT? (Aspects: B, D, E)

Interviewer: Your respondent may experience some discontinuity between this question which asks for present relationships, and the previous one which may include reflection on the past. You may want to preface the question by a remark like, "Let's go to the present for a
moment," if this seems appropriate. This question assumes that you have looked at the Life Tapestry, and have noted significant relationships from the past. If you have not talked about these, you might pursue the one or two most important ones as a follow-up to this question.

In probing this question, there are a number of things you will want to learn from your respondent. How is he/she thinking about relationships in general, and in what ways are they important? What is the attitude toward other people? To what extent do others function as authorities for this person? How does this person locate his or her own identity with respect to other persons or groups? How does he or she view their own participation in groups or organizations, etc.?

3. DO YOU RECALL ANY CHANGES IN RELATIONSHIPS THAT HAVE HAD A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON YOUR LIFE OR YOUR WAY OF THINKING ABOUT THINGS?

(Aspects: B, D, E)

Interviewer: The Life Tapestry will be of great help to you here. Make notes before the interview of significant relationships and marker events that you wish to follow up. Note that these relationships do not necessarily have to be with persons currently living, or with persons whom the respondent has known personally. They could be relationships with writers or thinkers, for example, that the person knows only from books. What is important here is that you get some sense of the way the respondent views these relationships, then and now, and the way in which the respondent thinks about change. This will yield valuable data on how the respondent thinks about other people and groups and about authority.
C. PRESENT VALUES AND COMMITMENTS

1. DO YOU FEEL THAT YOUR LIFE HAS MEANING AT PRESENT? WHAT MAKES LIFE MEANINGFUL TO YOU? (Aspects: F, A, B, E, D)

Interviewer: This question has the potential to yield data on several aspects because it is so open-ended. It is important that you give the respondent the latitude to answer the question in his/her own way. It is not necessary that you cover all of the aspects on this question, but rather, focus on the one that the respondent's initial thoughts seem to go with. What you are looking for here is the locus of the respondent's meaning-making activities. Does the respondent's sense of meaning or meaninglessness center on interpersonal relations, for example, or upon some set of principles or a world view or on some sense of individual purpose. If the question is answered in the negative, you might probe to find out how the sense that life has no meaning came about, when it occurred, etc.

2. ARE THERE ANY BELIEFS, VALUES, OR COMMITMENTS THAT SEEM IMPORTANT TO YOUR LIFE RIGHT NOW? (Aspects: F, D, A)

Interviewer: Here you will want to learn how beliefs, values, and commitments are held, and also, how they are enacted in a person's life. You are also interested in who or what supports the respondent's beliefs and values, and who or what might oppose them, how they have been derived and, to a lesser extent, how they may have changed. Some possible probes are: "Can you give me an example of how that works for you?" "How did you come to believe that?" Or, "Why do you believe that?", etc.

3. WHEN YOU THINK OF THE FUTURE, HOW DOES IT MAKE YOU FEEL? WHY? (Aspects F, E, D)

Interviewer: This question is projective, and you will want to know
what kind of a vision of the world is being disclosed in the respondent's projections of the possible future. It is also important to note the scope of the person's concern. Who comes to mind when he/she thinks about the future—self, family, country, world, etc.? If the initial response to the question is ambiguous, you may wish to probe for more specifics, for example, "Why do you think that?" or, "Who do you think will be most affected by that if it comes about?" etc. You are also looking here for signs of how the person assigns responsibility for the future, or whether he/she thinks of humanity as essentially good or evil, etc.

4. WHEN YOU HAVE AN IMPORTANT DECISION TO MAKE, HOW DO YOU GENERALLY GO ABOUT MAKING IT? CAN YOU GIVE ME AN EXAMPLE? (Aspects: C, B, D, E)

Interviewer: Here you will want to be sure to probe for a specific example of the person's decision-making process in action. In addition, note who or what functions as authority in an important decision, and where the weight is given—is it an internal or external authority? Note also whose point of view gets considered, and look for evidence, if any, that the respondent is able to think about an important decision from the constructed point of view of others who may be involved or affected by the decision.

5. DO YOU THINK THAT ACTIONS CAN BE RIGHT OR WRONG? IF SO, WHAT MAKES AN ACTION RIGHT IN YOUR OPINION? ARE THERE CERTAIN ACTIONS OR TYPES OF ACTIONS THAT ARE ALWAYS RIGHT UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES? ARE THERE CERTAIN MORAL OPINIONS THAT YOU THINK EVERYONE SHOULD AGREE ON? (Aspects: C, B, D, E)

Interviewer: It is important to get some sense of the way in which the respondent is thinking of issues like this. The question "why?" is important.

6. IF YOU HAVE A QUESTION WHICH YOU CANNOT DECIDE OR A VERY DIFFICULT PROBLEM TO SOLVE, TO WHOM OR WHAT WOULD YOU LOOK FOR GUIDANCE? (Aspects: D,
7. DO YOU THINK THAT PEOPLE CHANGE SIGNIFICANTLY AS THEY GET OLDER, OR DO THEY REMAIN PRETTY MUCH THE SAME? WHY? (Aspects: F, A)

D. RELIGION

1. DO YOU THINK THAT HUMAN LIFE HAS A PURPOSE? IF SO, WHAT DO YOU THINK IT IS? IS THERE A PLAN FOR OUR LIVES, OR ARE WE AFFECTED BY A POWER OR POWERS BEYOND OUR CONTROL? (Aspects: F, A)

   Interviewer: Note that the responses to this question may or may not be given in religious terms. It is important to try to stay within the context that the respondent sets with this question. You may wish to invert questions 2 and 3 and ask question 3 next.

2. WHAT DOES DEATH MEAN TO YOU? WHAT HAPPENS TO US WHEN WE DIE? (Aspects: F, A, G)

   Interviewer: If the response is "I don't know" you may wish to probe it further. You might ask the respondent what he or she would hope for or what they think might be possible, etc.

3. DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF A RELIGIOUS PERSON? WHAT DOES THIS MEAN TO YOU? (Aspects F, A, G)

   Interviewer: Note that if the answer to part one of the question is in the negative, you should still ask part two.

4. ARE THERE ANY RELIGIOUS IDEAS, SYMBOLS OR RITUALS THAT ARE IMPORTANT TO YOU, OR HAVE BEEN IMPORTANT TO YOU? IF SO, WHAT ARE THESE AND WHY ARE THEY IMPORTANT? (Aspects G, A, F)

   Interviewer: In this question you are interested not only in how the respondent thinks about specifically religious symbols, but also how these fit with the respondent's previously stated beliefs and attitudes. It is not necessary that these be presently meaningful. If the initial answer to the question is "no" you may follow by asking if there have ever
been meaningful symbols, rituals, or ideas, if this data is not obvious from the Life Tapestry. The question of why the idea, symbol, or ritual is important and what it means to the respondent is crucial, because you are also seeking data on how the respondent interprets symbols. If the respondent cannot recall any religious symbols, you might shift the question and ask if any ideas, symbols, or rituals at all are meaningful. If the response is "no" you can ask the respondent to interpret a common symbol. (E.g. the American flag, or the American eagle, etc.)

5. DO YOU PRAY, MEDITATE, OR PERFORM ANY OTHER SPIRITUAL DISCIPLINE? (Aspects: G, A)

Interviewer: It is important to get some sense of what the spiritual exercise means to the respondent. You might ask "What do you think is happening when you do this?" Or, "Why do you do this?"

6. DO YOU THINK THERE IS SUCH A THING AS SIN OR EVIL? (Aspects: G, A, F, D)

Interviewer: This question also should be probed. If the initial response is negative, you might ask how the respondent accounts for suffering in the world. If the initial response is yes, try to find out what the respondent thinks is the cause of evil, what he/she thinks evil consists of, and how he/she derived his/her present concept of evil.

7. IF PEOPLE DISAGREE ABOUT A RELIGIOUS ISSUE, HOW CAN SUCH CONFLICTS BE RESOLVED? (Aspects: E, B, D, C, F)

Interviewer: You are looking at several aspects of faith in this question. It is possible that the respondent may answer with a request for a specific example, such as, "That depends on what kind of conflict you mean" etc. In such cases you may suggest a hypothetical example like