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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

"In our authoritarian culture, many forces converge upon the young individual which have the effect of making him think less of himself. The church is one of these forces" (37: 12).

This rather iconoclastic statement was partially responsible for engendering the basic concern of this study. It represented the first time a department of a large national organization, (the National Education Association) almost the epitome of what could be called "the establishment," had, in a document of nationwide circulation (the 1962 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development) suggested that the church was a force that could impede self development.

The general purpose of this study is to gather evidence to test several hypotheses derived in relationship to Kelly's allegation. In particular this study will examine selected relationships between religious attitudes and the self-concept.

It is felt that Kelly's allegation is not only the concern of one man, but that it is indicative of a mid-twentieth century confrontation between man and God. Evidence for this is seen in our current concern with existentialism, a decidedly man-oriented philosophy, on the one hand and the "God is dead" theory advanced by Altizer and Hamilton (21: 11) on the other. This alleged confrontation between man and God is more clearly evident in the light of an explanation for the beginnings of formal religion suggested by Merry and Merry (54). According to them,

"Wonder and curiosity about the universe in which he lived led primitive man to formulate theories to explain natural phenomena such as the seasons, thunder, rain, and the like. Since he had no knowledge of natural laws, or of simple causal relationships, he ascribed these phenomena to supernatural forces."
"... Thus religion appears to have had its origin in the curiosity accompanying man's intellectual development rather than in a special instinct. Furthermore, religious beliefs have changed as man has advanced intellectually, although in many instances they have not kept pace with modern progress" (54: 518).

It appears that as man's knowledge of natural laws has now expanded rather remarkably, the question may now be, "Has man's intellectual advancements made a supernatural God no longer necessary?"

If religious beliefs have not kept pace with modern progress as Merry and Merry have suggested above, it appears that man must either reject or ignore these beliefs, or confine his intellectual pursuits within limits defined by his religious beliefs. If the latter course is taken, it may be argued that religion is impeding man's progress. Stated in other words, the issue may be: To the extent that man is willing to define himself in terms of ideals and values external to himself, the ultimate of which may be called God, he will be impaired in his ability to define himself with more human standards (herself) and thereby better accept himself as he is and assume total responsibility for his fate.

Definitions

In a broad sense, a man's religion may be whatever is his ultimate concern or value, whether or not he be aware of it (52: 210, 85: 128).

It is not the scope of this study to embrace this definition, but to limit itself with what may be called orthodox or traditional Christian religion—that which was taught in the majority of Catholic and Protestant churches and Sunday schools of America. Religion, as used in this study implies the Christian religion, as it is the predominate religion of the American culture and, more than likely, of the subjects used in this study.
This view of religion would mean, for the purposes of this study, an agreement with or an acceptance of Christian doctrines concerning the divinity of Jesus, belief in His supernatural characteristics as manifest in the miracles, and an attitude that the Christian religion offers the best philosophy for families and nations to live in peace together.

It has been pointed out that even within the boundaries of traditional Christianity, the religious variable is not unidimensional (38: 173). This study will be concerned with four aspects of religiosity, found in the literature to be most commonly referred to as: orthodoxy, ritual participation, authoritarianism, and particularism (28, 37, 38, 73).

Self-concept as used in this study is meant to imply the perceived, phenomenological, subjective self as viewed internally, as opposed to the normative, average, objective self as viewed externally. This concept of self includes:

1. Self description, which is the subject's view of his self as an object in his total perceptions. It is his concept of himself as he thinks he actually is.

2. Self acceptance, which is the degree of respect, satisfaction or esteem with which the subjects views his self.

3. Ideal self, which is the subject's view of the kind of person he would like to be.

4. Self-ideal self discrepancy, which is the congruence between the subject's self description and his ideal self.

Hypotheses

Taking the central notion expressed by Kelly as the departure point, this study will focus on the following hypotheses:
1. Subjects expressing a high self-concept will express low religious orthodoxy.

2. Subjects expressing high self-acceptance will express low religious orthodoxy.

3. Subjects expressing high self-ideal self discrepancy will express high religious orthodoxy.

4. Subjects expressing high orthodoxy and high authoritarianism will express lower self-concepts, lower self-acceptance and higher self-ideal self discrepancy than high orthodox subjects expressing low authoritarianism.

5. Subjects expressing high orthodoxy and high particularism will express lower self concepts, lower self-acceptance and higher self-ideal self discrepancy than high orthodox subjects expressing low particularism.

6. Subjects expressing high childhood ritualism and high authoritarianism will express low orthodoxy and low adult ritual participation. Subjects within this syndrome will express lower self-concepts than other subjects.

7. Subjects expressing high childhood ritualism and low authoritarianism will express high orthodoxy and high adult ritual participation. Subjects within this syndrome will express higher self-concepts than other subjects.

The rationale and logic for these hypotheses will be elaborated in the following chapter.

The "personal" or "perceptual" or "phenomenological" approach to the study of behavior does not yet enjoy complete acceptance in the social sciences primarily because of its imprecision and lack of objectivity
(13: 11, 55: 86, 51: Ch. 1). Nonetheless, this study will include as part of its procedure and analysis aspects of the phenomenological approach. As suggested by Maslow (46: 14), any attempt to enlarge the study of behavior to include the subjective is better than no attempt at all. This study is being undertaken, therefore, with no greater assurance of success than the integrity of the instruments involved.
CHAPTER II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

It was suggested in Chapter I that this study represents an exploration of certain aspects of a confrontation between man and God. This chapter will trace briefly the rise of the importance of the individual and the evolution of the self-concept as a topic of psychological inquiry on the one hand and the alleged decline of certain aspects of religion on the other. Finally, issues of conflict between the self-concept and religious attitude will be suggested which will provide the theoretical basis for this study.

The Rise of the Individual

An understanding of the rise of the importance of the individual in our culture may be fostered by noting the relationship between the family and the political and economic character of our country. Politically, we are a democracy which, ostensibly, is committed to the welfare of the individual. Economically we are a very rich, affluent culture which has afforded phenomenal growth, expansion and development in all areas of life, for the majority of citizens.

The advent of increased scientific and technical knowledge, the expansion of industry and new methods of mass production had a profound effect on the organization and solidarity of the American family. Prior to this quickened growth, the family had been a rather stable, cooperative unit with the welfare of each individual subordinated to the concerns of the family unit (40: Ch. 2). The family had much work to do; all members contributed as a team. As our young nation settled a frontier with a strong orientation to Divine guidance and relatively unquestioned obedience to it, so the early American family looked to its authoritarian father for leadership
and protection.

As our frontier became settled and increasingly safe and our abundant wealth facilitated increased production, it is perhaps not surprising that the doctrine of supernaturalism gave way to one of secularism and Humanism. Pragmatism became the American way. "If the prevailing patterns were found wanting, they became subject to change; continued adherence to tradition, cardinal principle of authoritarianism, became an unacceptable alternative" (40: 24). The moving out of the home of the means of production and the resultant lack of economic basis for family solidarity had a telling effect on authoritarian familism. It was observed that the individual, who was once a means to family ends, was now the end in itself (40: 29).

Maslow's concept of a hierarchy of needs reflects and corroborates this change. He classifies needs into five categories—physiological, safety, love, esteem and self-actualization—and explains that it is only when the needs at any one level are satisfied that the individual is able to function at the next higher level (48). It is doubtful that many American frontier wives were much concerned with self-actualization when survival through disease, starvation and the Indian was a major concern.

Thus we have the individual with the goals of his ancestors taken for granted, with their luxuries and dreams now becoming his necessities and, in some way to be worked out, his realities. What is the nature of man's highest aspiration? This now seems to be the issue in question.
Evolution of the Self-Concept

Throughout man's history, the question of a psychic entity which regulates and controls man's behavior has been continuously raised and discussed. It was early referred to as the soul. During the twentieth century it has been referred to as ego, mind, will, or self (30: 467).

The writing of William James identified the self in the traditional main stream of psychological science called positivism that had existed since the time of Locke and Comte (1: 550). In 1892 he spoke of the self as the empirical me, the material me, the social and the spiritual me (34: Ch. 2).

In 1902, the sociologist Charles Cooley discussed the self-concept:

"A self-idea of this sort seems to have three principal elements: the imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of that appearance, and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification" (14: 152).

In modern psychology the term self has come to have two distinct meanings. On the one hand, it has been defined as the self-as-object, denoting one's attitudes, feelings, perceptions, and evaluations about himself as an object. On the other hand it is regarded as the self-as-process, denoting a group of psychological processes which govern behavior and adjustment. Generally speaking, writers have adopted the term ego to refer to the group of psychological processes, and self for the person's system of conceptions about himself. Sometimes, however, the terms self and ego are used in just the opposite sense, and sometimes either term may be employed to designate both the processes and the object that is perceived (30: 468).
A number of personality theorists make some provision for the self in their formulations. These will now be reviewed briefly, concluding with Rogers' formulation of an eclectic theory, which will be utilized in this study.

For Freud (90: Ch. 4, 5, 6) the id, ego and superego are psycho-processes which obey different principles. The id is the link between somatic and mental processes; it is somewhere in direct contact with somatic processes and takes over from them instinctual needs and gives them mental expression. The id acts impulsively, knows no fear, and takes no precautions to insure survival. An id-inspired behavior may lead to clashes with the external world and death of the organism (90: 45). Thus, the id operates on the pleasure-pain continuum, seeking pleasure and avoiding pain.

While the id contains human passions, the ego represents reason and sanity. It keeps a precarious balance between the instinctual demands of the id and the moralistic demands of the superego by clinging to reality and guiding behavior in a rational way (90: 50).

The superego is the internal representative of the values of a society. It represents the ideal and strives for perfection rather than pleasure. It is the "voice" of the parents and their moral standards as perceived by the child; it also represents parental wrath and punitive attitudes. The superego is partly irrational, imposing rigid restrictions not related to present situations. The adult superego, according to Freud, must outgrow the initial parental prohibitions (90: 63, 64).

According to Jung, the self is seen as man's striving for unity. It is the midpoint of personality around which all the other systems are constellated, holding them together and providing the personality with
unity, equilibrium, and stability. It is the motivating force in man's behavior and causes him to search for wholeness, especially through religion. The region halfway between consciousness and unconsciousness is the province of the self (30: 76-113).

Adler (30: 116-127) views the creative self as an intervening variable between stimulus and response. For him, man makes his own personality, constructing it out of heredity and experience. He creates his own goal and means to the goal.

For Sullivan (83) the self system emerges from the anxiety produced by interpersonal relations. This anxiety is originally transmitted from the mother to the infant. Later it is transmitted by threats to one's security. The individual adopts various types of protective measures and controls over his behavior to avoid or minimize anxiety. The self system sanctions certain forms of behavior (the good-me self) and forbids others (the bad-me self). It refuses to let in information, or it distorts information that is incongruous with its present organization.

Goldstein's (30: 299-327) motive behind the self is self-actualization. The organism is a unity; whatever happens in a part affects the whole. There is continual reorganization as the organism interacts with the environment. According to Lecky (30: 328-333) personality is conceived of as an organization of values which are consistent with one another. Behavior becomes an attempt to maintain this self consistency and unit of the organization. The individual defines his totality and, as new experiences are introduced, they are assimilated so that they become a unity with the organism.
Following psychoanalytic theory, Symonds (84: 4, 30: 469) defines the ego as a group of processes, namely, perceiving, thinking, and remembering, which are responsible for developing and executing a plan of action for attaining satisfaction in response to inner drives, and the self as the ways in which the individual reacts to himself. The self has four aspects: 1) how a person perceives himself, 2) what he thinks of himself, 3) how he values himself, and 4) how he attempts through various actions to enhance or define himself. Symonds points out that the conscious and unconscious perceptions of the self may be completely different (84: 5, 6).

Combs and Snygg (13) are phenomenologists, believing with Lundholm (30: 470-471) that all human behavior "may be observed from at least two very broad frames of reference: from the point of view of an outsider, or from the point of view of the behaver himself" (13: 16). The first is the objective or external frame of reference. The second is the subjective and seeks to understand behavior from the point of view of the behaver himself. It attempts to understand the behavior of the individual in terms of how things "seem" to him. This frame of references has been called the "perceptual", "personal", or "phenomenological" frame of reference and it is the point of view applied by Combs and Snygg. Kelly (37) also belongs in this category, especially applying perceptual principles to the field of education.

Sarbin's unique contribution to self theory appears to be his classifying the self into the body (the somatic self), the sense organs and musculature (the receptor-effector self), and social behavior (the social self). He believes the selves emerge in developmental sequence, the body self first, and much later the social self. Sarbin uses the terms ego and
self interchangeably (30: 471-472).

For Bills et al. (7) the self is a value system. Traits are of value or are rejected depending on their consistency with one's philosophy or value system. This value system, philosophy of life and the concept of the ideal self are synonymous. "The goal of life is to produce and maintain consistency within the value system" (7: 257). Behavior is motivated by the striving for maintenance and enhancement of the consistency within the value system.

The self theory of Carl Rogers

The self theory of Rogers (30: 467-502) represents a synthesis of holistic and organismic theory, phenomenology, interpersonal theory, and his own self-theory. The main components of this theory are:

"1) the organism which is the total individual, 2) the phenomenal field which is the totality of experience, and 3) the self, which is a differentiated portion of the phenomenal field and consists of a pattern of conscious perceptions and values of the 'I' or 'me'" (30: 478).

According to Rogers, as the individual grows and he achieves a tendency toward differentiation which is part of the actualizing tendency, part of his experience becomes differentiated and symbolized in an awareness of being, and part in an awareness of functioning. Together they may be described as self-experience.

"This representation in awareness of being and functioning becomes elaborated through interaction with the environment, particularly the environment composed of significant others, into a concept of self, a perceptual object in his experimental field" (70: 223).

Rogers feels that the best vantage point for understanding behavior is from the internal frame of reference of the individual. There are well supported criticisms of this view which will be discussed more fully in Chapter III.
According to Hall and Lindzey (30), Rogers' theory, although as yet unfinished, is "... the most fully developed statement of self theory. Moreover, Rogers has buttressed his speculations with an imposing array of empirical supports" (30: 469). Rogers' research has been based on the premise that a discrepancy between the self-concept and the concept of the desired or valued self reflects a sense of self-dissatisfaction. The degree of discrepancy, and hence, the degree of dissatisfaction, determine one's need for psychiatric counseling.

Rogers, then, represents the growing edge of one branch of the study of human behavior. We have seen the self emerge from a positivist, discipline-oriented, objective science to a science that has been expanded to include relative, whole-individual-oriented, subjectivity. This new area of inquiry does not enjoy the degree of quantifiable precision that characterized the early behaviorists, but it does recognize the importance of the fact that, accurate or not, an individual will likely respond to the world in accord with his perception of it.

The Decline of Religion

The much-discussed decline of religion is too broad and complex a topic to be presented in this study without some elucidation. The term "decline" implies a value judgment regarding the direction of what might as well be called "change" in religion. If religion is changing, then it may be in the direction from institutionalized or organized religion to a more personal religion. We have inherited with our language an "either-or" kind of attitude which makes it difficult to accept that an idea or an institution may at the same time be both good and bad. Without attempting
to rigorously analyze the nature of all the changes occurring in religion, some evidence will be given to support the contention that for a large number of Americans, some aspects of religion have been progressively viewed with decreasing regard. "Religion" as used in this chapter is meant to imply, then, "some aspects of religion", and "decline" will imply "alleged decline" and refer to what at this point in history may be more defensibly called "change".

If, as Merry and Merry have suggested (54: 518), primitive man was inclined to ascribe natural phenomena to supernatural forces, it is perhaps not surprising that with the increasing sophistication of science, religion should experience a corresponding decline.

In this same regard, Mowrer offers an interesting point of view:

"By their narrowness, bigotry, arrogance, sanctimony, false piety, irrealism, supernaturalism, and hypocrisy, several generations of theologians and laymen have given organized religion an exceedingly negative imprint and reputation; and if there have been those who said, 'Let the Devil take them,' it can hardly be wondered at" (56: 122).

Darwinian evolutionary theory appears to challenge the creation story of the Old Testament and perhaps these two explanations of man's origin have yet to be successfully reconciled in our corporate thinking. Modern science instruction makes some of the miracles difficult for even young elementary children to accept (54: 520), particularly if they are presented as other-than-symbols. Perhaps inherent in the confusion over both the creation story and the miracles is our seeming inability to accept the distinction between scientific or literal truth and symbolic or figurative truth.

Sensing a desire for a realistic rather than an idealized representa­tion of Jesus, Schonfield states
"The traditional portraiture no longer satisfies: it is too baffling in its apparent contradiction of the terms of our earthly existence. The God-man of Christianity is increasingly incredible, yet it is not easy to break with centuries of authoritative instruction and devout faith, and there remains embedded deep in the sub-conscious a strong sense of the supernatural inherited from remote ages" (72: 10).

Columnist James Reston (67) seems to reflect the dilemma between the realistic and the symbolic when he says, "The present age does not believe, but it believes in believing: Therefore it relies on faith, without quite knowing what its faith is".

According to a Gallup pole, "since 1957, the proportion of adults who say religion on the whole is losing its influence on American life has more than tripled" (23: 20A). This trend has been accompanied by a decrease in the proportion of adults who report attending church in a typical week--from 49 per cent in 1958 to 45 per cent in 1964.

Allport (2) in 1948 reported a strong trend toward religious humanism at the college level. This change represents man's ability to create a good life without supernatural aid and implies the importance of ethical responsibility (54: 520).

Theologian George Forell (21) said in 1966 that the "God is dead" fad has been given much more attention than other fads among intellectual circles because it strikes a highly sensitive nerve. He said that the words once used by men of religion mean little against today's reality and that "the machinery once used to soothe men's minds and reinforce faith may be as obsolete today as the Wright Brothers' airplane" (21: 1).

Issues of Conflict Between Religion and the Self

Specifically then, what is it about traditional, orthodox Christianity as it has been interpreted and lived in America that would justify the
hypothesis that it would have a negative effect on the self-concept?

Before a response to this issue is presented, the writer is constrained to acknowledge the possibility of the truth of the reverse of this hypothesis. Viewed from a different perspective, traditional Christianity is, or has been, so closely identified with our country that any person declaring independence from it would seem to risk alienating himself from the large group that gives him self-ness. In the words of Kierkegaard: "The self does not become a self simply by willing to be one. Rather it is radically contingent upon a power other than itself" (11: 225). In the Christian tradition the ultimate of this power would be called God. Thus, an alternate hypothesis would be that traditional, orthodox Christianity would have a positive effect on the self-concept.

Following is a discussion of the aspects of religion which are proposed as being linked to the general hypotheses that strong attitudes in favor of the traditional, orthodox Christianity will be inversely related to a positive self-concept.

The claim of absoluteness

According to Tillich (85: 137) three great religions, Christianity, Islam, and their common origin, Judaism, still make the claim of absoluteness for themselves above all others. In addition, Tillich speaks of a demonization of religion—a failure and a distortion rather than an intentional evil. Demonization occurs when a particular religion claims to be identical with the religious Absolute. Such a religion rejects judgment against itself. This rejection leads, internally, to demonic suppression of doubt, criticism, the honest search for truth within the particular
religion itself, and, externally, to the most demonic and destructive of all wars, religious wars (85: 133). The Absolute is not a being; it is Being-Itself (85: 127). It is the undefinable, ultimate reality which drives man to ask the question (85: 129), "Why is there something and not nothing?"

When a young, growing individual encounters this demonization of religion and his honest doubt and criticism of it are repressed, he has several alternatives: 1) He may inform himself historically and theologically, perceive the distortion in this imperfect expression of the Absolute, and not be seriously troubled. 2) He may reject the Absolute and the demonized expression of it because he does not see the difference, and seek other, more extreme brands of relativism, i.e., other demonizations. This, according to Tillich, should be of concern to the mature as it is to the youth of today (85: 136). 3) The individual may be lazy and let the demonized church do the explaining for him. A possible outcome of this alternative is the individual's believing that he is sinful and arrogant for doubting the doctrines of his church, with the possible result that he turns against himself. It is this third alternative and possibly the confusion resulting from a fruitless pursuit of some other relativism in the second alternative, that, it is hypothesized, may partially account for a lack of wholeness or self-acceptance.

The body-soul antithesis

The attitude that the soul, or spirit was the eternal aspect of man and superior to the body, the flesh or the temporal, seems to have been part of our Christian inheritance. The scope of this study is not to
explain the origin of this dualism or to assess its pervasiveness, but to suggest ways in which this "splitting of the self" may have an adverse effect on the self-concept.

The subordination of the body is often manifested in the suppression or regulation of sexuality (32: 21-47). Our cultural taboo against pre-marital sexual intercourse and the resultant dilemma of expressing normal sexuality before marriage seems to be a type of rejection of the body.

In the discussion of the Protestant ethic, Nixon (58: Ch. 3) suggests that any sign of pleasure indicates a sign of absence of struggle (an effort to overcome the body) and is therefore suspect. Touching and other kinds of sensual pleasure are identified with the animal in our nature and also to be avoided (32: 22). Kluckhohn and Murray (31: 48) caution about the suppression of this aspect of man:

"Whatever else they may be or may become, human beings are and must always remain animals; and this unalterable fact sets definite limits on the extent to which suppression of biologically given needs and inclinations can go, with benefit either to the individual or to the group of which he is a member."

Even the emotions of anger and anxiety were to some degree proscribed in the Christian because they represented undue concern over physical well-being (58: 49).

Commentary by many contemporary observers suggests that this generation is being less influenced by these attitudes, thus suggesting that the body-soul antithesis is not in conflict. Observations by the writer in classes of sophomores and juniors pursuing the topic of self development would suggest that the issue is still very real. It is therefore held as a possibility that this aspect of traditional religion would also support the hypotheses central to this study.
The acceptance of death

A number of contemporary American existential psychologists, psychotherapists and theologians (52, 81, 85) seem to have in common the idea that a prerequisite for self-actualization, or fullest living, is an acceptance of the reality of death, a symbol of man's finiteness. Death is viewed as the ultimate in alienation and loneliness, and once it is faced, the person is more able to pursue the courage to live (81: Ch. 2). He can then be more "open to experience" (70: 206) without the paralyzing fear of rejection or failure, because he has already been reconciled to the ultimate rejection or failure, death.

Although the Christian religion offers a rather sophisticated rationale for the acceptance of death, there is some evidence that it has not been correctly understood or accepted. True, the early Christian martyrs were eager to realize their heavenly reward and their numbers became so large and their

"provocations of the civil authorities to impose the death penalties became so outrageous, that they led to the development of the present strictures in the Roman Catholic Church against suicide" (16: 391).

Feifel, however (51: 96), reports tentatively that religious people in general seem to be more afraid of death. Merry and Merry (54: 524) have suggested that the concept of immortality has been developed as man's sole defense against the idea of complete annihilation implicit in death. "According to some writers this is an evidence of emotional immaturity" (54: 525). If this is true, it is reasonable to assume that failure to be reconciled with the finality of death may have some adverse effect on the self-concept.
Tillich (85: 128) suggests that the Christian concept of heaven and hell symbolizes an absolute threat and an absolute promise which are present in many religions. He would prefer that they be understood psychologically as ultimate despair and highest blessedness. To the degree that a person cannot accept the traditional (demonized) Christian literal meaning of heaven and hell, but yet does not grasp their significance as symbols, he is left with an incomplete eschatology that may have some effect on total personality integration.

Perhaps very central to an acceptance of death is the issue of the immortality of Jesus. Apparently Robinson has voiced the inner thoughts of many when he says,

"We do not, of course, these days believe in anything so crude as the resurrection of the body; but, if there is to be any form of existence, it is at death that we enter it" (68: 130).

Undoubtedly the literal truth of the resurrection of Christ has been and still is being believed and taught by many in the church. As stated earlier, there is much evidence that this has not successfully assuaged current anxiety about death. A recent book by Schonfield (72) is very appropriate here. Without in any way attempting to undermine the historical significance of Christ, he has attempted to explain the crucifixion and resurrection in other-than-supernatural terms. Lest the writer over-simplify and risk discredit of this meticulously researched book, suffice it to say that the intent of the author appears to be objectivity. He has suggested an explanation of the crucifixion and the resurrection which ultimately reveals Christ as a profound symbol of the noblest of man.
The concept of sin

"We are by nature sinful and unclean" is a phrase that is still part of the confessional of many Protestant churches. Rogers' self theory reveals most clearly why, according to Kelly, "The concept of guilt, with its imaginary burden of sin, cannot help one to think well of himself" (37: 12).

In his discussion of the self, Rogers speaks of the portions of experience that are differentiated into an awareness of being and into an awareness of functioning, in other words, what a person is and what he does. Human imperfections, immaturities, mistakes and "immoral" acts, it is reasoned, can more readily be accepted by the individual if they are applied to his awareness of functioning, or what he does, as the person then has some opportunity to cease this unacceptable behavior and to grow or to "become" better. The Christian concept of sin seems to apply these to the awareness of being, or what a person is, which leaves the person no opportunity to redeem himself (save through the Church, which in his eyes may also be imperfect). An individual may accept the concept of sin and his innate badness—an injury to the self, or he may reject the concept of sin, and with it possibly other teachings of the orthodox religion.

Some rather stern objections to the concept of sin and its possible impact on the self are voiced by Ellis:

"The concept of sin (as distinguished from the objective appraisal of wrongdoing) is so humanly inhuman that it would be difficult even to conceive a more pernicious technique for keeping mankind moral" (3: 142).
"... giving anyone a sense of sin, guilt, or self-blame is the worst possible way to help him to be an emotionally sound and adequately socialized individual" (3: 145).

"... the concept of sin is the direct and indirect cause of virtually all neurotic disturbance" (3: 146).

Summary

Drawing from the literature and research related to the concept of self, the dependent variable in this study will be expressed as self definition provided by the subjects in the study.

The independent variables will be the various aspects of a person's religion. Although separate measures are not designed for each of the aspects of religion, i.e., the claim of absoluteness, the body-soul antithesis, the acceptance of death, and the concept of sin, it is these aspects and others (to be discussed in the following chapter) that will be examined to determine whether the hypothesized relationship between self-concept and religion does exist. In short, the instrument and items used to gather data about the individual's religion are derived for the most part from other studies. For this reason, though somewhat unorthodox, the discussion of the aspects of religion labelled as orthodoxy, ritualism and authoritarianism will be presented in the methodology chapter.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the instrument chosen to measure self-concept (Bills' Index of Adjustment and Values) and the instrument chosen to measure religious attitude (the Religious Attitude Scale developed by Poppleton and Pilkington) will be described and defended. An elaboration of operational definitions of the following terms will also be presented: authoritarianism, childhood and adult ritualism, and particularism, all of which, in this study, are employed as aspects of religious attitude. Finally, a description of the subjects and the methods of data collection and analysis will be given.

Measurement of the Self-Concept

Wylie's book, The Self Concept (91), was found to present the most frequently used instruments for measurement in this area. She reviews such tests as the Berger Scales, Fey's Questionnaire for Acceptance of Self and Other, and Phillips' Attitudes Toward Self and Others Questionnaire. She is very skeptical of the construct and discriminant validity of these instruments (91: 67).

A widely-used technique for assessing phenomenal self-regard is the Q-sort. In this technique a large number of adjectives are arranged by the subject along a continuum according to the degree to which the subject feels them to be characteristic of the subject's self. Wylie points out the weaknesses of the Q-sort technique in that it involves forced choice, lack of content specification, and lack of discriminant validity (91: 60). In their discussion of the limitations of this method, Strong and Feder report that forced-distribution procedures inherent in Q-sort technique
result in a significant loss of information (82: 171). Also, they concede a certain uniqueness in measurement, but are concerned that the correlation of persons does not take into account certain mean differences. It is possible that individuals may be grouped according to similarity in profiles and be entirely different in personality structure. Also, because the procedure is time consuming when a large number of subjects take part in a study, few attempts have been made to apply Q-sort to a group situation (82: 171).

The Index of Adjustment and Values

Concerning the Bills' Index of Adjustment and Values (Appendix, and now referred to as the IAV), Wylie states that much more information is available on the norms, reliability, and validity of this instrument than on any other measure of the self-concept included in her study (91: 70). Strong and Feder (82) report that the data which have been collected from several studies indicate that the IAV is a reliable and valid measure of adjustment and values. Renzaglia concluded that reliable and valid samples of the self-concept, self satisfaction, and the ideal self-concept can be elicited from this instrument (66: 785). For these reasons and because of its appropriateness for college students and the fact that it could be administered easily in a classroom setting, it was chosen for this study.

The IAV was designed to answer the need for objective instruments for research in self-concept theory. It is based upon the theory that behavior is consistent with the behaver's perceptions of the world, including his beliefs about himself. According to Bills, the individual has information relative to his present self-organization as well as a concept of himself
as he wishes to be, and much of his behavior is designed to bring the two closer together. When the discrepancy between these two concepts is too great, maladjustment exists.

The IAV consists of a list of 49 selected traits arranged vertically and followed by three blank columns. These traits are as follows: acceptable, accurate, alert, ambitious, annoying, busy, calm, charming, clever, competent, confident, considerate, cruel, democratic, dependable, economical, efficient, fearful, friendly, fashionable, helpful, intellectual, kind, logical, meddlesome, merry, mature, nervous, normal, optimistic, poised, purposeful, reasonable, reckless, responsible, sarcastic, sincere, stable, studious, successful, stubborn, tactful, teachable, useful, worthy, broad-minded, business-like, competitive, fault-finding.

Subjects are asked to use each of the words to complete the sentence "I am a (an) _______ person" and to indicate on a five-point scale how much of the time this statement is like them. This rating is placed in the blank opposite the word in Column I. The use of rating number 1 indicates a rating of seldom; number 2 occasionally; number 3, about half of the time; number 4, a good deal of the time; and number 5, most of the time. The sum of Column I measures self description.

In the second column the subjects are asked to indicate how they feel about themselves as described in Column I. The ratings are as follows: 1) I very much dislike being as I am in this respect; 2) I dislike being as I am in this respect; 3) I neither dislike being as I am nor like being as I am in this respect; 4) I like being as I am in this respect; 5) I very much like being as I am in this respect. The sum of Column II measures self acceptance.
In Column III the subjects are asked to use each of the words to complete the sentence "I would like to be a (an) _______ person," and to indicate how much of the time they would like this trait to be characteristic of them. The same numerical ratings are used as in Column I. The sum of Column III measures the ideal self. The difference between Columns I and III measures the discrepancy between self description and ideal self, and is referred to as self-ideal self discrepancy.

**Scoring**  The items in the IAV are weighted by means of Mosier's technique of reciprocal averages (6). After the responses to negative traits are reversed and all responses are weighted, Columns I, II, and III are summed and these are the self description, self acceptance, and ideal self scores, respectively. The discrepancy scores are arrived at by noting the differences between Column I and Column III in a fourth column, which is then summed without regard for sign.

**Reliability**  Based on 100 subjects, Bills (6: 53-54) found split-half reliability of .53 for self-concept, .82 for self-acceptance and .87 for discrepancy. Based on 237 subjects, he found split-half reliability of .91 for self-acceptance and .88 for discrepancy. These coefficients were corrected for the full length of the test by use of the Spearman-Brown formula and all were significantly different from zero at less than the .01 level of significance. Intercorrelation coefficients were shown to be significantly different from zero at less than the .01 level.

**Content validity**  To arrive at the final 49 traits that are used in the IAV, Bills (6: 63) selected a sample of 124 words from Allport's list of 17,953 Traits. An effort was made to choose items that occurred
frequently in client-centered interviews that appeared to him to be clearcut examples of self-concept definitions. The sample of 124 traits was given to 44 subjects, who were retested three weeks later. The results of both tests were compared to determine the variability of the items from first to second administration. Those words with greater than average variation were eliminated, resulting in the retention of the 49 words presently used.

**Construct validity** Bills (6: 74) predicted that people who are accepting of themselves would report fewer psychosomatic complaints than would people who are not accepting of themselves. Eighty-five subjects in three groups according to their scores on the IAV, were given a check list of 51 psychosomatic complaints on which they were asked to indicate the degree to which these ailments were common to them. An analysis of variance gave an F of 5.14, which with 2 and 80 degrees of freedom gave a probability of less than .01, indicating that differences in scores among the groups were statistically significant.

Following Rogers' theory that student-centered teaching is essentially an application of client-centered therapy to the classroom and thus should result in changes similar to those noted in client-centered therapy, Bills (6) predicted that in student-centered teaching the self-description would change, become more like the ideal self, and that self-acceptance would increase. Ninety-five students from seven mental hygiene classes were matched with 130 students from other classes on the basis of tests given at the beginning of the semester. A retest at the end of the semester showed that statistically significant changes had occurred in the self-description and in self-acceptance for those students in the student-centered mental hygiene classes.
Renzaglia studied correlations between IAV scores and MMPI scores, finding significant correlations with all four IAV scores and the MMPI anxiety index and K scale, and significant correlations for the IAV self-description, self-acceptance, and discrepancy scores and the MMPI internalization index (6: 82).

**Concurrent validity**  Several correlations have been made with other tests showing statistically significant relationships. Bills (6: 64) tested three groups of students at the University of Kentucky with the IAV and the Phillips Attitudes Towards Self and Others Questionnaire, the California Test of Personality, and the Washburne S-A Inventory. The correlations with the Phillips test were significantly different from zero at the .01 level of significance for the self-acceptance and discrepancy scores. The correlations with the California Test of Personality were significantly different from zero at the .05 level for the self acceptance scores. The correlations with the Washburne test were significantly different from zero at the .01 level for the discrepancy scores.

Omwake (6: 64) tested 113 students at Agnes Scott College and found significant correlations between the IAV and the Berger Scales and the Phillips Attitudes Toward Self and Other Scale. The correlations between the IAV and both tests were significantly different from zero at the .01 level for the acceptance of self scores.

Rather extensive employment of the IAV was found in the literature. In addition to Haynes (31), referred to in Chapter II, Maxwell (50) used the IAV to measure the relationship of family adjustment to the self-concept of lower-class adolescent males. Zion (92) employed it concerning the relationship of body concept to self-concept in a university population.
In the field of education the IAV has been used by Gillett (26), McIntosh (53), and Shafer (74).

The instrument is not without weaknesses. Wylie's criticisms of it concern the problems of the influence of "faking good" or "social desirability" found in all other instruments of this type and the problem that might exist with the process of absolute summation in arriving at the self-ideal self discrepancy score. She calls attention to the strong possibility that the self and the ideal self score do not contribute equally to the variance in the discrepancy score (91: 74). This is supported by Frank and Hiester (22), who suggest that the concept of the ideal self is somewhat less reliable than the self-concept and as it tends to reflect change merely as a function of time, not all change in self-ideal self discrepancy should be attributed to experimental conditions.

In a more general sense, all the problems inherent in approaching the subject from an internal frame of reference are possible in this instrument. They are perhaps exemplary of fundamental growing pains within the field of psychology in that they represent part of the third broad trend which Rogers says is identified by such terms as phenomenological, existential, self-theory, self-actualization, health-and-growth psychology, being and becoming, and science of inner experience (71: 1).

In defense of this trend, Allport says:

1The first trend is identified by the phrases: behaviorism, objective, experimental, impersonal, logical-positivistic, operational, laboratory. The second trend includes: Freudian, New-Freudian, psychoanalytic, psychology of the unconscious, instinctual, ego-psychology, id-psychology, dynamic psychology.
"... positive science alone cannot discover the nature of man as a being-in-the-world. Each special science is too narrow. None is synoptic. And the methods of positive science tend to rule out the most appropriate tool for research: phenomenology. It is not enough to know how man reacts; we must know how he feels, how he sees his world, what time and space are to him (not to the physicist), why he lives, what he fears, for what he would willingly die. Such questions of existence must be put to man directly, and not to an outside observer" (1: 556).

Rainy (30: 491) and Wylie (91: 7) point out that this internal frame of reference does not account for such nonphenomenological constructs as drives, unconscious motivation, repression and denial, which undoubtedly are also causes of behavior. Shroeder echoes this criticism in more theoretical detail. She says

"In Rogers' formulation (1951), self-acceptance implies a state in which all aspects of experience are accepted as part of the self. Within a different theoretical framework Clara Thompson states, 'When the 'good me' tends to deny responsibility for 'bad me's' activities . . . 'bad me' ceases to function openly, or to be recognized as part of the self' (1948, p. 9)" (78: 405).

To more accurately predict behavior it would obviously be desirable to employ both internal and external frames of reference, however, such sophistication is usually beyond the means of most research environments. Wylie takes leave of this unresolved controversy and expresses the assumptions of this writer that

"We shall take as our point of departure the fact that these theorists do specify that S's phenomenal field 'determines' at least a great deal, if not all, of his general behavior" (91: 8).

Measurement of Religious Attitude

The religious attitude and behavior of American college students has received considerable attention from researchers both before and after World War II (63: 20). One familiar study concerns the religion of the
post-war college student by Allport, Gillespie and Young in 1948 (2). Material was obtained via questionnaire from 500 undergraduate students at Harvard and Radcliffe College in 1946. This study does not profess a high degree of empirical rigor, but it does suggest some interesting generalizations. For example, women as a group are more religious than men; a bare quarter of the students are essentially orthodox in their adherence to Christian dogma; the majority are dissatisfied with institutional religion as it exists, and only 10 per cent of women and 20 per cent of men declared definitely that they have no need for religion.

In 1951 Brown and Lowe (8) constructed an Inventory of Religious Belief which proved to be both a reliable and valid instrument, and used it with 622 Protestant undergraduate students at the University of Denver. They found that Protestant students, as a group, were "'middle-of-the-road' regarding Christian dogma; they neither strongly reject nor strongly accept it" (8: 127). No significant difference in religious belief between Protestant men and women was found. A marked positive relationship between church membership and greater religious belief was reported. According to Poppleton and Pilkington, this instrument contained statements which "were deliberately chosen so as to encourage outright acceptance or rejection for the purpose of obtaining two well-defined groups" (63: 21).

Both of these instruments were sensitized to record changes in religious attitude—perhaps an indication of broad cultural adjustment reflecting the alleged decline of religion discussed in Chapter II.

In searching for a device that would measure religious attitude for this study, the following criteria were employed. The instrument must
contain issues which, in the opinion of the writer, were salient to orthodox Christian doctrine. Included must be questions about the divinity of Jesus, an interpretation of the miracles, and most important, the issue of immortality which is symbolized in the death and resurrection of Jesus. For adequate statistical treatment, optimum size would be between twenty and twenty-five items. This length would also be feasible for a "package" questionnaire that could be administered during a 50-minute class period. It must be of acceptable reliability and validity and appropriate for a university population.

Shaw and Wright's recent book, *Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes* (75), gives summaries of available tests that measure religious attitude. Although none of these instruments met the requirements of this study, following are brief descriptions of those closely related to the concerns of this study.

1. "Attitude Toward the Church" by Thurstone and Chave (75: 544) was developed in 1929 and has been used extensively since that time. It is a 24-item scale and the content deals with social, personal, and moral significance of the church. Shaw and Wright believe this to be a relatively valid measuring instrument for group testing but state that further estimates of its reliability are required. It was not used in this study primarily because it focused on the church as an institution in society and only incidentally embraced doctrine.

2. "Religionism Scale" is one of a set of three developed by

---

1 J. A. Walsh, statistics consultant, Iowa State University of Science and Technology.
Ferguson (75: 329) and derived from the Thurstone scale above. It was developed from 1939 to 1944, and the set includes measures of attitude toward God, patriotism, treatment of criminals, censorship, evolution, capital punishment, birth control, law, and communism. The test evidences adequate reliability and validity, however, Shaw and Wright criticize the author for using a procedure that violates the assumptions underlying the selection of monotonic and nonmonotonic items. The test was not used, however, because it included a large proportion of items concerning birth control and evolution which were not considered relevant to this study.

3. "Religious Ideology Scale" developed by Putney and Middleton, 1961. The scale is composed of three subscales of six Likert-type items each, an Orthodoxy Subscale, a Fanaticism and an Importance Subscale. The reviewers question that the separate subscales are actually measuring different things. They report the scale to be valid for measuring of conservative attitude toward religion but add that the lack of reliability estimates detract from its value (75: 337). For this reason and the fact that specific questions about the miracles and the divinity of Jesus were not included, the instrument was not selected.

4. "The Religious Attitude Inventory" developed by Ausubel and Schpoont, 1957 (75: 339), measures attitudes toward religious doctrine, immortality, God, and the church. It is a 50-item, Likert-type scale. The reviewers report the scale to be reliable but limited in evidence of validity. This limitation and the scale's excessive length were reasons for its being rejected.

The "Religious Attitude Scale" developed by Poppleton and Pilkington, although not reviewed in Shaw and Wright's book, seemed to satisfy the
the criteria set up for this study and was chosen as the measure of religious attitude. A summary of the details of its construction and other attributes of it will now be presented.

**The Religious Attitude Scale**

This scale (Appendix) was developed in 1963 at the University of Sheffield, Great Britain by Pamela K. Poppleton of the Department of Education, and G. W. Pilkington of the Department of Psychology (63). The instrument was conceived specifically to investigate a suspected revival of religion in British universities and also to provide a reliable and valid instrument for use in further investigations. A survey of existing instruments by the authors produced none adequate for their purposes, hence they developed their own.

**Construction of the scale** Using the Thurstone method for the compilation and scaling of items, two parallel forms of 22 items each were constructed for a pilot survey. Items were selected from an original 156 which referred to many aspects of religious belief and were drawn from statements submitted by student and staff members of the University. These two forms were then given to a group of 121 people from the same population; half the group had Form A first, and half Form B, the other form being given after a 3-week interval. Reliability for the two sets of scores was .93.--

Using a method suggested by Likert (1932), an item analysis was conducted on both forms resulting in 23 items being discarded, the remaining 21 then being assembled into a final Form C.
Scoring  Subjects are instructed to respond with the degree to which they ascribe to these statements to religious belief by checking columns headed "strongly agree," "agree," "uncertain," "disagree," or "strongly disagree". Columns were weighted by a method suggested by Guilford (1954) which uses empirically derived weights for response categories. These weights give a possible range of 40-130, the higher score being pro-religious.

Reliability  For the purpose of calculating the reliability of the new Form C, it was split into three in order to test all parts. Substituting values of the variances in Cronbach's (1947) formula for coefficient alpha, an alpha of 0.97 was given, indicating "a very high measure of reliability" (63: 23).

Validity  Validation was obtained by a comparison of the scores on Form A and B to information about respondents' statements concerning their religious activities and beliefs. This information was obtained from an additional sheet attached to the questionnaire. From this information a markedly pro-religious and markedly anti-religious group were selected in the pilot survey. A t-test between the mean scores of these groups on Form B showed them to be significantly different at the .01 level. Thus, the preliminary version showed some evidence of validity. A similar procedure was used for Form C. Here a pro-religious group consisted of 107 respondents who reported (a) active membership of a church, (b) church attendance of three times or more during a month, and (c) saying private prayers at least once weekly. An anti-religious group was comprised of 109 respondents who described themselves as either atheists or agnostics. The median scores for these two groups were 116 and 60; there was no overlap
between scores of these two groups.

Another attractive feature of this scale is its simplicity, believed to be desirable if use over a long period of time is anticipated. Concerning this feature, the authors state:

"One trend in evidence throughout was the gradual elimination of statements which expressed a subtle or sophisticated attitude. The statements which remained were straight-forward, and sometimes rather naive, expressions of belief and disbelief. This may seem surprising in view of the educational level of the population for which the scale was designed" (63: 22).

Other Aspects of Religious Attitude

In an effort to more clearly understand the nature of religious attitude and possibly derive some implication from this study, perhaps for parents, teachers or religious leaders, an effort was made to sample some concomitants of religious experience. These will now be presented in addition to other biographical data on the subjects that was sought in the questionnaire.

Authoritarianism

When Kelly suggests that the church may be one force that makes the individual think less of himself, he adds, "It is not religion per se which makes one think ill of himself. It is the representatives of religion who use authoritarian methods to gain their ends" (37: 13). This study will gather evidence to test whether indeed it is more the authoritarian aspect of religion, or religion per se which may be acting on the self-concept.

Authoritarianism, as it applies to a growing person, is an attitude of rightness held by a superior concerning the utilization of his superiority. It is as though he had put on a filtering device which would
give all opinions and decisions emanating from him a quality of absoluteness which could not be questioned by subordinates. It is not rational authority, for it gets its power from position rather than from competence. The authoritarian apparently views his rightness as being exclusive, since his faith in himself is not readily projected or transferred to aspiring subordinates without their enduring some kind of systematized training or "coercion," according to Kelly (37: 12). A certain amount of authoritarianism is assumed necessary for a growing person but when the authoritarian's values are imposed upon the recipient to the extent that his perceptions become distorted, then the recipient, because of anxiety or fear, suppresses the perceptions that conflict with the values of the authoritarian and he becomes in a sense crippled. Within the church this could occur where an individual is asked to accept a doctrine as literal truth, "on pain of sin", when it violates rational concepts.

Kelly alleges that excessive authoritarianism is prevalent in many American homes, schools and churches even though democracy is our political byword. As parents are often the adults who staff the Sunday schools, and to some degree other schools, no effort will be made to isolate authoritarianism found only in religion. In this study, religious authoritarianism will be inferred wherever evidence of it, as operationally defined, is perceived by the subject, i.e., wherever he encounters an authoritarian representative of a quite "religious" culture. In this study this will include feelings of being forced to go to church or Sunday school, an undue awareness or fear of deviating from parents wishes, feelings of compulsion to accept the teachings of the church, or an inability to change one's own religion or to choose a spouse of a different faith.
The following items were included in the questionnaire because of their possible empirical relevance to this construct. These questions were factor analyzed to test their homogeneity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>As a child did you feel compelled to accept or believe the things that you were taught in the church?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very much so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>question does not apply to my situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>As a child were you forced, to some degree against your wishes, to go to church, Sunday school, or some other religious activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>often, I was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sometimes I was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I never was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>question does not apply to my situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Looking at your religious life as a child in your home and church, how would you compare it to the religious life of the average person in your peer group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My religious life was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more conservative (i.e., orthodox, strict, or traditional) than most of my peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>about the same as most of my peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more liberal than most of my peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>question does not apply to my situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>How do you regard your present religious beliefs in relation to your parent's religious beliefs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mine are more conservative than my parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>about the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mine are more liberal than my parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mine are very much more liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>question does not apply to my situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assuming your parents knew what your current religious beliefs were, do you feel that they would approve of them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very much so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>generally, yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it wouldn't make any difference to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>probably not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>definitely not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>question does not apply to my situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As far as your parents are concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion or become an atheist or an agnostic without causing serious strain on your relationship with your parents?

very much so
probably
I don't know
I don't think so
definitely not
question does not apply to my situation

Do you feel that you could differ with your parents on a controversial issue such as Viet Nam, civil rights, or length of your hair (beard), without straining your relationship with them?

very much so
generally, yes
I don't know
I doubt it
definitely not
question does not apply to my situation

As far as your personal values are concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion or become an atheist or an agnostic if there was some need to?

very much so
probably
I don't know
I don't think so
definitely not

As far as the members of your home town church are concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion, or no religion, without causing strain on your relationships with this group?

very much so
probably
I don't know
I don't think so
definitely not
question does not apply to my situation

Have your religious attitudes changed since you came to college?

very much so, in the direction of more conservative
somewhat, in the direction of more conservative
no, my religious attitudes have not significantly changed
somewhat, in the direction of more liberal
very much so, in the direction of more liberal
Childhood and adult ritualism

The concept of ritualism, or ritual participation, is employed by Glock and Stark (28) in their study of the relationship of Christian belief to anti-semitism. Ritualism implies the religious activities engaged in by a person and are in some degree related to his beliefs. In this study an attempt was made to measure childhood ritualism as an indication of the degree to which religiousness had been a part of the person's prior experience. Where this factor was not evidenced in subject's experience, it would be difficult to infer that religious attitude would have any molding effect on his self-concept. Also, validation of authoritarianism as a construct could be facilitated by employing authoritarianism as an independent variable on subjects high in childhood ritualism, and using adult ritualism as a dependent variable. It would be hypothesized that, barring undue submissive tendencies, subjects experiencing strong authoritarianism would reverse their adult behavior and become significantly less ritualistic.

For operational expression of this factor questions were included probing the subject's childhood for 1) recollections of religious rituals in the home including prayer before meals and at bedtime, 2) an assessment of his composite religious saturation compared to those of his peers, and 3) pleasant or unpleasant associations with church activities.

The following questions, believed indicative of childhood ritualism, were included in the study and submitted to factor analysis to test homogeneity:
Do you consider your childhood to have been

___ very religious
___ somewhat religious
___ neutral concerning religion
___ not especially religious
___ definitely not religious

As a child did you feel compelled to accept or believe the things that you were taught in the church?

___ very much so
___ sometimes
___ not at all
___ question does not apply to my situation

As a child were you forced, to some degree against your wishes, to go to church, Sunday school, or some other religious activity?

___ often, I was
___ sometimes I was
___ I never was
___ question does not apply to my situation

Looking at your religious life as a child in your home and church, how would you compare it to the religious life of the average person in your peer group?

My religious life was

___ more conservative (i.e., orthodox, strict, or traditional) than most of my peers
___ about the same as most of my peers
___ more liberal than most of my peers
___ question does not apply to my situation

In your home as a child, how would you describe your religious rituals, e.g., prayers before meals and at bedtime?

___ we had them every day
___ we had them sometimes
___ we had them only on special occasions
___ they were not a part of my childhood

An attempt was made to measure adult ritualism for purposes discussed earlier in this section and also as a means to give another basis for assessing religious attitude. In other words, it proposes to answer the question, "How does the degree to which a person acts on his faith relate
to the degree of his faith, and would these factors have an effect on the self-concept? Any conclusions on this issue would certainly be tentative since ritualism, as defined in this study, would not take into account the reason or motive of going to church, praying, belonging to groups, etc.

Included in this cluster as defined operationally were questions to assess both public and private ritual participation. Public ritual participation would include church membership, attendance, and participating in campus religious organizations. Private ritualism was defined as praying privately and the frequency with which private prayers were said. As students away from home and at college are often exposed to other religions for the first time, it was decided to sample the degree to which they had visited other churches since coming to college. This question was considered to be relevant to ritual participation in that it evidences a certain concern about religion. It was, therefore, included in the cluster and tested for homogeneity. Following are the questions used in the instrument to assess adult ritual participation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Are you a member of a church? yes no (circle one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>If &quot;yes&quot; to item 1, would you describe yourself as an active member of this church, that is, how often do you attend church when it is possible for you to do so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>three times a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>twice a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>less than once a month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Check the denominations below that you have "visited" (attended services in) since coming to college.

____ (American) Baptist  ____ (American) Lutheran
____ (Southern) Baptist  ____ (Missouri) Lutheran
____ Congregational  ____ Methodist
____ Disciples of Christ  ____ Presbyterian
____ Episcopal  ____ Roman Catholic
____ Jewish  ____ Other (Please specify)

Do you participate regularly, or nearly so, in campus religious affairs? (For example, Newman Club, Wesley Foundation, or Campus Crusade?) yes no (circle one)

Do you pray privately? yes no (circle one)

If "yes" to No. 7, how often do you pray?
____ at least once daily
____ at least once weekly
____ less frequently

Compared to your childhood patterns of religiousness, how do you consider your life as an adult?
____ much more religious (more regular church attendance, etc.)
____ somewhat more religious
____ about the same
____ somewhat less religious
____ definitely less religious

**Particularism**

The words of Glock and Stark (28) are most effective in explaining this term:

"Most simply put, religious particularism is the belief that only one's own religion is legitimate . . . . To the particularistic mind there are not faiths, but one true faith".

"In our pluralistic, modern society particularism can take broader or narrower forms. Some may feel that any faith is acceptable so long as it acknowledges a supreme being. Others may specifically limit religious legitimacy to Christians, and still other may reject all but their own specific denomination. A few persons even call down a pox upon all but themselves and their immediate families. In the words of Coleridge, 'He who begins by loving Christianity better than truth, will proceed by loving his own
sect or church better than Christianity, and end in loving himself . . . better than all" (28: 20-21).

It may be difficult at times to differentiate particularism from ethnocentrism. Although they often coincide, Max Weber, as quoted (28: 21), suggests that "ethnocentrism lacks the cutting edge of religious particularism".

Coleridge's statement above would be held in sharp contention by the existential self-theorists. For them it is axiomatic that a person cannot really love himself if he retains animosity toward an Other, because their welfare is inextricably bound. The Other is only a different manifestation of the common human condition.

For this study, evidence of particularism would be evidence of alienation of the individual with some other group, and if the theory holds, it should be an indication of a lack of self-acceptance or personality integration i.e., adjustment. Particularism resembles authoritarianism in its sense of rightness, however particularism seems even more Divinely oriented but perhaps less pervasive. It is included in this study to assess its single relationship to orthodoxy and also to the self-concept.

In view of the nature of this factor as defined by Glock and Stark, and also in this study, particularism will be construed whether within Christianity, or between it and other major faiths. Religious questions of a particularly Christian orientation from the Religious Attitude Scale were extracted for testing with this cluster. Questions about Jesus and the miracles were considered most relevant. Those included were:
Item  Page 

(Subjects respond with Strongly Agree, Agree, Uncertain, Disagree or Strongly Disagree)

2 4  Jesus Christ was an important and interesting historical figure but in no way divine.

4 4  People without religious beliefs can lead just as moral and useful lives as people with religious beliefs.

7 4  The miracles recorded in the Bible really happened.

9 4  Christ atoned for our sins by His sacrifice on the cross.

10 4  The truth of the Bible diminishes with the advance of science.

14 4  The proof that Christ was the Son of God lies in the record of the Gospels.

15 5  The best explanation of miracles is as an exaggeration of ordinary events into myths and legends.

18 5  Parents have a duty to teach elementary Christian truths to their children.

19 5  There is no survival of any kind after death.

Concerning particularism within Christianity, the degree of visiting other denominations was assumed to be negatively associated with particularism. Likewise, as in authoritarianism, where the individual was reluctant to change religion or to differ from parents or church members, particularism was suspected. Following were the questions as included in the instrument:

Item  Page 

Check the denominations below that you have "visited" (attended services in) since coming to college.

___ (American) Baptist  ___ (American) Lutheran
___ (Southern) Baptist  ___ (Missouri) Lutheran
___ Congregational  ___ Methodist
___ Disciples of Christ  ___ Presbyterian
___ Episcopal  ___ Roman Catholic
___ Jewish  ___ Other (Please specify)
As far as your personal values are concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion or become an atheist or an agnostic if there was some need to?

_____ very much so
_____ probably
_____ I don't know
_____ I don't think so
_____ definitely not

As far as your present peer group in your hometown community is concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion or become an atheist or an agnostic without causing serious strain on your relationships with this group?

_____ very much so
_____ probably
_____ I don't know
_____ I don't think so
_____ definitely not
_____ question does not apply to my situation

As far as the members of your hometown church are concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion, or no religion, without causing strain on your relationships with this group?

_____ very much so
_____ probably
_____ I don't know
_____ I don't think so
_____ definitely not
_____ question does not apply to my situation

Is it important to you that your marriage partner be of the same religious faith?

_____ very important
_____ somewhat important
_____ of little importance
_____ not important at all

Have your religious attitudes changed since you came to college?

_____ very much so, in the direction of more conservative
_____ somewhat, in the direction of more conservative
_____ no, my religious attitudes have not significantly changed
_____ somewhat, in the direction of more liberal
_____ very much so, in the direction of more liberal
With these aspects of religious attitude explained more fully within the purposes of this study, perhaps it is in order to summarize the justification for their inclusion as the subordinate hypotheses of this study. These are hypotheses 4-7.

**Hypothesis 4** Subjects expressing high orthodoxy and high authoritarianism will express lower self concepts, lower self acceptance and higher self-ideal self discrepancy than high orthodox subjects expressing low authoritarianism.

If Kelly's incrimination of authoritarianism has foundation, then it can be expected that where high authoritarianism was found in addition to high orthodoxy, subjects would express significantly lower self-concepts (Bills, Col. I), lower self-acceptance (Col. II), and higher discrepancy between self and ideal self (Col. IV), than high orthodox subjects expressing low authoritarianism.

**Hypothesis 5** Subjects expressing high orthodoxy and high particularism will express lower self-concepts, lower self-acceptance and higher self-ideal self discrepancy than high orthodox subjects expressing low particularism.

As nine items used in testing for homogeniety in particularism are also contained in the orthodoxy scale (the RAS), there is some concern whether particularism will survive analysis as a discrete factor. However, this risk is openly taken. The hypothesis in detail is similar to hypothesis 4 except that "particularism" is substituted for "authoritarianism".

**Hypothesis 6** Subjects expressing high childhood ritualism and high authoritarianism will express low orthodoxy and low adult ritual participation. Subjects within this syndrome will express lower self-concepts
A number of issues are involved in this hypothesis. First, taking only subjects high in childhood ritualism and of these selecting those also high in authoritarianism identifies relative saturation of these variables. It is hypothesized that these subjects will express low orthodoxy and low adult ritual participation, i.e., significantly lower than subjects with high childhood ritualism and low authoritarianism. It is assumed that childhood ritualism will be positively related to orthodoxy.

It is hypothesized that subjects within this syndrome (i.e., high in childhood ritualism, high in authoritarianism, and of these, the number that did express either low orthodoxy or low adult ritual participation or both) would express lower self-concepts than other subjects because they would be representative of maximum saturation and maximum "interference" from authority figures. Of these, taking the number that were low in orthodoxy and adult ritual participation would identify subjects alienated from the values of the majority, which, in our culture are presumed to be traditionally strong in orthodoxy and ritual participation. This hypothesis would be in conflict with the first three which anticipate low orthodoxy to be associated with higher self-concept. It is reversed here because of the anticipated influence of high authoritarianism which was a common factor of those low in adult ritual participation.

**Hypothesis 7** Subjects expressing high childhood ritualism and low authoritarianism will express high orthodoxy and high adult ritual participation. Subjects within this syndrome will express higher self-concepts than other subjects.
Similar to hypothesis 6, this is intended to test the effect of low authoritarianism with subjects highly saturated in childhood religiousness. It is believed that with low authoritarianism, these subjects will have received less interference, will be willing and able to identify with the larger, higher orthodox-higher ritualistic group and the result will be more favorable self-concepts. The assumption in both hypotheses 6 and 7 is that people who perceive themselves as on the fringe or outside of majority beliefs have less potential ego support from the group, according to the dynamics of individual-group interaction.

Other items in questionnaire

On the introductory page of the questionnaire (Appendix) were questions of a demographic nature plus a question about the perceived normalcy of subject’s childhood as it regarded having both parents in the home. It was thought that this factor as well as age, sex, "home" state, size of home town, and marital status may account for some of the variation in religious attitude and self concept in addition to being of sociological interest.

Collection and Analysis of Data

Subjects

Subjects were all of the students (i.e., those who were present on the day that the questionnaire was administered) taking Sociology 319, Courtship and Marriage, a junior-level course in the College of Science and Humanities, and all the students taking Family Environment 270, The Individual and the Family, a sophomore-level course in the College of Home Economics at Iowa State University. The majority of students taking
Courtship and Marriage were male; the course is not required. The course Individual and the Family is required in the College of Home Economics and is made up mostly of female students. Together, there were twenty-two sections taught during spring quarter, 1968, when, during three weeks in April, data were collected. Of 598 students who were exposed to the instrument, 565 returned usable questionnaires.

Procedure

The questionnaire was administered by the writer in the normal class setting with the regular teacher present in all cases, at least at the beginning of the period. In accord with University policy concerning the use of students as subjects for research, the following statement was read:

"Let me introduce myself. I am David Weltha, a graduate student at this university. The research that you will be asked to participate in today has been approved by the Heads of the Departments of Sociology and Family Environment. It is hoped that all of you will participate, as a large number of students are needed for this study. You are to understand that participation is not required as a part of this course; it will have no bearing on your grade. To insure anonymity and encourage honesty in your response to the questions, you need not give your name. However, should you feel that any of the questions unduly violates your rights of personal privacy and you do not wish to participate in the survey, you may return the questionnaire and be excused."

"If you read each sentence in the instructions carefully, you should have no questions, however, if something is not clear to you, please raise your hand and I will assist you."

This was the only oral introduction to the research setting. General directions on the first page of the instrument (Appendix) were read silently by the students. Immediately after reading the above statement to the students, the writer informed them informally that they may use either pen or pencil, and that it would take them approximately 30 minutes
to complete the questionnaire. For stragglers who entered the classroom after the statement had been read, a copy of it was given to them with the questionnaire.

**Treatment of data**

The measures of association used for correlating and intercorrelating the scores of the various items and factors of the study were standard correlation techniques used in the Department of Statistics, Iowa State University of Science and Technology. The particular program was developed by J. A. Walsh at the University of Washington, 1962 (88).
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

Tests of Homogeneity

The questionnaire contained items intended to measure other aspects of religious attitude, namely, child and adult ritualism, authoritarianism and particularism. All items that were expected to have any possible relationship to these areas were submitted to factor analysis. Factor analysis provides an estimate of the number of independent dimensions to which the items relate and a quantitative indication of the degree to which an item belongs in a homogeneous category.

Results of this analysis which was based on a random sample of 125 subjects of the 325 remaining after all "not-applicable" and "no response" items were excluded, revealed three factors. These three were reconciled with the four that were theorized, resulting in three factors: childhood ritualism, particularism and authoritarianism, which will be related to the three scores in the IAV and the Religious Attitude Scale (the RAS).

Nunnally (59: 355-358) was used as a general guide in the criteria for the existence of factors and for the acceptance or rejection of variables within factors. In this study, no item was accepted within a factor with a loading of .40 or below.

Childhood ritualism

This factor included seven items from the Religious Attitude Scale intended to be measures of particularism. These seven items were found to be related to the theorized categories of both childhood and adult ritualism. Factor analysis indicated no basis for separating ritualism into two categories, hence they were combined into one and labeled
childhood ritualism. The items in the RAS and those intended to measure adult ritualism can be justified under the category of childhood ritualism in that they appear reasonably related to salient aspects of childhood religious instruction and residuals of childhood rituals, respectively. For example, the question intended to measure adult ritualism, "How often do you pray?" would seem to have been answered very much according to the degree that this occurred in childhood.

As adult ritualism did not survive as a discrete factor, it is necessary to withdraw it from hypotheses 6 and 7. These hypotheses, as revised, will be stated in this chapter under findings concerning the subordinate hypotheses.

Following are the items in the revised factor childhood ritualism, with loadings (item-factor correlation) as indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Christ atoned for our sins by His sacrifice on the cross.
15 The best explanation of miracles is an exaggeration of ordinary events into myths and legends.
7 The miracles recorded in the Bible really happened.
14 The proof that Christ was the Son of God lies in the record of the Gospels.
2 Jesus Christ was an important and interesting historical figure but in no way divine.
19 There is no survival of any kind after death.
24 Is it important to you that your marriage partner be of the same religious faith?

4 very important
3 somewhat important
2 of little importance
1 not important at all

3 If "yes" to item 1, would you describe yourself as an active member of this church, that is, how often do you attend church when it is possible for you to do so?

5 once a week
4 three times a month
3 twice a month
2 once a month
1 less than once a month
Item    Page  
9     6  Do you consider your childhood to have been  
   5  very religious  
   4  somewhat religious  
   3  neutral concerning religion  
   2  not especially religious  
   1  definitely not religious  
10    4  The truth of the Bible diminishes with the advance of science.  
14    7  In your home as a child, how would you describe your religious rituals, e.g., prayers before meals and at bedtime?  
   4  we had them every day  
   3  we had them sometimes  
   2  we had them only on special occasions  
   1  they were not a part of my childhood  
13    7  Looking at your religious life as a child in your home and church, how would you compare it to the religious life of the average person in your peer group?  
   3  more conservative (i.e., orthodox, strict, or traditional) than most of my peers  
   2  about the same as most of my peers  
   1  more liberal than most of my peers  
   8  question does not apply to my situation  
8     6  If "yes" to No. 7, how often do you pray?  
   3  at least once daily  
   2  at least once weekly  
   1  less frequently  

Particularism

Factor analysis revealed that the items from the RAS concerning the role of Jesus and the miracles which were intended as measures of particularism, were related to ritualism. This is not surprising as the RAS is an orthodoxy scale and the relationship between orthodoxy and ritualism is well established (28: 17). Three of the four items in this category had in common the phrase, "do you feel that you could switch to any other religion." Since particularism was defined as the attitude that one's own religion is to some extent the right religion, unwillingness to switch is accepted as evidence of particularism. This does not, however, differentiate from those well satisfied with their religion but who do not feel
that it is superior, or exclusive. Also lost from this category to ritualism was the question, "Is it important to you that your marriage partner be of the same religious faith?" Apparently choosing a spouse of the same religion is more related to the degree of your faith (orthodoxy) and what you do about it (ritualism) than to the exclusiveness (particularism) of it. The question concerning the number of denominations visited since coming to college was found to be included in this category. This question was weighted so that the more churches visited, the less evidence of particularism.

The following items will be used in this instrument as operational definitions of particularism. Numbers on the blanks are weights assigned to that response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Check the denominations below that you have &quot;visited&quot; (attended services in) since coming to college.</td>
<td>≤.84 ≤.84 ≤.84 ≤.84 ≤.84 ≤.84 ≤.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (American) Baptist</td>
<td>(American) Lutheran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Southern) Baptist</td>
<td>(Missouri) Lutheran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disciples of Christ</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 8 As far as the members of your home town church are concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion, or no religion, without causing strain on your relationships with this group?

1 very much so
2 probably
3 I don't know
4 I don't think so
5 definitely not
8 question does not apply to my situation

1 If no churches had been visited, the score was 6; if one church had been visited, 5; two churches, 4; three churches, 3; four churches, 2; more than four churches, 1.
As far as your parents are concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion or become an atheist or an agnostic without causing serious strain on your relationship with your parents?

1. very much so
2. probably
3. I don't know
4. I don't think so
5. definitely not
8. question does not apply to my situation

As far as your present peer group in your home town community is concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion or become an atheist or an agnostic without causing serious strain on your relationships with this group?

1. very much so
2. probably
3. I don't know
4. I don't think so
5. definitely not
8. question does not apply to my situation

Authoritarianism

As theorized, items evidencing parental pressure or items evidencing differences with parents on religious beliefs or other nonreligious controversial issues were found to be related. These were labeled authoritarianism. One item in this group--"Compared to your childhood patterns of religiousness, how do you consider your life as an adult?" was found to be negatively related. This is interpreted as being a quite logical result of strong authoritarianism, e.g., maximum interference by parents in a person's childhood is associated with less religion in adult life. Weights for this question were consequently reversed in figuring the scores for this factor.

Following are the questions remaining in this category with loadings as indicated:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assuming your parents knew what your current religious beliefs were, do you feel that they would approve of them?</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. very much so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. generally, yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. it wouldn't make any difference to them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. probably not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. definitely not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. question does not apply to my situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>How do you regard your present religious beliefs in relation to your parent's religious beliefs?</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. mine are more conservative than my parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0. about the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0. I don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. mine are more liberal than my parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. mine are very much more liberal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. questions does not apply to my situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>As a child were you forced, to some degree against your wishes, to go to church, Sunday School, or some other religious activity?</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. often, I was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. sometimes I was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. I never was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. question does not apply to my situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Do you feel that you could differ with your parents on a controversial issue such as Viet Nam, civil rights, or length of your hair (beard), without straining your relationship with them?</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. very much so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. generally, yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. I don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. I doubt it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. definitely not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. question does not apply to my situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Compared to your childhood patterns of religiousness, how do you consider your life as an adult?</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. much more religious (more regular church attendance, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. somewhat more religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. about the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. somewhat less religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. definitely less religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 17 is actually a combination of item 17 and item 18. Weights for item 17 were added to the weight for the response made to item 18. It was reasoned that parental approval was more significant to the degree that the child differed from his parents.

Findings Concerning the Major Hypotheses

Correlations and intercorrelations between the self-concept as measured by the IAV and religious attitude as measured by the RAS are shown in Table 1. Although the correlation between orthodoxy and the self-concept (0.113) is statistically significant, it is significant primarily due to a large N and cannot be interpreted as support for the first hypothesis, "Subjects expressing a high self-concept will express low religious orthodoxy." This correlation of .113 is also not in the direction of the hypothesized relationship.

Hypothesis 2, "Subjects expressing high self-acceptance will express low religious orthodoxy" is also not supported since the correlation of .01 is neither significant nor in the direction of the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3, "Subjects expressing high self-description-ideal discrepancy will express high religious orthodoxy", has a correlation of .05 in the hypothesized direction, but is not significant. As in

---

1 Item 18, with weights indicated reads: Assuming your parents knew what your current religious beliefs were, do you feel that they would approve of them?
1 very much so
2 generally, yes
3 it wouldn't make any difference to them
4 probably not
5 definitely not
8 question does not apply to my situation.
Table 1. Correlations of the IAV and the RAS and intercorrelations of the IAV scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-concept</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
<th>Orthodoxy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The IAV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>-0.699</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.648</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The RAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

hypothesis 2, no relationship is indicated.

When the relationship of scores on the IAV and the RAS is looked at by church denomination (Table 2), it appears that there is some kind of relationship at least for some denominations. For example, American Baptists are highest in orthodoxy and also very high on all the scores in the IAV. This is a reversal of the main hypotheses. Roman Catholics and Congregationalists, however, appear to support the hypotheses. Roman Catholics are well above the mean in orthodoxy but very low on the IAV. Congregationalists, on the other hand, are next to the lowest in orthodoxy but highest on all three scales in the IAV. Other denominations, with perhaps one or two exceptions, evidence no consistent pattern and appear to support a conclusion of no relationship.

The religious denominations in this study were those identified by Glock and Stark (28), with the exception of Southern Baptist, which was the denomination of only one subject and therefore excluded as a category. Glock and Stark's ranking of the denominations (28: 13) according to orthodoxy is compared to the ranking on the RAS used in this study in Table 3. A rank-order correlation between these two sets of ranks was
Table 2. Means of RAS (orthodoxy) and IAV scores by denomination by rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean score Orthodoxy</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean score Self concept</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean score Acceptance</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean score Discrepancy^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Baptist</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109.214</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>188.571</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>173.214</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Lutheran</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105.829</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>184.914</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>170.229</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Lutheran</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102.563</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>184.690</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>169.529</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sects^b</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102.400</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>183.560</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>169.680</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>102.100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>180.737</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>163.512</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94.485</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>185.364</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>167.939</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples of Christ</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93.933</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>183.733</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>173.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92.412</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>183.007</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>165.641</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.795</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>190.136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175.750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85.250</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>182.417</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>165.250</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Members</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67.091</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>179.697</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>169.727</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>565</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.488</td>
<td>183.874</td>
<td></td>
<td>168.071</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Lower score indicates more positive adjustment.

Table 3. Rank-order comparison of religious orthodoxy between Glock and Stark's scale and the RAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Rank Glock and Stark</th>
<th>Rank The RAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Lutheran</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Baptist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Lutheran</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples of Christ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman rank-order correlation 0.824

.824. A test of significance showed a t of 4.116 which, with 2 degrees of freedom was significant beyond the .10 level (2.920), but not at the .05 level (4.303). This is evidence that the RAS is a valid measure of religious orthodoxy.

Further findings relevant to the main hypotheses appear in Table 4 which shows the means and standard deviations on the scores in the RAS and the LAV broken down into three groups. These groups resulted from factor analysis, and are composed of 1) 240 subjects who responded "not applicable" or failed to respond to the questions submitted to factor analysis, 2) 125 of the remaining subjects that were used to implement the factor analysis and 3) the remaining 200 subjects that were used to test the minor hypotheses. As was expected, because many questions concerning
Table 4. Means and standard deviations of 3 groups of subjects on the RAS and the IAV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The IAV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-concept</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 subjects</td>
<td>186.320</td>
<td>14.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 subjects</td>
<td>184.645</td>
<td>16.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 subjects</td>
<td>181.958</td>
<td>18.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-acceptance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 subjects</td>
<td>168.552</td>
<td>19.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 subjects</td>
<td>168.740</td>
<td>22.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 subjects</td>
<td>167.262</td>
<td>22.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discrepancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 subjects</td>
<td>37.936</td>
<td>14.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 subjects</td>
<td>38.730</td>
<td>15.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 subjects</td>
<td>38.921</td>
<td>16.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The RAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orthodoxy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 subjects</td>
<td>105.032</td>
<td>14.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 subjects</td>
<td>100.330*a</td>
<td>16.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 subjects</td>
<td>86.483</td>
<td>22.332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sig. at .001 level.

*a Compared with orthodoxy mean for 240 subjects.

religion did not apply to them, the group of 240 subjects had a significantly lower mean on the RAS. However, they did not differ significantly on any of the scores on the IAV. These data appear to support the previous findings of no relationship between scores on the RAS and the IAV.
Findings Concerning the Subordinate Hypotheses

Hypothesis 4 reads, "Subjects expressing high orthodoxy and high authoritarianism will express lower self-concepts, lower self-acceptance and higher self-ideal self discrepancy than high orthodox subjects expressing low authoritarianism." In order to test this, scores in authoritarianism were obtained on the 200 subjects used to test this hypothesis. Of these, 117 were found to be above the median in orthodoxy. With these, three 2 by 2 chi squares were set up comparing those high in authoritarianism with the three scores on the IAV. Table 5 shows the observed and expected frequencies for each cell, for each score on the IAV. Although none of the three relationships are significant at the .05 level, the relationship between observed and expected frequencies for high authoritarianism-high discrepancy is in the direction hypothesized and significant at the .10 level.

Hypothesis 5 states, "Subjects expressing high orthodoxy and high particularism will express lower self-concepts, lower self-acceptance and higher self-ideal self discrepancy than high orthodox subjects expressing low particularism." Observed and expected frequencies are shown in Table 6. On all measures of the IAV, chi squares did not approach significance at the .10 level.

As factor analysis failed to sustain adult ritualism as a factor, hypotheses 6 and 7 were revised and stated as one hypothesis, in two parts. Hypothesis 6 now reads, "a) Subjects expressing high childhood ritualism and high authoritarianism will express lower orthodoxy than high childhood ritualism subjects expressing low authoritarianism. b) Subjects within the syndrome of high childhood ritualism, high authoritarianism and
Table 5. Observed and expected frequencies of high orthodox and high authoritarian subjects on IAV scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Orthodoxy</th>
<th>Authoritarianism</th>
<th>Self-concept</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 0.581 \quad \chi^2 = 1.243 \quad \chi^2 = 3.016^*$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Orthodoxy</th>
<th>Authoritarianism</th>
<th>Self-concept</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td>22.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>35.97</td>
<td>32.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sig. at .10 level.
Table 6. Observed and expected frequencies of high orthodox and high particularism subjects on IAV scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Self-concept</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Particularism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .0061 \] \[ x^2 = .0972 \] \[ x^2 = 1.0142 \]

| Expected |                      |            |            |            |
|----------|-----------------------|------------|------------|
| Orthodox | Particularism         |            |            |            |
| High     | High                  | 28.21      | 31.79      | 60         | 28.72      | 31.28      | 60         |
|          | Low                   | 26.79      | 30.21      | 57         | 27.28      | 29.72      | 57         |
|          |                       | 55         | 62          | 117        | 53         | 64          | 117        |
low orthodoxy will express lower self-concepts, lower self-acceptance and higher self-ideal self discrepancy than subjects within the syndrome of high childhood ritualism, low authoritarianism and high orthodoxy." A chi square (Table 7) revealed no significant differences in orthodoxy for high ritualism subjects high and low in authoritarianism (hypothesis 6a), therefore, there was no basis for accepting the syndrome and further relating of it to self-concept and other parts of the IAV (hypothesis 6b) was inappropriate. Hypothesis 6, thereby, was not supported.

Table 7. Observed and expected frequencies for high ritualism, high authoritarian subjects on orthodoxy scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ritualism</th>
<th>Authoritarianism</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>37 3 40</td>
<td>36.8 3.2 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>55 5 60</td>
<td>55.2 4.8 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92 8 100</td>
<td>92 8 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = .0226\]

Findings Concerning Demographic Data

Ages of subjects ranged from 18 to 35 with 96% ranging from 19 to 23 years. The majority (241 or 42.6%) were 20 years old.

Forty-five subjects (8%) were married and 31 (5%) responded "no" to the question, "Would you consider your home 'normal' in the sense that you lived with both of your parents during most of your childhood?" As these figures each represent fewer than 10% of the subjects, their relationship as a category to scores on the RAS and the IAV was not investigated.

Table 8 gives means and standard deviations, by sex, on the scores in the RAS and the IAV. Females scored significantly higher than males on
Table 8. Means and standard deviations, by sex, on IAV and RAS scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Self-concept mean</th>
<th>Self-acceptance mean</th>
<th>Discrepancy (Orthodoxy) mean</th>
<th>The RAS mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>183.495</td>
<td>17.507</td>
<td>169.167</td>
<td>21.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.233</td>
<td>14.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>184.099</td>
<td>16.664</td>
<td>167.423</td>
<td>22.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.465</td>
<td>15.942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $t = 2.9409$ sig. at .01 level.

*aCompared with female orthodoxy mean.
Orthodoxy (at the .01 level), but did not differ significantly on the scores in the IAV.

Concerning the home state of the subjects, 448 of them were from Iowa, 72 from the states bordering Iowa, and 44 from other states in the United States. Table 9 shows the breakdown, by these geographic areas, of scores on the IAV and the RAS. No significant differences were found between Iowans and those in states bordering Iowa, however, subjects from "other" states scored significantly lower at the .05 level than both Iowans and those bordering Iowa on self-concept. On orthodoxy, "other" states differed from Iowans significantly (lower) at the .001 level, and differed from "bordering Iowa" significantly (lower) at the .01 level. Discrepancy and self-acceptance scores did not differ significantly.

Concerning population of home town (Table 10) subjects from towns of over 100,000 differed significantly (.05 level) in orthodoxy from those from towns of under 2,500. Subjects in the towns of over 100,000 had the lower orthodoxy mean. There were no significant differences on scores in the IAV.

Other Findings of Sociological Interest

Findings concerning religion

There were 33 subjects in the study that said they were not members of a church. This represents 5.8% of the sample. The responses of those who were church members to the question, "... would you describe yourself as an active member of this church, that is, how often do you attend church when it is possible for you to do so?" are presented in Table 11.
Table 9. Means and standard deviation, by home state, on IAV and RAS scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home state</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iowa</strong></td>
<td>448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self concept</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>184.109</td>
<td>17.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>167.998</td>
<td>22.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.449</td>
<td>15.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The RAS (Orthodoxy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>96.667</td>
<td>19.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bordering Iowa</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>185.611</td>
<td>15.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>170.403</td>
<td>21.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.597</td>
<td>17.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The RAS (Orthodoxy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.111</td>
<td>17.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other states in U.S.</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>178.756</td>
<td>16.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>165.067</td>
<td>21.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.556</td>
<td>16.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The RAS (Orthodoxy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.600</td>
<td>25.325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sig. at .05 level.
**Sig. at .01 level.
***Sig. at .001 level.

\( a_t = 2.0869 \) compared with self-concept mean for other states in U.S.

\( b_t = 3.5823 \) compared with orthodoxy mean for other states in U.S.

\( c_t = 2.2419 \) compared with self-concept mean for other states in U.S.

\( d_t = 3.3318 \) compared with orthodoxy mean for other states in U.S.
Table 10. Means and standard deviations, by population of home town, on IAV and RAS scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population of home town</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 2,500</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td></td>
<td>184.714</td>
<td>16.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>167.286</td>
<td>22.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.146</td>
<td>14.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS (Orthodoxy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.589*</td>
<td>19.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,501 - 5,000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td></td>
<td>183.806</td>
<td>16.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>170.328</td>
<td>19.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.836</td>
<td>13.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS (Orthodoxy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.851</td>
<td>18.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td></td>
<td>184.327</td>
<td>17.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>170.106</td>
<td>21.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.875</td>
<td>15.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS (Orthodoxy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>96.404</td>
<td>19.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 100,000</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td></td>
<td>183.298</td>
<td>17.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>168.363</td>
<td>21.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.855</td>
<td>17.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS (Orthodoxy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.847</td>
<td>21.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 100,000</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td></td>
<td>182.179</td>
<td>16.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>164.885</td>
<td>22.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.744</td>
<td>17.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS (Orthodoxy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>91.500</td>
<td>20.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>565</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sig. at .05 level.

at = 2.2403 compared with orthodoxy mean for towns of over 100,000.
Table 11. Frequency and percent of responses to the question, "How often do you attend church?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>three times a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>twice a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>less than once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>(not applicable or no response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 61% indicated that they attended church at least twice a month when it was possible for them to do so.

Although response was appropriate for only 33 subjects, 41 replied to the question, "If 'no' to item 1, (Are you a member of a church?) which of the following best describes you?" Table 12 indicates the breakdown. The question was asked primarily to get some indication of how many in the sample considered themselves atheists or agnostics. Responses indicate that 25, or 4.42% viewed themselves in this category.

Participation in campus religious affairs, e.g., Newman Club or Wesley Foundation, was not a popular activity. Five hundred subjects or 88.5% said they did not participate regularly; 63 or 11% said that they did.

In response to the question, "Do you pray privately?", 439 or 77.7% responded yes; 125 or 22.1% responded no. One subject indicated that this question was an invasion of her privacy and did not respond.
Table 12. Frequency and percent of responses to the question, "Which of the following best describes you?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency N = 565</th>
<th>Percent of Total N</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>atheist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>agnostic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>believer, but non-church-member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> 41</td>
<td><strong>7.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two questions were designed to assess childhood and adult religiousness, and degree of change in religiousness as perceived by the adult. Responses to these questions are found in Table 13. These responses indicate that 475 or 84% considered their childhood to be somewhat or very religious and that 241 or 42.6% considered their adult life to be definitely or somewhat less religious. One hundred ninety or 33% considered their adult patterns of religiousness about the same as their childhood patterns.

In the area of the subject's relationship with his parents concerning religion, the question was asked, "Assuming your parents knew what your current religious beliefs were, do you feel that they would approve of them?" Four hundred twenty-five or 75.2% responded affirmatively or that it would not make any difference to them. However, in response to the question, "As far as your parents are concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion or become an atheist or an agnostic without causing serious strain on your relationship with your parents?"
Table 13. Frequency and percent of responses to two questions concerning childhood and adult religious patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider your childhood to have been</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>very religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>somewhat religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>neutral concerning religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>not especially religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>definitely not religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to your childhood patterns of religiousness, how do you consider your life as an adult?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>much more religious (more regular church attendance, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>somewhat more religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>about the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>somewhat less religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>definitely less religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>100.1^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Due to rounding error.

325 or 57.5% responded, "I don't think so", or "definitely not". One hundred fifty-nine or 28.14% felt that they could switch.

A final question in this area was designed to assess the changes in religious attitude associated with going to college. Response to this question is found in Table 14. It indicates that a majority, or 55% feel that their religious attitudes have become more liberal since coming to college.

Findings concerning family relationships

Two questions were included to assess the general home environment of the subject's childhood. Responses to these questions indicate a large
Table 14. Frequency and percent of responses to the question, "Have your religious attitudes changed since you came to college?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>very much so, in the direction of more conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>somewhat, in the direction of more conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>no, my religious attitudes have not significantly changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>somewhat, in the direction of more liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>very much so, in the direction of more liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

majority, 85.8% felt that their childhood was very happy or happy most of the time. Regarding discipline and controls set by their parents, half of the subjects (49.9%) felt that discipline was not overly strict or overly liberal. Complete responses to these questions are found in Table 15.

A question designed to assess the existence of what is popularly referred to as the generation gap reads, "Do you feel that you could differ with your parents on a controversial issue such as Viet Nam, civil rights, or length of your hair (beard), without straining your relationship with them?" Response to this question (Table 16) indicates a large majority (75%) felt they could. Only 99, or 17.5% felt they could not.
Table 15. Frequency and percent of responses to two questions concerning home environment of childhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>very happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>happy most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>not particularly happy, nor unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>unhappy much of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>very unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>(did not respond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following best describes the discipline and controls your parents exerted on you in your childhood (until you came to college)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>very strict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>somewhat strict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>not overly strict or overly liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>somewhat liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>very liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>(did not respond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Frequency and percent of response to question, "Could you differ with your parents on controversial issues?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>very much so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>generally, yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>I doubt it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>definitely not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>question does not apply to my situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>(did not respond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>100.1(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Due to rounding error.
The findings indicate no apparent relationship between religious attitude and the self-concept. This chapter will include an interpretation and discussion of these findings.

In scoring individuals on the two basic instruments of this study, the IAV and the RAS, it was found that many subjects had scores that strongly supported the hypotheses. Other subjects had scores that were just as strong in refuting the hypotheses, and a great many of them leaned in neither direction. It appears that those in support balanced those in non-support and, as a group, no relationship was evident. This is possibly an indication that individual behavior related to religious beliefs cannot be predicted using the predictors employed in this study. Because an individual brings his whole background of experiences (his self) into an encounter with reality, he perceives it uniquely, and perhaps, in the case of religious orthodoxy, it does not have a predictable impact on the individual. This would seem also to be an appropriate explanation for the impotence of particularism and childhood ritualism as significant variables. Perhaps the impact of the church occurs too late in a child's life to have serious implication for the self-concept. Even when the impact may occur, the child perhaps interprets the religious stimulus in a manner related to the degree that he perceives his parents as viewing it, hence, parental relationships would be the more critical variable.

Given that the home is more significant to the child than is the church, it appears that authoritarianism, which is primarily a domestic phenomenon to the child, has no consistent effect on the self-concept.
This is not surprising if one is aware that in some cases, depending on the child's inner drive, resilience, health and intelligence, perceived authoritarianism can become as much a force to strengthen the child's self-concept as much as a force to weaken it. The child has, in a sense, something to pit himself up against, and he may as readily rise to the demands as buckle under them.

It is also quite possible that the instruments used in this study have lost some strength either because of the passage of time or because of their insensitivity to different population samples. Norms for the IAV were based on 1728 subjects in undergraduate studies at the University of Florida, the University of Louisville, the University of Minnesota, and the University of Kentucky, prior to or during 1952 (7: 14). Means for the subjects in this study were significantly different on all three scores on the IAV, however, not in the same direction. On the self-concept scores, Bills' norms are higher (185.79 to 183.87); on the self-acceptance scores they are also higher (171.86 to 168.07), but the discrepancy, which, if the direction were to continue, should be lower, was also higher (43.79 to 38.63). Discrepancy and self-acceptance differences were significant at the .001 level, while self-concept means were significantly different at the .05 level.

Results in this study also indicate some loss of consistency within the IAV. Intercorrelations reported by Bills, based on 1951 data indicate a correlation of .90 between self-concept and self-acceptance and -0.83 between self-concept and discrepancy (7: 53). This study showed correlations of .75 and -0.699 respectively for these scores. For self-acceptance and discrepancy, Bills reported -.67 while this study had
-0.648. It appears that the IAV may not be wearing well over time. Perhaps increased student sophistication and hostility towards tests of this nature has had some effect on their reliability.

Regarding the RAS, there was a considerably higher orthodoxy mean found in this study than that reported by Poppleton and Pilkington in 1962. Their mean for 463 subjects was 88. The mean for this study of 565 subjects was 95.488. It appears that this difference could be either the effect of time, or differences between British and American (primarily Midwestern) subjects. Comparing orthodoxy scores of 1) Iowans, 2) those bordering Iowa and 3) other states in the United States, the latter seems more plausible. It is recalled that the orthodoxy mean for Iowans was 96.667 and for states bordering Iowa, 97.111. Although these did not significantly differ, they both were significantly different from the orthodoxy mean for other states in the United States, 82.600. This seems to be in support of the traditional label of "Bible belt", applied to the Midwest by the late Henry Mencken.

It is not readily apparent why subjects from towns of over 100,000 population should have significantly lower (at the .05 level) means on self-concept, than Iowans and those from states bordering Iowa. Perhaps the fact that they constitute a minority of the sample (7.78%) and presumably are a comparable minority on campus is relevant. It may be that, as theorized with low-orthodox Congregationalists below, they have little inner conflict in rating themselves conservatively on the IAV traits. It is also possible that their low orthodoxy is but another indication of their minority status, and they are not benefiting from the ego support enjoyed by those who share majority views and status. Further
research is needed before either of these, or perhaps other explanations are accepted.

Significant differences in orthodoxy between males and females were found in this study. Other studies reported by Allport, Gillespie and Young (2) and Pilkington and Poppleton (62) have also shown females to be more orthodox in their religion than males.

The writer is behooved to offer some possible explanation for denominational differences in self-concept and orthodoxy scores. It is recalled that striking differences existed among American Baptists, Roman Catholics and Congregationalists on these scores.

Why, for example, do American Baptists who are highest in orthodoxy, and Congregationalists who are next to lowest, have scores that rank second and first respectively, on all of the scores in the IAV? One explanation is perhaps the small N (14) of American Baptists in the study. However, their high orthodoxy is also supported by Glock and Stark (28: 13). It is perhaps possible that in the American Baptist's high orthodoxy, he shows a strong need for answers, or closure, or a low tolerance for ambiguity that is also influencing his response sets in items on the IAV. For example, even with minimum test-taking sophistication, a person is aware when he is rating himself high or low on a desirable trait, or revealing the degree to which he accepts himself. If this awareness is threatening to the individual, he will perhaps consciously or subconsciously minimize these disparities, and score higher on the IAV. This appears to be an example of what Sullivan (p. 10) and Clara Thompson (p. 16) have referred to earlier as a refusal to recognize the bad-me as part of the self. Another way of interpreting it may be, "The
American Baptist needs or wants answers to the eternal mysteries; the church provides them in their doctrine, and the person is happy and adjusted."

The Congregationalist, on the other hand, appears to be given considerable individual latitude in his interpretation of doctrine. This would suggest a higher tolerance for ambiguity as found in the eternal mysteries. This tolerance may be operating while rating himself in traits on the IAV in that he would see himself more acceptable in the light of these abstract realities (the traits), and his lack of frustration would tend to reveal less disparity in the scores. In terms of the self theory of Rogers (p. 12, above) it appears that the Congregationalist sees little discrepancy between his self and his ideals. This is viewed as being in harmony with the hypothesized humanization of God (ideals) as discussed on page 16 of this study. Perhaps in the relatively liberal Congregationalist, we see evidence of this transformation of values from divine to human.

Roman Catholics, however, who rank fourth in orthodoxy (but are considerably above the mean--102.214 to 95.488), rank lowest of all denominations in self-concept and self-acceptance, and higher only than Episcopalians (who number only 12 in this study) in the discrepancy score. It is suggested that, like American Baptists, they have a respect and awe of the eternal mysteries, but unlike the Baptists, they are not threatened by revealing their human inadequacies as they rank themselves on the traits of the IAV. This revelation of inadequacies is perhaps not unlike the nature of confessions, which are accepted by the Catholic as a normal part of life. Thus, the low scores on the IAV may not be indicative of
low self-concepts, or self-acceptance, but a lack of fear of appearing low, to themselves first, and also to others.

Findings in this study agree with those reported by Allport, Gillespie and Young (2), and by Merry and Merry (54: 520), that there are few atheists in college. It appears that for the college student his liberal thinking may be but a role he is trying on while it is relatively safe to do so. To break with the society on something as fundamental to America as the existence of God before the student has demonstrated his economic maturity (also a basic American value), is apparently a step he is not yet willing to take.

The trend to religious humanism as reported by Merry and Merry (54: 520) was also evidenced by the students' many questions and comments, "What do you mean by religious?" raised while they were completing the questionnaire. It appears that if the students are redefining God, and changing the concept of what it means to be religious, they are making a reconciliation with the church which may ultimately change its image. If such is the case, it will become increasingly indefensible, in the future, to suspect that the church can be a force to make a person think less of himself.

Suggestions for further research

Although the main instruments revealed essentially no relationship between self-concept and religious attitude, individual scores, and scores for certain denominations indicated that there may be a relationship. It would seem worthwhile to explore some other factors found in individuals or denominations which strongly support or refute the hypotheses. For
example, it is suspected that children who grow up feeling unacceptable or insecure due to inadequate parental nurturance will have a stronger need to seek worthiness and security by conformity with some values outside the home, for example, the beliefs of a church. If more sensitive instruments could be devised that measured the quality of parent-child relationships, including a more sophisticated measure of authoritarianism than was possible within the scope of this study, these instruments could be used in correlation with self-concept and orthodoxy scales. In the case of denominational differences, it would be interesting to know if Congregationalists and Catholics or Baptists differed in their attitudes towards tests of this ilk, or, on what other orthodox-liberal continuums would they show differences.

The finding that subjects from small towns are more orthodox may be related to the fact that Iowans are more orthodox than subjects from other states in the United States (except those states bordering Iowa), and the fact that Iowa has a large proportion of small towns.

In spite of the reported validity of the IAV, the writer is of the opinion that instruments of this type, by themselves, are unable to give dependable measures of self-confidence, or degree of adjustment. The issue of "faking good" has yet to be successfully dealt with. If an instrument such as the IAV could be used in conjunction with statements a person could make in speaking or writing about his self-confidence, and reconcile these statements with external observations by persons qualified in this area (and these could possibly include peers), then some individual measure of reliability could be considered in testing.
It is felt that if research in this area is going to have relevance for the understanding of individual behavior, which was an aspiration and partial justification of this study, it will need to be pursued more in the direction of idiographic, rather than normative inquiry. It is believed that depth exploration of the existential self by a number of methods offers the best source of insight into the infinite variety of response an individual has to his perceived reality. It is anticipated and hoped that this insight will foster both a greater understanding and respect for antecedent events as explanations of behavior, and an increased optimism in the capacity of the individual to interpret and apply these past events toward optimum personal fulfillment.
CHAPTER VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to gather evidence to test whether or not religious attitude (orthodoxy) has any relationship to the self-concept.

Three main hypotheses, stated in the alternate form of the null hypothesis, were:

1. Subjects expressing a high self-concept will express low religious orthodoxy.
2. Subjects expressing high self-acceptance will express low religious orthodoxy.
3. Subjects expressing high self-ideal self discrepancy will express high religious orthodoxy.

Bills' Index of Adjustment and Values was the instrument used to measure self-concept and the Religious Attitude Scale developed by Poppleton and Pilkington was used as the measure of religious orthodoxy.

In addition, a questionnaire contained items designed to identify and measure other factors related to religious attitude, namely, childhood and adult ritualism, particularism and authoritarianism, which were used in the testing of three subordinate hypotheses:

4. Subjects expressing high orthodoxy and high authoritarianism will express lower self-concepts, lower self-acceptance and higher self-ideal self discrepancy than high orthodox subjects expressing low authoritarianism.

5. Subjects expressing high orthodoxy and high particularism will express lower self-concepts, lower self-acceptance and higher self-ideal
6. a) Subjects expressing high childhood ritualism and high authoritarianism will express lower orthodoxy than high childhood ritualism subjects expressing low authoritarianism.

b) Subjects within the syndrome of high childhood ritualism, high authoritarianism and low orthodoxy will express lower self-concepts, lower self-acceptance and higher self-ideal self discrepancy than subjects with the syndrome of high childhood ritualism, low authoritarianism and high orthodoxy.

Subjects were 210 male and 355 female undergraduate students enrolled in two courses related to marriage and family living in the College of Science and Humanities and the College of Home Economics at Iowa State University of Science and Technology. The questionnaire was administered by the writer to 22 separate sections of these classes during the normal class period. Factors involved in the subordinate hypotheses were analyzed for homogeneity and relationships were measured using standard correlational techniques.

Findings showed very low correlations between self-concept and religious orthodoxy as measured in the study, and indicated essentially no relationship. Thus, the three major hypotheses were refuted. Scores by church denomination evidenced that American Baptists refuted the three main hypotheses, and Congregationalists and Roman Catholics supported them. These denominational differences were not expected.

The subordinate hypotheses were not supported with the exception that in hypothesis 4, high orthodox and high authoritarian subjects scored significantly (at the .10 level) higher in self-ideal self discrepancy than high orthodox subjects expressing low authoritarianism. This was
interpreted as evidence that authoritarianism has some negative effect on self-adjustment, as measured by this study.

Other findings showed females significantly (at the .01 level) more orthodox in their religious attitude than males, and Iowans and those from states bordering Iowa significantly (at the .001 and .01 levels respectively) more orthodox than those from other states in the United States. Subjects from towns of under 2,500 population were significantly (at the .05 level) more orthodox than subjects from towns of over 100,000 population. With the exception that subjects from other states in the United States reported significantly (at the .05 level) lower self-concepts than Iowans and those from states bordering Iowa, these groups did not differ significantly on other scores in the IAV. This also supported other findings which indicated no relationship between religious attitude and self-concept.

Conclusions

This study revealed no significant relationship between measures of self-concept and religious attitude. There was indication of a relationship within certain church denominations, however, it was found to occur in either direction and therefore evidence that other factors were involved. When religious orthodoxy appeared in conjunction with authoritarianism, as defined in this study, it was found to have some relationship to poorer adjustment. Significant differences in orthodoxy found within sex, population of home town, and geographic origin (home state) groups were associated with primarily non-significant differences
in measures of the IAV, thereby supporting a conclusion of no relationship between religious attitude and self-concept, as measured in this study.
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APPENDIX
You are being requested to participate in a research study involving attitudes of students toward themselves and their attitudes about religion.

The answers you are asked to give are your personal opinions; there are obviously no "right" or "wrong" answers. If you have difficulty deciding on some item, mark the answer which seems closest to what you believe even though you have doubts. It is very important that you respond to every item.

There is no need that you be personally identified with your answers; they will be held in strict confidence. However, as you are supplying the data for this study, you may be interested in knowing the results. Therefore, if (after completing the questionnaire) you desire a report on your personal scores, please give a permanent address below. Results will be mailed in approximately six months.

1. Age (at nearest birthday): ______

2. Sex: male female (circle one)

3. What is your "home" state? ____________________________

4. What was the population of your home town? (where you lived most of the time up to graduation from high school)

   _______ under 2,500
   _______ 2,501 - 5,000
   _______ 5,001 - 25,000
   _______ 25,001 - 100,000
   _______ over 100,000

5. Would you consider your home "normal" in the sense that you lived with both of your parents during most of your childhood? yes no (circle one)

6. If "no" to the above, briefly describe the circumstances: (For example: "My parents divorced when I was 6 and I lived with my mother and step-father.")

   ______________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________

7. What is your current marital status: married single (circle one)

8. If you are married and have children, please give their ages: ____________

   ____________

Turn the page and follow instructions.
SELF INSTRUCTIONS FOR IAV

There is a need for each of us to know more about ourselves, but seldom do we have an opportunity to look at ourselves as we are or as we would like to be. On the following page is a list of terms that to a certain degree describe people. Take each term separately and apply it to yourself by completing the following sentence:

I AM A (AN) _______ PERSON.

The first word in the list is academic, so you would substitute this term in the above sentence. It would read — I am an academic person.

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME this statement is like you, i.e., is typical or characteristic of you as an individual, and rate yourself on a scale from one to five according to the following key.

1. Seldom, is this like me.
2. Occasionally, this is like me.
3. About half of the time, this is like me.
4. A good deal of the time, this is like me.
5. Most of the time, this is like me.

Select the number beside the phrase that tells how much of the time the statement is like you and insert it in Column I on the next page.

EXAMPLE: Beside the term ACADEMIC, number two is inserted to indicate that — occasionally, I am an academic person.

Now go to Column II. Use one of the statements given below to tell HOW YOU FEEL about yourself as described in Column I.

1. I very much dislike being as I am in this respect.
2. I dislike being as I am in this respect.
3. I neither dislike being as I am nor like being as I am in this respect.
4. I like being as I am in this respect.
5. I like very much being as I am in this respect.

You will select the number beside the statement that tells how you feel about the way you are and insert the number in Column II.

EXAMPLE: In Column II beside the term ACADEMIC, number one is inserted to indicate that I dislike very much being as I am in respect to the term, academic. Note that being as I am always refers to the way you described yourself in Column I.

Finally, go to Column III; using the same term, complete the following sentence:

I WOULD LIKE TO BE A (AN) _______ PERSON.

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME YOU would like this trait to be characteristic of you and rate yourself on the following five point scale.

1. Seldom, would I like this to be me.
2. Occasionally, I would like this to be me.
3. About half of the time, I would like this to be me.
4. A good deal of the time, I would like this to be me.
5. Most of the time, I would like this to be me.

You will select the number beside the phrase that tells how much of the time you would like to be this kind of a person and insert the number in Column III.

EXAMPLE: In Column III beside the term ACADEMIC, number five is inserted to indicate that most of the time, I would like to be this kind of person.

Start with the word ACCEPTABLE and fill in Column I, II, and III before going on to the next word. There is no time limit. Be honest with yourself so that your description will be a true measure of how you look at yourself.
**Column I**

I AM A (AN) ________ PERSON

1. Seldom, is this like me.
2. Occasionally, this is like me.
3. About half of the time, this is like me.
4. A good deal of the time, this is like me.
5. Most of the time, this is like me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annoying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>busy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fearful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fashionable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intellectual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column II**

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT YOURSELF

1. I very much dislike being as I am in this respect.
2. I dislike being as I am in this respect.
3. I neither dislike being as I am nor like being as I am in this respect.
4. I like being as I am in this respect.
5. I like very much being as I am in this respect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. meddlesome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. merry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. mature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. nervous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. normal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. optimistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. poised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. purposeful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. reckless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. sarcastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. studious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. stubborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. tactful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. teachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. worthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. broad-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. businesslike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. fault-finding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column III**

I WOULD LIKE TO BE A (AN) ________ PERSON

1. Seldom, would I like this to be me.
2. Occasionally, I would like this to be me.
3. About half of the time, I would like this to be me.
4. A good deal of the time, I would like this to be me.
5. Most of the time, I would like this to be me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are 21 statements which concern religious beliefs. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of them. On the right-hand side of the page you will find five alternative answers. Place a cross opposite each statement in the column which best represents your opinion. For example:

If you agree with the statement, "More time in broadcasting should be allotted to agnostic speakers." you would check as indicated.

Please do not leave out any statements even if you find it difficult to make up your mind.

1. To lead a good life it is necessary to have some religious belief.
2. Jesus Christ was an important and interesting historical figure but in no way divine.
3. I genuinely do not know whether or not God exists.
4. People without religious beliefs can lead just as moral and useful lives as people with religious beliefs.
5. Religious faith is merely another name for belief which is contrary to reason.
6. The existence of disease, famine and strife in the world makes one doubt some religious doctrines.
7. The miracles recorded in the Bible really happened.
8. It makes no difference to me whether religious beliefs are true or false.
9. Christ atoned for our sins by His sacrifice on the cross.
10. The truth of the Bible diminishes with the advance of science.
11. Without belief in God life is meaningless.
12. The more scientific discoveries are made the more the glory of God is revealed.
13. Religious education is essential to preserve the morals of our society.
14. The proof that Christ was the Son of God lies in the record of the Gospels.
15. The best explanation of miracles is as an exaggeration of ordinary events into myths and legends.

16. International peace depends on the world-wide adoption of religion.

17. If you lead a good and decent life it is not necessary to go to Church.

18. Parents have a duty to teach elementary Christian truths to their children.

19. There is no survival of any kind after death.

20. The psychiatrist rather than the theologian can best explain the phenomena of religious experience.

21. On the whole, religious beliefs make for better and happier living.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please supply the following additional information by circling or checking the one response that best describes you:

1. Are you a member of a church? yes no (circle one)

2. If yes, check the denomination below to which you belong:

   ____ (American) Baptist
   ____ (Southern) Baptist
   ____ Congregational
   ____ Disciples of Christ
   ____ Episcopal
   ____ Jewish
   ____ (American) Lutheran
   ____ (Missouri) Lutheran
   ____ Methodist
   ____ Presbyterian
   ____ Roman Catholic
   ____ Other (Please specify) ______

3. If "yes" to item 1, would you describe yourself as an active member of this church, that is, how often do you attend church when it is possible for you to do so?

   ____ once a week
   ____ three times a month
   ____ twice a month
   ____ once a month
   ____ less than once a month

4. If "no" to item 1, which of the following best describes you?

   ____ atheist
   ____ agnostic
   ____ believer, but non-church-member
   ____ none of the above
5. Check the denominations below that you have "visited" (attended services in) since coming to college.

___ (American) Baptist
___ (Southern) Baptist
___ Congregational
___ Disciples of Christ
___ Episcopal
___ Jewish
___ (American) Lutheran
___ (Missouri) Lutheran
___ Methodist
___ Presbyterian
___ Roman Catholic
___ Other (Please specify) __________

6. Do you participate regularly, or nearly so, in campus religious affairs? (For example, Newman Club, Wesley Foundation, or Campus Crusade?) yes no (circle one)

7. Do you pray privately? yes no (circle one)

8. If "yes" to No. 7, how often do you pray?

___ at least once daily
___ at least once weekly
___ less frequently

9. Do you consider your childhood to have been

___ very religious
___ somewhat religious
___ neutral concerning religion
___ not especially religious
___ definitely not religious

10. Compared to your childhood patterns of religiousness, how do you consider your life as an adult?

___ much more religious (more regular church attendance, etc.)
___ somewhat more religious
___ about the same
___ somewhat less religious
___ definitely less religious

11. As a child did you feel compelled to accept or believe the things that you were taught in the church?

___ very much so
___ sometimes
___ not at all
___ question does not apply to my situation

12. As a child were you forced, to some degree against your wishes, to go to church, Sunday School, or some other religious activity?

___ often, I was
___ sometimes I was
___ I never was
___ question does not apply to my situation
13. Looking at your religious life as a child in your home and church, how would you compare it to the religious life of the average person in your peer group?

My religious life was

___ more conservative (i.e., orthodox, strict, or traditional) than most of my peers
___ about the same as most of my peers
___ more liberal than most of my peers
___ question does not apply to my situation

14. In your home as a child, how would you describe your religious rituals, e.g., prayers before meals and at bedtime?

___ we had them every day
___ we had them sometimes
___ we had them only on special occasions
___ they were not a part of my childhood

15. In general, concerning your home life, which best describes your childhood?

___ very happy
___ happy most of the time
___ not particularly happy, nor unhappy
___ unhappy much of the time
___ very unhappy

16. Which of the following best describes the discipline and controls your parents exerted on you in your childhood (until you came to college)?

___ very strict
___ somewhat strict
___ not overly strict or overly liberal
___ somewhat liberal
___ very liberal

17. How do you regard your present religious beliefs in relation to your parent's religious beliefs?

___ mine are more conservative than my parents
___ about the same
___ I don't know
___ mine are more liberal than my parents
___ mine are very much more liberal
___ question does not apply to my situation

18. Assuming your parents knew what your current religious beliefs were, do you feel that they would approve of them?

___ very much so
___ generally, yes
___ it wouldn't make any difference to them
___ probably not
___ definitely not
___ question does not apply to my situation
19. As far as your parents are concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion or become an atheist or an agnostic without causing serious strain on your relationship with your parents?

____ very much so
____ probably
____ I don't know
____ I don't think so
____ definitely not
____ question does not apply to my situation

20. Do you feel that you could differ with your parents on a controversial issue such as Viet Nam, civil rights, or length of your hair (beard), without straining your relationship with them?

____ very much so
____ generally, yes
____ I don't know
____ I doubt it
____ definitely not
____ question does not apply to my situation

21. As far as your personal values are concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion or become an atheist or an agnostic if there was some need to?

____ very much so
____ probably
____ I don't know
____ I don't think so
____ definitely not

22. As far as your present peer group in your home town community is concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion or become an atheist or an agnostic without causing strain on your relationships with this group?

____ very much so
____ probably
____ I don't know
____ I don't think so
____ definitely not
____ question does not apply to my situation

23. As far as the members of your home town church are concerned, do you feel that you could switch to any other religion, or no religion, without causing strain on your relationships with this group?

____ very much so
____ probably
____ I don't know
____ I don't think so
____ definitely not
____ question does not apply to my situation
24. Is it important to you that your marriage partner be of the same religious faith?

___ very important
___ somewhat important
___ of little importance
___ not important at all

25. Have your religious attitudes charged since you came to college?

___ very much so, in the direction of more conservative
___ somewhat, in the direction of more conservative
___ no, my religious attitudes have not significantly changed
___ somewhat, in the direction of more liberal
___ very much so, in the direction of more liberal

26. Have your feelings about yourself changed since you came to college?

___ yes, I have more confidence in myself; I accept myself as I am
___ yes, I have become less critical of myself when I find others who excel me in qualities of value to me
___ no, my feelings about myself have not significantly changed
___ yes, I have become more critical of myself when I find others who excel me in qualities of value to me
___ yes, I have less confidence in myself; I am more dissatisfied with myself as I am

27. Check the following courses that you have taken prior to this quarter.

___ C. D. 236
___ F. E. 270 (formerly C. D. 270)
___ Soc. 319
___ None of the above

28. Please add here any other information or comments you consider pertinent to this survey.