Master's Theses   Theses and Dissertations

1983

Religious Orientation and Death Attitude Factors: A Correlational Study

Margaret R. Dorsher
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses

Part of the Psychology Commons

RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION AND DEATH ATTITUDE FACTORS:

A CORRELATIONAL STUDY

by

Margaret R. Dorsher

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

December

1982

DEDICATION

To my parents, whose love and example made this effort possible.

VITA

The author, Margaret Ruth Dorsher, is the daughter of Robert Peter Dorsher and Mary McGee Dorsher. She was born May 18, 1957, in Park Ridge, Illinois.

Her elementary education was obtained in the public schools of Northfield and Northbrook, Illinois, with the exception of attending first grade at St. Phillip the Apostle in Northfield, Illinois. In 1975, she graduated from Marillac High School, Northfield, Illinois.

She attended St. Mary's College in Notre Dame, Indiana, and in May 1979 she received the degree of Bachelor of Arts with a double major in psychology and English. While at St. Mary's College, she received the Kappa Gamma Pi award for oustanding achievement in 1978, and the English Departmental Award in 1979.

In September, 1979, she began graduate studies in clinical psychology at Loyola University of Chicago. For her first year, she was awarded a U.S.P.H. Fellowship; for her second and third years, she served as a research assistant.

From June, 1980, through August, 1980, she completed a psychology clerkship at V.A. Lakeside Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois. The following summer, from May through August, 1981, she worked as an advanced clinical psychology clerk at V.A. West Side Medical Center,

Chicago, Illinois.

She had a short story published in <u>Kaleido Literary</u> Magazine in
August, 1979.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

Every major religion grapples with the reality of death, for how
death is understood colors the sense of meaning one gives to one's
existence. Becker (1973) has stated that religion solves the problem
of death. This may be true for many people, and yet the relationship
is not a straightforward one. The ideas of a immortal soul or rein-
carnation may ease the pain of loss of life; yet the idea of a final
judgment may make the prospect of death more frightening. Leming
(1979-80) has found support for the contention that religion heightens
anxiety concerning death, but then alleviates it for those committed
to the teachings of the religion. However, in general, the results
of research examining the relationship of religiosity and attitudes
toward death have been inconclusive.

The contradictory results may well be a consequence of a repeat-
ed methodological problem: the assumption that both death attitudes
and religiosity are unidimensional concepts. Recent findings, how-
ever, contradict this assumption, and consequently a number of multi-
dimensional measures have been developed and validated. Allport and
Ross's (1967) measure of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orienta-
tions has become widely used. Batson (1976) has built upon these
to delineate three different religious orientations. In the area of
thanatological research, Durlak and Kass (1981) found five ortho-
gonal death attitude factors, two of which have been further validated

1

in a multitrait-multimethod analysis by Durlak and Dorsher (in progress). A number of studies have concluded that the multidimensionality of religiosity and death attitudes has been established, necessitating a more complex treatment of these variables (Minton & Spilka, 1976; Spilka et al., 1977; Hoelter & Epley, 1979). The purpose of this study was to further validate these different dimensions of religious orientation and death attitudes, and then to investigate the relationship between them.

Specifically, this study was attempting to support previous research suggesting that, depending upon one's religious orientation, certain concerns about death may be alleviated while others are exacerbated. Three different religious orientations were assessed, based on Batson's (1976) research: Religion as Means, Religion as End, and Religion as Quest. The first orientation, Religion as Means, represents an extrinsically motivated person who uses religion to satisfy essentially non-religious needs, such as sociability, self-justification and social status. A Religion as End orientation reflects a more intrinsic motivation: religious dogma strongly influences the individual's beliefs and behavior. Religious values are conscientiously adhered to. The Religion as Quest orientation is similarly internalized, but from a more individualistic, questioning point of view. A person with a Religion as Quest orientation is likely to perceive himself or herself as religious, but may or may not feel an affiliation with a particular denomination. Instead of looking to

church dogma for answers, he or she questions life experiences and struggles to reconcile personal religious beliefs with the contradictions and tragedies of life.

The two dimensions of death attitudes used have been validated in separate studies by Durlak and Kass (1981) and Durlak and Dorsher (submitted for publication). The first involves a negative evaluation of reminders of death, such as funerals, cemeteries, and terminally ill friends or relatives. The second is a more personal negative evaluation of one's own death. Factor analyses were expected to replicate the three dimensions of religious orientation and the two dimensions of death attitudes. It was also anticipated that the different religious orientations could be further clarified with respect to the personality variables of social desirability and tolerance of ambiguity. The three dimensions of religious orientation were then related to the two dimensions of death attitudes in a correlational analysis.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Both religiosity and death attitudes have been studied in a
variety of contexts. The current study draws upon findings from each
area that address the need for multidimensional measures. Included is
research on the development of the constructs measured in this study,
i.e., the three dimensions of religious orientation and the two di-
mensions of death attitudes. Of particular interest were those studies
examining the relationships among different religious orientations and
death attitudes.

Religious Orientation

The most widely studied multidimensional construct of religiosity
is that of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation, as measured
by Allport and Ross's (1967) Religious Orientation Scale. This scale
was a revision of earlier measures developed first by Wilson (1960)
and then Feagin (1964). Feagin's (1964) scale was developed on the
assumption that intrinsic and extrinsic tendencies represented opposite
poles of a single dimension. However, in his study of Southern
Baptists, Feagin (1964) found that extrinsic and intrinsic items fell
along two independent dimensions. Allport and Ross (1967) then de-
veloped a revised scale that would give measures of both extrinsic
and intrinsic tendencies in one's approach to religion. In all of
these studies, emphasis was placed on intrinsic-extrinsic as a kind of
motivation for or orientation to religion, rather than as a kind of

4

religion or type of religious behavior.

Allport and Ross (1967) defined the extrinsically oriented person as one who uses religion to satisfy essentially non-religious needs, such as sociability, self-justification, social conformity, and security. The extrinsic religious orientation thus represents an instrumental approach to religion, in which religion is less a value in its own right than it is a means of meeting other needs. Conversely, the intrinsically oriented person finds his or her master motive in religion. Other needs are subordinated to the teachings of religious dogma. Religious prescriptions strongly influence the individual's beliefs and behavior. Religious values are embraced and internalized.

Hunt and King (1971) reviewed and evaluated the intrinsic-extrinsic construct. They concluded that intrinsic and extrinsic orientations were in fact independent dimensions, and not opposites along a bipolar continuum. In examining different definitions of the dimensions, they found support only for the operationalization of the extrinsic orientation as a selfish, instrumental approach to religion. However, the intrinsic dimension was judged not successfully operationalized, and Hunt and King (1971) recommended that the intrinsic concept be broken down and further refined.

Batson (1976) proposed that the intrinsic religious orientation itself involved two distinct and independent dimensions. The first, which Batson (1976) termed Religion as End, was characterized by a conforming, unquestioning "true believer" approach to religion. A

person with a predominantly Religion as End orientation was seen as relying on religious dogma to supply personal strength, direction, and security. This orientation was described as very similar to, but not identical with, the intrinsic orientation as described by Allport and Ross (1967). Batson (1976) identified the second dimension of the original intrinsic construct as Religion as Quest, an internalized but more individualistic, questioning point of view. A person with a Religion as Quest orientation is likely to perceive himself or herself as religious, but may or may not feel an affiliation with a particular denomination. Instead of looking to church dogma for answers, a person with this kind of orientation questions life experiences and struggles to meaningfully reconcile the contradictions and tragedies of life with his or her personal religious beliefs. Batson's (1976) model included a third religious orientation which he termed Religion as Means. Much like Allport and Ross's (1967) extrinsic orientation, the Religion as Means orientation represents an instrumental approach to religion, i.e., as a means of satisfying other non-religious needs.

Batson attempted to confirm his three dimensional model by factor analysis of questionnaire data. A sample of seminarians completed both the Intrinsic and Extrinsic subscales of Allport and Ross's (1967) Religious Orientation Scale, and two newly introduced measures, the Religious Life Inventory and the Doctrinal Orthodoxy Scale. The Religious Life Inventory examines different motives for religiosity; the Doctrinal Orthodoxy Scale measures the extent of agreement with traditional Christian beliefs. The scales were subjected to a principal

component analysis with varimax rotation: a three-factor solution

accounted for 80% of the variance for the scales. The Extrinsic sub-

scale of Allport and Ross's (1967) Religious Orientation Scale had the

highest component loading for the Religion as Means factor (.90). The

Internal and Interactional subscales of the Religious Life Inventory

showed the highest component loadings for the Religion as End and the

Religion as Quest factors (r =.87 and r =.95, respectively). Batson

concluded that the scales displayed satisfactory convergent and dis-

criminant validity. In summary, Batson (1976) found it possible to

measure the three independent dimensions hypothesized in his model of

religious orientations. Religion as Means was strongly correlated

with Allport and Ross's (1967) Extrinsic subscale; Religion as End

was similarly correlated with their Intrinsic subscale. A new di-

mension, Religion as Quest, was highly correlated with the Interaction-

al subscale of Batson's (1976) Religious Life Inventory. Batson's

(1976) results also suggested that the measurement of the Religion as

End orientation may be confounded by social desirability effects.

Personality Variables. There is evidence that the different

religious orientations may be associated with different personality

characteristics. Batson (1976) found the Religion as End orientation,

but not the Religion as Quest orientation, to be positively correlated

with social desirability concerns as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne

Social Desirability Scale. There are also data to suggest that the

religious orientations differ in respect to authoritarianism (Kahoe,

1977) and tolerance-intolerance of ambiguity, as measured by Budner's

(1962) Scale of Tolerance-Intolerance of Ambiguity (Kahoe, 1977; King & Hunt, 1969).

Crowne and Marlowe (1964) developed their scale in reaction to Edward's (1957) conception of social desirability as the tendency to deny pathological symptoms. In the development of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (SDS), social desirability was more broadly defined, to refer to the need of the subject to obtain approval by responding in culturally sanctioned ways. Scores of thirty-seven subjects who completed the Edwards SDS, the Marlowe-Crowne SDS, and the MMPI were inter-correlated. The consistently higher correlations found between the Edwards SDS and the MMPI clinical scales led to an interpretation of the Edwards SDS as a measure of the willingness to admit to neurotic symptoms. However, the Marlowe-Crowne SDS correlated more consistently with the MMPI validity scales, the latter being measures of the degree to which the subject is answering defensively or attempting to present himself or herself in a favorable light. Crowne and Marlowe (1964) concluded that their scale was thus measuring the need of subjects to respond in a socially acceptable manner.

This social desirability effect was examined by Batson, Naifeh, and Pate (1978) in relation to religious orientation. Fifty-one college students completed the Marlowe-Crowne SDS, the religious orientation scales used in the present study, and Allport and Ross's Anti-Negro Scale. The results showed that only a Religion as End orientation was significantly correlated with social desirability effects

(r =.45). Also, while both Religion as End and Religion as Quest
orientations showed a significant negative correlation with racial
prejudice, once the effects of social desirability were controlled,
only the Religion as Quest orientation continued to have a significant
inverse correlation (r =.36). Thus, the data suggest that a Religion
as Quest orientation is independent of social desirability effects,
but a Religion as End orientation is not.

Kahoe (1977) studied the relationship between an intrinsic
religious orientation and authoritarianism, as measured by the
California F Scale. The scores of 200 Southern Baptist college stu-
dents on the Allport-Ross Intrinsic subscale were correlated with six
factor scales of the California F Scale. Kahoe found a positive rela-
tionship between intrinsic religion and two of the factors: conven-
tionalism and belief in the supernatural (r =.35 and r =.31, respective-
ly). These factors were seen by Kahoe as representing the acceptance
of institutional dogma. He concluded that his data supported the
"true believer" effect of intrinsic religious orientation as described
by Batson (1976).

Budner (1962) constructed a scale to measure intolerance of
ambiguity as a personality variable. Intolerance of ambiguity was
defined as the tendency to perceive ambiguous situations as threatening;
tolerance of ambiguity as the tendency to perceive ambiguous situations
as desirable. Based on data from seventeen subject samples, totalling
over eight hundred subjects, Budner (1962) found intolerance of

ambiguity to be positively correlated with a belief in a divine power

and dogmatism about one's religious beliefs. These same personality

variables Kahoe (1977) found to be associated with a Religion as End

orientation. Scores on tolerance-intolerance of ambiguity were not

significantly correlated with social desirability effects. King

and Hunt (1969) found an extrinsic or Religion as Means orientation also

to be positively correlated with intolerance of ambiguity. By con-

trast, the Religion as Quest orientation, with its questioning

posture, seems to involve the seeking out of ambiguous experiences.

These data suggest that of the three religious orientations, only

Religion as Quest would be positively correlated with tolerance of

ambiguity.

Death Attitudes. Results of previous research examining death

attitudes and religiosity have been largely contradictory. A number

of researchers (Hoelter & Epely, 1979; Durlak & Kass, 1981) attribute

these equivocal results at least in part to the continued use of uni-

dimensional measures of death anxiety, despite the accumulating

evidence of the multidimensionality of death attitudes. Other re-

searchers (Templer, 1972; Rigdon & Epting, 1982) argue for a general

death response construct. Until quite recently, researchers have

used a wide variety of measures and constructs in examining different

facets of religiosity and death attitudes, making comparisons of results

confusing at best.

Templer (1972) administered his Death Anxiety Scale to "religious-

ly involved persons," and found that they reported a lower level of

death anxiety than did a sample of college students. Measures for religiosity and for death anxiety were both unidimensional. However, Templer's religiously involved subjects who were described in terms similar to Allport's "intrinsic" type, i.e., as being more traditionally religious, ascribing to their religious belief system, attending religious functions more frequently, believing in a life after death, and interpreting the Bible literally. Templer (1972) concluded that the relationship demonstrated could be interpreted in a variety of ways: as a function of traditional Christian beliefs, or of the degree of conviction in one's religious beliefs, or by a number of personality variables.

Kahoe and Dunn (1975) looked at religious orientation, dogmatism, and death concern among Baptist, Methodist, and Catholic respondents. They found an intrinsic orientation and self rated religiosity to be negatively correlated with death concern. Dogmatism was found to be more salient for Baptists than for the other denominations. The authors concluded from their data that fear of death can motivate religious behavior, but some religious orientations are more effective than others in allaying those fears, i.e., subjects with an intrinsic religious orientation tended to be less fearful of death.

Feifel and Branscomb (1973) were among the first researchers to distinguish among different levels of fear of death, by looking at the fear of personal death. A variety of measures were used to assess fear of personal death at three levels of consciousness: conscious level, fantasy level, and below-the-level-of-awareness. The authors

found that on conscious and fantasy levels, age and religious self-
rating were significantly inversely related to fear of personal death,
whereas at the more unconscious level there was more anxiety and
negative attitudes toward death. Everts (1978) also examined fear
of death at different levels of consciousness. Comparing a self-
actualized, religiously intrinsically oriented group with a control
group, Everts (1978) found no differences in fear of death at less
conscious levels of awareness. He concluded that the relationship
between conscious fear of death and less conscious fear of death is
not clear.

Several studies have examined the relationship between death
anxiety and religious orientation in the context of other personality
or religiosity variables. Sullivan (1977) studied the interrelation-
ships among death anxiety, religious orientation, purpose in life,
and locus of control. He found that although purpose in life and
locus of control did correlate significantly with fear of death,
religious orientation did not. The results were similar whether using
Templer's unidimensional scale or Collett and Lester's multidimensional
Fear of Death Scale. However, Cremins (1979) reported a lower fear
of death among teenage subjects who were religiously intrinsically
oriented and field independent. Also Livingston and Zimet (1965),
using the California F Scale and a self-report death scale, found a
negative relationship between authoritarianism and reported death
anxiety. This seems to relate to the conforming posture of the Religion
as End orientation.

Patrick (1979) examined the effect of different religious denominations on the relationship between death anxiety and religious orientation, using Templer's Death Anxiety Scale and four of Spilka's 10 Death Perspective Scales. Examining questionnaire responses among Christian and Buddist subjects, Patrick (1979) found fear of death to be negatively correlated with intrinsic orientation and positively correlated with extrinsic orientation for Christian respondents only. He concluded that death attitudes must be separately examined within the context of each religious value system.

Minton and Spilka (1976) analyzed several different death perspectives in relation to four dimensions of religiosity: committed, consensual, intrinsic and extrinsic. The committed and consensual dimensions were defined in terms very similar to, respectively, Batson's (1976) Religion as End and Religion as Means orientations. Committed religiosity was shown to correlate with perceptions of death in terms of an Afterlife of Reward, whereas consensual religiosity was associated with more negative outlooks such as death as Natural End, Unknown, and Failure. Intrinsic orientation showed no significant correlations; extrinsic orientation correlated with views of death as Pain, Loneliness, Unknown, Punishment, Forsaking Dependents, Failure, and Natural End. The authors concluded that both religion and death perspectives should be treated as complex, multidimensional variables.

Utilizing factor analysis in relation to the above death perspectives, Spilka et al. (1977) again found the intrinsic-committed

(Religion as End) outlook to be positively associated with favorable
views of death such as Afterlife of Reward or as Courage. The same
religious orientation was inversely related to more pessimistic
views of death as Loneliness-Pain, Indifference, Unknown, and Failure.
Conversely, extrinsic-consensual religiosity was positively correlated
with such negative views of death as Loneliness-Pain, Unknown, In-
difference, Forsaking Dependents, and Natural End. The authors re-
iterated the need to relate different forms of personal religion to
different dimensions of death attitudes.

Gibbs and Achterberg-Lawlis (1978) examined death anxiety among
terminally ill cancer patients. Data were gathered with questionnaires
and interviews; measures included Templer's Death Anxiety Scale and
Allport and Ross's Religious Orientation Scale. Results indicated
that religious orientation was not significantly correlated with death
anxiety. Another interesting finding was that those subjects who
relied most heavily on the church for emotional support displayed more
denial of their own death, whereas those who relied primarily on them-
selves exhibited less denial of their impending death. This last
finding seems to parallel the distinction between the Religion as End
and Religion as Quest orientations: whereas the former finds the
answers he or she needs in church dogma, the latter tends to look within
himself or herself and may or may not accept religious teachings.
These findings would suggest that someone with a Religion as Quest
orientation would tend to confront and deal with his or her negative
reactions to death, rather than to deny them.

In a study of the fear of death of self, Feifel and Nagy (1981) utilized both direct and indirect fear of death measures in an interview and testing format. The authors found that 29% of the death fear variance could be accounted for by four predictors: degree to which death was perceived in negative terms, frequency of thoughts about death, religious orientation, and attitudes toward attending funerals. The religious orientation factor was defined in terms quite similar to Batson's (1976) Religion as End orientation, i.e., religious self-rating, intrinsic religiosity, belief in God, importance of religion in everyday life, and belief in life after death. Results showed this factor to be inversely related to fear of personal death. The study also emphasized the importance of studying different facets of the fear of death with a variety of outcome measures.

Hoelter and Epley (1979) examined the relationship of several measures of religiosity with two unidimensional and one multidimensional fear of death scales. Results showed that seven of the eight multidimensional fear of death subscales correlated significantly with at least one of the religiosity measures, whereas neither of the unidimensional measures was significantly correlated with religiosity. Those who perceived themselves as religious and those who were religiously orthodox expressed greater fear of such aspects of death as fear of being destroyed, fear for significant others, and fear for body after death. These same subjects, however, showed little fear of the unknown, which the authors attributed to it being the one aspect of death directly dealt with through the religious belief system, i.e.,

through the promise of continued existence. The authors suggested
that other aspects of death threat, not directly addressed by reli-
gious teachings, may be exacerbated by religion's tendency to increase
the religious person's awareness of mortality. The authors concluded
that religiosity may reduce some fears of death while increasing
others, and therefore multidimensional measures of death attitudes
appear to be essential.

In summary, current findings relating religious orientation
and death attitudes are inconclusive. A few studies have found no sig-
nificant relationship at either conscious (Sullivan, 1977; Gibbs &
Achterberg-Lawlis, 1978) or unconscious levels (Feifel & Branscomb,
1973; Everts, 1978). However, the majority of researchers have con-
cluded that an intrinsic/committed/Religion as End orientation is
associated with a more positive reaction to death than is an extrinsic/
consensual/Religion as Means orientation (Templer, 1972; Kahoe & Dunn,
1975; Minton & Spilka, 1976; Spilka et al., 1977; Cremins, 1979;
Hoelter & Epley, 1979; Feifel & Nagy, 1981). The variety of unidi-
mensional and multidimensional death attitude measures used in these
studies has made interpretation of results across studies difficult.
Several researchers have emphasized the need for the consistent measure-
ment of death attitudes as complex, multidimensional variables (Minton
& Spilka, 1976; Spilka et al., 1977; Hoelter & Epley, 1979; Feifel &
Nagy, 1981).

In an attempt to clarify the construct validity of some of the

most widely used self-report death scales, Durlak and Kass (1981)
factor analyzed a sample of fifteen such measures. A varimax rotation
yielded five orthogonal death attitude factors: Negative Evaluation
of Death, Reluctance to Interact with the Dying, Negative Reaction to
Pain, Reaction to Reminders of Death, and Preoccupation with Thoughts
of Dying. The authors concluded that the data supported thanatological
theory that death attitudes are multidimensional and as such must be
differentiated in assessment. Durlak and Kass (1981) also suggested
"death attitudes" may be a more accurate descriptor than "death fear"
or "death anxiety," as reactions to death appear to include worry,
threat, depression, and non-acceptance, as well as fear or anxiety.

Rigdon and Epting (1982) reported an alternate analysis of
the data from Durlak and Kass's (1981) study. Asserting that a
quartimax solution was preferable in its approximation of the ideal
of simple structure, Rigdon and Epting (1982) found support for a
general factor involving an individual's general response to personal
death. The authors suggested that response to death is not necessari-
ly multidimensional or complex.

In a reply to Rigdon and Epting (1982), Kass and Durlak (1981)
justified their choice of a varimax method of rotation. They pointed
out that the theoretical evidence supported the multidimensionality
of death attitudes. The authors also argued that a varimax solution
was better suited to factorial simplicity with complex variables.

And, with little shared variance among the measures, a five-factor
solution could not be considered trivial, when it accounted for 70%
of the variance in the correlation matrix.

Durlak (1982) has also cautioned against the continued use of
Templer's (1970) Death Anxiety Scale. Durlak argued that recent
findings showed this "unidimensional" scale to contain from three to
five separate factors. Consequently, total scores cannot be inter-
preted as a simple measure of death anxiety, and scores across
studies, obtained from different groups under different experimental
conditions, may not be psychologically comparable.

And most recently, in a multitrait-multimethod analysis, Durlak
and Dorsher (submitted for publication) examined the convergent and
discriminant validity of seven self-report death scales. Each scale
related to one of three of the death attitudes reported by Durlak
and Kass (1981): evaluation of personal death, reactions to reminders
of death, and reluctance to interact with the dying. A structured
interview was developed to assess these same attitudes. Using
Campbell and Fiske's multitrait-multimethod validation model, moderate
convergent and discriminant validity was found for three of seven
scales: Dickstein's (1974) Negative Evaluation of Death Scale,
Nelson and Nelson's (1974) Death Avoidance Scale, and Collett and
Lester's (1969) Fear of Death of Others Scale. The first scale
measures negative feelings about one's own death, including depression,
anxiety, threat and fear. The other two scales relate to reactions

to reminders of death, such as graveyards and corpses, and reactions

to the possibility of loved ones dying (Durlak & Kass, 1981). Thus,

additional validation was found for two of the death attitudes re-

ported by Durlak and Kass (1981) - the negative evaluation of personal

death and reactions to reminders of death. These are the two death

attitudes selected for the present study.

Summary of Literature and Hypotheses

The present study investigated the relationship between religious

orientation and attitudes toward death. Specifically, this study

attempted to support recent findings that suggested that, depending

upon one's religious orientation, certain concerns about death may

be alleviated while others are exacerbated. Subjects completed

measures drawn from the following studies: Crowne and Marlowe (1964),

Allport and Ross (1967), Batson (1976), Budner (1962), and Durlak

and Kass (1981).

In a review of the literature on religious orientation, Allport

and Ross's (1967) intrinsic and extrinsic orientations were found to

be independent dimensions (Feagin, 1964; Allport & Ross, 1967; Hunt &

King, 1971). There was evidence of the operationalization of the

extrinsic orientation as a selfish, instrumental approach to religion;

however, the intrinsic concept appeared to need further refinement

(Hunt & King, 1971).

Batson (1976) has developed a three dimensional model of religious

orientation, re-naming the extrinsic orientation as Religion as Means,

and differentiating the intrinsic conceptualization further into two distinct and independent religious orientations, Religion as End and Religion as Quest. The former was characterized as a conforming, unquestioning, "true believer" approach to religion. It was shown to be positively correlated with such personality variables as authoritarianism (Kahoe, 1977) and social desirability (Batson, Naifeh, & Pate, 1978). The latter, Religion as Quest, was described as an internalized but more questioning approach to religion: it was found to be independent of social desirability effects (Batson, Naifesh, & Pate, 1978). It was also reported that an extrinsic or Religion as Means orientation was positively correlated with intolerance of ambiguity (King & Hunt, 1969). Based on these research findings, the following were hypothesized:

Hypothesis 1. Using factor analysis, this study will replicate Batson's (1976) three dimensional model of religious orientation, that consists of Religion as Means, Religion as End, and Religion as Quest.

Hypothesis 2. Only the Religion as End orientation will be significantly correlated with social desirability.

Hypothesis 3. The Religion as Quest orientation, with its questioning stance, will be the only orientation to be positively correlated with tolerance of ambiguity.

In a review of the literature on death attitudes, support was found for the measurement of death attitudes as complex, multidimensional variables (Minton & Spilka, 1976; Spilka et al., 1977; Feifel & Nagy,

1981; Hoelter & Epley, 1979; Durlak & Kass, 1981). A number of researchers found the intrinsic or Religion as End orientation to be associated with less fear of death (Templer, 1972; Kahoe & Dunn, 1975; Cremins, 1979), or of certain aspects of death concerns (Feifel & Branscomb, 1973; Everts, 1978; Minton & Spilka, 1976; Spilka et al., 1977; Feifel & Nagy, 1981). Conversely, the extrinsic or Religion as Means orientation.was associated with greater anxiety or more nega- tive views of death (Patrick, 1979; Minton & Spilka, 1976; Spilka et al., 1977). It was suggested that religiosity may reduce some fears of death while increasing others (Hoelter & Epley, 1979).

Support was found for the convergent and discriminant validity of scales measuring two death attitude factors: evaluation of personal death, and reactions to reminders of death (Durlak & Kass, 1981; Durlak & Dorsher, submitted for publication). Therefore, these are the death attitudes used in the present study. Reactions to reminders of death has not yet been studied in relation to religious orientation; however, the relationship between evaluation of personal death and religiosity has begun to be examined. Several studies suggest that intrinsically oriented persons have less fear of personal death than do extrinsic persons (Feifel & Branscomb, 1973; Feifel & Nagy, 1981). On the basis of these studies, the following were hypothesized:

> Hypothesis 4. Utilizing factor analysis, this study will
>
> replicate Durlak and Dorsher's (submitted for publication)

findings of two independent death attitudes: the negative
evaluation of personal death and reactions to reminders of
death.

Hypothesis 5. The Religion as End orientation, with its
more traditional and positive view of death, will correlate
significantly with a positive evaluation of personal death
and correlate negatively with avoidance of reminders of
death.

Hypothesis 6. The Religion as Means orientation, with its
more social focus and its more negative view of death, will
correlate significantly with a negative evaluation of per-
sonal death and correlate positively with avoidance of
reminders of death.

Hypothesis 7. The Religion as Quest orientation, with its
more individualistic, questioning approach to personal
religious beliefs, will correlate significantly with a nega-
tive evaluation of personal death but correlate negatively
with avoidance of reminders of death.

The majority of hypotheses were predicated on the successful
replication of Batson's (1976) three factors of religious orientation
and Durlak and Dorsher's (submitted for publication) two factors of
death attitudes. In the event that the first and fourth hypotheses
were not supported, the decision had been made a priori to proceed
with an exploratory data analysis. Factor analyses of the religious
orientation and death attitude measures would be conducted; the result-
and factors would be used in the analyses for the other hypotheses

METHOD

The original sample consisted of one hundred eleven college

students at a large private midwestern university. These subjects

were from introductory and upper level psychology courses: they re-

ceived extra credit for their participation. The demographic charact-

eristics of the male (n=39) and female (n=72) subjects were highly

comparable. The average age for the entire group was 18.9 (range 17

to 28; mode=18). The vast majority (98%) was single. Exactly one-

third of the subjects reported having been in a situation in which

they felt close to death themselves; just over two-thirds (70%) re-

ported having experienced the death of a family member or close friend

at some time in their lives.

Most of the students described themselves as somewhat religious

(58%) or religious (32%). A small percentage reported being either

somewhat nonreligious (5%) or nonreligious (5%). As anticipated, be-

cause of the Catholic affiliation of the university, a large number

(71%) of the subjects described themselves as Catholic. A smaller

group (25%) of other Christian denominations, including such denom-

inations as Greek Orthodox, Methodist, Baptist, and Lutheran, was

also distinct. Because of the low incidence of Jewish and Islamic

subjects (2% and 1% respectively), these data were added to the "Other"

group. No students identified themselves as agnostic, and only 2%

23

atheistic. A decision had been made a priori that unless there were enough agnostic and atheistic subjects to form a distinct group, they would be dropped from the analyses, as they did not seem to fit with the denominations combined under the "Other" category.

Thus the data for two atheistic subjects were dropped, as were the incomplete data for two other subjects. The final sample, then, consisted of 107 subjects, 38 males and 69 females. In terms of percentages, the demographics concerning age, marital status, and experiences with death were unchanged. With the loss of four subjects, the percentage of students describing themselves as nonreligious decreased to 4%. Consequently, these cases were combined with those identified as somewhat nonreligious, leaving three categories for degree of religiosity: Nonreligious (10%), Somewhat Religious (58%), and Religious (32%). There were also two final denominational groups: Catholic (75%) and Other (25%).

Materials

Participants completed a schedule of brief, self-report measures. Religious orientation scales included Allport and Ross's (1967) Religious Orientation Scales and Batson's (1976) Religious Life Inventory and Doctrinal Orthodoxy Scale. The two personality scales completed were Marlowe and Crowne's (1960) Social Desirability Scale and Budner's (1962) Scale of Tolerance-Intolerance of Ambiguity. And the death attitudes were measured by Nelson and Nelson's (1975) Death

Avoidance Scale and Death Fear Scale, Collett and Lester's (1969)

Fear of Death of Others Scale, and Dickstein's (1972) Negative Evalua-

tion of Death Scale. A copy of each measure used is in Appendix A.

Religious Orientation Scales. Allport and Ross's (1967)

Religious Orientation Scale consists of twenty items and yields mea-

sures of both intrinsic and extrinsic tendencies in a person's reli-

gious orientation. The respondents state their agreement or disa-

greement with each item along a six-point continuum ranging from (1)

strongly disagree to (6) strongly agree. For each subscale, higher

scores indicate more of that tendency. The Intrinsic subscale con-

tains nine statements of internalized beliefs such as, "I try hard to

carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life." The Ex-

trinsic subscale has eleven items espousing more utilitarian attitudes:

e.g., "The primary reason for my interest in religion is that my

church is a congenial social activity."

Batson's (1976) Religious Life Inventory is similarly multi-

dimensional, measuring three different motives for religiosity. The

External motive reflects the use of religion to provide identifica-

tion with and reinforcement from a social group: e.g., "My religion

serves to satisfy needs for fellowship and security." The Internal

motive is a response to the need for direction and security, whereas

the Interactional motive suggests a need to try to understand the con-

tradictions of life experiences. A sample item for the former would

be, "God's will should shape my life"; for the latter, "It might be

said that I value my religious doubts and uncertainties." Each motive
is based on nine items, which subjects rate along a nine-point continuum from (1) completely disagree to (9) completely agree. The items
represent both positive and negative statements, to control for response bias. Higher scores reflect stronger motives.

Batson's (1976) Doctrinal Orthodoxy Scale is a modification of
an earlier measure developed by Glock and Stark (1966). As with the
Religious Life Inventory, there is a nine-point continuum of agreement to such statements as, "I believe Jesus Christ is the Divine
Son of God." The twelve items yield a single score of agreement with
traditional Christian doctrine, with higher scores reflecting more
orthodox beliefs.

Personality Scales. Two measures of personality variables were
included as well, in an attempt to further clarify the Religion as
Quest from the Religion as End orientation. Marlowe and Crowne's
(1960) Social Desirability Scale and Budner's (1962) Scale of Tolerance-
Intolerance of Ambiguity were used to measure, respectively, the degree
to which a subject responded with socially appropriate answers and
the degree of comfort the subject reported in reaction to ambiguous
experiences. For both scales, higher scores reflected more of those
qualities, i.e., more socially desirable responses and more tolerance
of ambiguity.

Marlowe and Crowne's (1960) Social Desirability Scale contains
thirty-three items, to which the respondents answer true or false as

they feel the statements apply to them. Some statements are worded positively and others negatively to control for response bias. A sample positive item would be, "I never resent being asked to do a favor;" a negative item, "I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget." The scale yields a total score reflecting the tendency to respond in a socially "correct" manner.

Budner's (1962) Scale of Tolerance-Intolerance of Ambiguity consists of sixteen Likert-type items and yields a single measure of a person's comfort with indefinite or ambiguous situations. The respondents state their agreement or disagreement with each item along a six-point continuum ranging from (1) strong disagreement to (6) strong agreement. Some statements are worded positively: "People who insist upon a yes or no answer just don't know how complicated things really are." Others are worded negatively: "The sooner we will acquire similar values and ideals the better."

Death Attitude Scales. The choice of death attitude measures was based on the findings of two recent studies. Durlak and Kass (1981) found five orthogonal death attitude factors underlying a sample of sixteen self-report death scales. Durlak and Dorsher (submitted for publication) found further validation for two of these factors: reaction to reminders of death, and negative evaluation of one's own death. For each dimension of death attitudes, two scales were selected that had loaded highly on the factors in both studies. All four of the self-report measures are Lickert rating scales

containing from five to eight items.

The reaction to reminders of death was measured by Nelson and Nelson's (1975) Death Avoidance Scale and Collett and Lester's (1969) Fear of Death of Others Scale. The former consists of eight items and yields a measure of a person's negative reactions to such reminders of death as coffins or graveyards. A sample statement would be, "Seeing a dead body would not bother me." The respondents state their agreement or disagreement with each item along a five-point continuum ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Ratings are reversed before totalling so that higher scores indicate stronger avoidant tendencies.

Collett and Lester's (1969) Fear of Death of Others Scale is a seven-item measure of the degree of one's negative reaction to the death of family members or close friends. There is a five-point continuum of agreement to both positively and negatively worded statements such as, "I could not accept the finality of the death of a friend." Again, a higher score reflects more concern about the loss of loved ones.

The other death attitude dimension, the negative evaluation of one's own death, was measured by Nelson and Nelson's (1975) Death Fear Scale and Dickstein's (1972) Negative Evaluation of Death Scale. Each scale contains five statements. A sample item for the former would be, "I am very much afraid to die"; for the latter, "The prospect of my own death depresses me." The respondents state their

agreement with each item along a five-point continuum for the Death Fear Scale and along a six-point continuum for the Negative Evaluation of Death Scale. As with the other death attitude scales, higher scores indicate more negative attitudes.

Procedures

Subjects were drawn from the volunteers in the undergraduate subject pool. Extra credit was given for participation in the study. Groups of subjects received counterbalanced sets of the self-report measures. An introductory statement was included on the top of each packet of measures. In this statement, the students were asked to fill out the measures as completely and as honestly as possible. Subjects were also advised that they were identifiable only by subject number, and that they could discontinue at any point without penalty. All subjects chose to complete their participation. Students were also given the option of staying for debriefing at the end of the testing session. It took most subjects approximately forty minutes to complete the scales.

RESULTS

Religious Orientation Scales

The first part of the data analysis involved a principle compon-
ents factor analysis with varimax rotation, after Batson (1976). Table
1 shows the intercorrelations among the religiosity scales. The weak
negative relationship between the Intrinsic and Extrinsic scales (r =
-.16) is close to that originally reported by Allport and Ross (r = -.21).
Also, the general pattern of relationships among the scales was as ex-
pected, with the Intrinsic, Internal, and Interactional scales closely
intercorrelated. And, as expected, Doctrinal Orthodoxy showed a
strong positive correlation with the Intrinsic and Internal, but not
the Interactional scale. An exception was the External scale, which
was significantly correlated with every other measure except the In-
teractional scale, and negatively correlated with the Extrinsic scale.
Batson (1976) found similarly unstable correlations with the External
scale and questioned its validity. It also may be noted that the Ex-
ternal scale has lowest internal consistency reliability.

Table 2 shows the results of a principle components analysis of
the six religious orientation scales. As hypothesized, a varimax ro-
tated three-factor solution was the best fit, accounting for 79.3% of
the variance for the six scales. The pattern of interscale relation-
ships closely replicated Batson's (1976) results, suggesting support

Table 1

Intercorrelations Among Religiosity Scales

Scales	Intrinsic	Extrinsic	Internal	External	Interactional	Doctrinal Orthodoxy
Intrinsic	(.76)	−.16	.52**	.64**	.27*	.51**
Extrinsic		(.70)	−.18	−.48**	.17	−.22*
Internal			(.80)	.56**	.33**	.36**
External				(.60)	.13	.56**
Interactional					(.63)	.12
Doctrinal Orthodoxy						(.91)

Note: The main diagonal contains the internal consistency reliability.

*p <.01
**p <.001

Table 2

Component Loadings for Religiosity Scales

(n=107)

Scales	Religion as End	Religion as Means	Religion as Quest
Intrinsic	.72*	.08	.35
Extrinsic	-.17	-.72*	.12
Internal	.41	.24	.54*
External	.68*	.55	.24
Interactional	.13	-.17	.58*
Doctrinal Orthodoxy	.64*	.17	.11

*Indicates highest component loading for scale.

for the theoretical constructs of Religion as End, Means, and Quest.
As Batson (1976) had found, the Religion as End orientation was defined
by high loadings of the Intrinsic, External, and Doctrinal Orthodoxy
scales. In Batson's (1976) analysis, the Internal scale loaded most
highly on the Religion as End orientation; in this study, the Internal
scale showed the highest loading for the Religion as Quest factor, and
with the Interactional scale, defined this orientation. The Inter-
actional scale was clearly associated with the Religion as Quest di-
mension, although the component loading in the present study (.58) is
not as strong as that reported by Batson (.95).

The third dimension, Religion as Means, showed the most equivocal
results of this factor analysis. Consistent with Batson's (1976) find-
ings, this factor was defined by a very high loading of the Extrinsic
scale and a moderately high loading of the External scale. However,
in this study the Extrinsic component loaded with a negative value,
in the opposite direction of past findings. This suggests that while
there is support for a religious orientation in which interests that
are social or outside of the religion are particularly salient, the
exact nature of the relationship between the religious and the social
dimensions is not clear. In summary, the data closely replicated
both Allport and Ross's (1967) and Batson's (1976) findings. The
results suggest strong support for the constructs of Religion as End
and Religion as Quest, and moderate support for the Religion as Means
dimension.

Personality Variables. The next section of the analysis examined whether two personality variables, tolerance of ambiguity and social desirability, could further clarify differences among the three religious orientation dimensions. Table 3 shows the correlations of the two personality variables with the six religious orientation scales and the Religion as End, Means, and Quest components.

Allport and Ross's Intrinsic and Extrinsic scales were the only measures to show significant social desirability effects, and in the expected direction. Contrary to the hypothesis and to Batson, Naifeh and Pate's (1978) findings, the Religion as End orientation was not associated with social desirability. For that matter, there were no significant correlations of either personality variable with any of the three religious orientation components. Only the Internal scale of Batson's (1976) Religious Life Inventory was significantly correlated with tolerance of ambiguity. And tolerance of ambiguity and social desirability proved to be independent of each other (r= .03). In general, no clear pattern emerged concerning the relationships among religious orientation, tolerance of ambiguity, and social desirability effects.

Death Attitudes. A principle components factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on the four death attitude scales. The results, shown in Table 4, replicate previous findings by Durlak and Kass (1981) and Durlak and Dorsher (submitted for publication). Nelson and Nelson's Death Fear and Dickstein's Negative Evaluation

Table 3

Correlations of Religious Orientation Measures

with Personality Variables

($\underline{n}$=109)

Religious Orientation Measures	Personality Scales	
	Tolerance of Ambiguity	Social Desirability
Scales		
Intrinsic	.03	.16*
Extrinsic	.10	−.19*
Internal	.16*	.05
External	.04	.13
Interactions1	−.02	.01
Doctrinal Orthodoxy	.06	.07
Components		
End	−.04	.12
Means	.06	.10
Quest	.09	−.03

*$\underline{p}$ < .05

Table 4

Component Loadings for Death Attitude Scales

($\underline{n}$=107)

Scales	Varimax Rotated Components	
	Negative Evaluation of Personal Death	Reaction to Reminders of Death
Nelson & Nelson: Death Fear	.80	.20
Dickstein: Negative Evaluation	.91	.14
Nelson & Nelson: Death Avoidance	.27	.70
Collett & Lester: Fear of Death of Others	.06	.72

loaded strongly on the first factor and weakly on the second; converse-
ly, Nelson and Nelson's Death Avoidance and Collett and Lester's
Fear of Death of Others loaded highly only on the second factor. The
two-factor solution accounted for 83% of the variance for the four
death attitude scales.

The final data analysis involved correlating the factor scores
of the two death attitudes with the factor scores of the three religious
orientation dimensions. Table 5 shows the results of these product
moment correlations. As hypothesized, the Religion as Means orienta-
tion showed a strong positive correlation with avoidance of reminders
of death. Also as expected, the Religion as End orientation was nega-
tively correlated with a negative evaluation of own death. The Reli-.
gion as Quest orientation negatively correlated with avoidance of
reminders of death. The other hypothesized relationships were not
supported, although the correlation between the Religion as Quest
orientation and a negative evaluation of personal death was in the
expected direction and approached significance. It should be noted
however, that the strongest religious orientation - death attitude
correlation accounted for only 7% of the variance.

Table 5

Correlations of Factor Scores for Religious Orientations

and Death Attitudes

($\underline{n}$=107)

Religious Orientations	Death Attitude Factors	
	Negative Evaluation of Personal Death	Reaction to Reminders of Death
Religion as End	−.27**	.04
Religion as Means	.02	.24**
Religion as Quest	.14	−.20*

*$\underline{p}$ <.05
**$\underline{p}$ <.01

DISCUSSION

The results of the data analysis supported a number of the hypotheses. The replication of Batson's (1976) three dimensional model of religious orientation suggested support for the theoretical constructs of Religion as End, Religion as Means, and Religion as Quest. The pattern of scale loadings on the three religious orientation factors was generally quite similar to that reported by Batson (1976). There were, however, a few noteworthy differences.

One such difference was the strong inverse loading of the Extrinsic scale on the Religion as Means dimension. The negative value of the component loading was contrary to the direction hypothesized and the direction found in past research (Batson, 1976). In both studies the Extrinsic and External scales defined a religious orientation in which social or nonreligious interests are particularly salient; however, the contradictory values obscure the exact nature of the relationship between the religious and social aspects.

Also, in the current study the Religion as End and Religion as Quest orientations were not as clearly differentiated. Batson (1976) reported the Internal scale loading solely on the Religion as End dimension; the Interactional scale, with a loading of .95, essentially defined the Religion as Quest factors. And, while the Interactional scale was clearly associated with the Religion as Quest orientation,

39

its component loading was not as striking as that reported by Batson (1976).

The observed differences may be a function of the preponderance of Catholic subjects in the current study. The Catholic church is perceived by many as particularly emphasizing adherence to church dogma. It is possible that even those Catholic subjects with a Religion as Quest orientation would carry over some of the reliance on organized religion typically associated with the Religion as End dimension. Thus, Catholic "questors" may draw upon a combination of formal and personal religious beliefs. If so, this might explain a somewhat lower Interactional loading, offset by the additional Internal scale loading on the Religion as Quest factor.

Another possibility is that the Internal and Interactional scales may have some overlapping content. Batson (1976) designed the Internal scale to measure the reliance on religion for strength, security, and direction, whereas the Interactional measured the questioning of one's experiences in personal and social crises. Both imply the need for an overarching meaning for life experiences; items from both scales stress the importance of religious beliefs, the content of which notwithstanding. Also, the Internal and Interactional scales were significantly correlated ($r = .33$, $p < .001$). The Religion as End and the Religion as Quest orientations, then, may differ more in process or style than in underlying needs or motives, i.e., for both orientations religious beliefs are an important source of strength and direction,

but the substance of the beliefs may be sought either predominantly from church dogma (Religion as End) or predominantly from a personal religious outlook (Religion as Quest). This interpretation is further supported by data showing the clearest differentiation between the two dimensions to be the degree of doctrinal orthodoxy, i.e., doctrinal orthodoxy loads on the Religion as End but not the Religion as Quest dimension.

The second and third hypotheses, concerning the relationships of social desirability and tolerance of ambiguity with the Religion as End and Religion as Quest dimensions, were not supported. The data did replicate Batson, Naifeh, and Pate's (1978) finding that the Intrinsic scale was positively correlated with social desirability. However, neither personality variable showed any significant correlation with any of the religious orientations. As such, the personality variables studied failed to differentiate between these two religious orientations.

The data did yield very strong support for the convergent and discriminant validity of the two death attitude factors reported by Durlak and Kass (1981) and Durlak and Dorsher (submitted for publication). All of the measures loaded in the hypothesized direction, supporting the continued identification of the two dimensions as negative evaluation of personal death and reaction to reminders of death, after Durlak and Kass (1981). These data add to the accumulating evidence that there are at least two stable dimensions of feath

attitudes that can be measured by self-report scales.

There was mixed support for the hypothesized relationships between the different religious orientations and death attitudes. The Religion as Means showed the predicted positive correlation with reaction to reminders of death, indicating a strong tendency to react negatively to death-related stimuli such as funerals and graveyards. The Religion as Means orientation was described as a more superficial and instrumental approach to religion, in which the primary concerns were for sociability, personal security, and social status. To the extent that reminders of death can be equated with reminders of the ultimate loss of that which has been "built up" socially, it is reasonable that such a person would be uncomfortable with reminders of death. It was also hypothesized that this more superficial involvement in religion would be associated with more unresolved and therefore more negative feelings about personal death: this hypothesis was not supported by the data.

There may be several explanations for such results. Possibly personal death is a less salient matter for a person with a Religion as Means orientation. Indeed, if one's reaction to reminders of death are negative, then the reality of personal death may seem very removed to the person as well, and thus nothing about which to express concern. Or, if the person's involvement in religion is largely within the social sphere, then he or she is not as apt to have addressed the more reflective or introspective dimension of personal death, as opposed

to the more social aspects of attending funerals or wakes.

Similarly, there was partial support for the hypothesized relationships between the Religion as End orientation and the two death attitudes. As predicted, this orientation showed a strong negative correlation with the negative evaluation of personal death, i.e., those with this orientation expressed fewer negative feelings about their own death. This seems best understood in terms of the "answers" church doctrine provides concerning death as a positive experience. That is to say, the Christian tradition -- to which the vast majority of subjects reported some affiliation -- proscribes a lifestyle that, if followed, will lead to an afterlife of eternal reward and contentment. The Religion as End orientation, however, had an unexpectedly neutral response to the reminders of death. Close involvement in the church would necessitate repeated exposure to reminders of death, whether in catechism lessons, readings, funeral rites, or church rituals. Such exposure might well desensitize the church members, leading to a relatively calm, non-anxious response to reminders of death. In retrospect, a neutral reaction is in some ways more consistent with the Religion as End orientation than is the hypothesized positive relationship.

By contrast, the Religion as Quest orientation showed a significant negative correlation with this same death attitude, suggesting fewer negative feelings toward reminders of death. Such an attitude fits the characterization of the Religion as Quest orientation as one of closely examining and questioning troubling life experiences.

Persons of this orientation would not then avoid reminders of the very
experiences upon which they feel a need to reflect. Indeed, the sym-
bols and rituals associated with death would provide some of the in-
formation needed by the person to process his or her feelings. It
was expected that these people would report a negative evaluation of
their own deaths -- the hypothesized impetus behind their probing
and questioning. The results did not support this hypothesis, al-
though the correlation was in the predicted direction and approach-
ing significance. This finding makes some sense in relation to the
other orientations. For the Religion as End orientation, organized
religion provides a framework for viewing personal death positively;
for the Religion as Means orientation, feelings about death tend to
be avoided and largely unresolved. For the Religion as Quest orien-
tation, the reflective, questioning style probably results in some
awareness of concerns about death while precluding any easy answers
that would resolve these concerns. Thus, reports of some negative
feelings about personal death would be expected, and the nonsignifi-
cant correlation obtained may again be a reflection of the saliency
of particular death attitudes. As with the Religion as Means orien-
tation, concern about personal death may be secondary to a broader
willingness or reluctance to meaningfully incorporate death as a
part of life. With a Religion as Quest orientation, the main focus
may be on the integration of personal and interpersonal experiences
with death, with this integration ultimately leading to more indivi-
dually resolved (and hopefully positive) feelings about death. For

such young subjects, the consolidation and eventual resolution of
these feelings may not occur for several years.

In summary, the factor analyses yielded strong support for both
Batson's (1976) three dimensional model of religious orientation and
Durlak and Kass's (1981) two dimensions of death attitudes. This is
the first time that Batson's model has been replicated with such a
large sample size or with Catholic subjects. However, previous find-
ings concerning the relationship of social desirability to these di-
mensions were largely not supported. And no clear relationship between
tolerance of ambiguity and the religious orientations was observed.

The data lent credence to the conceptualization of death atti-
tudes as multidimensional. This in turn implies treatment of the
relationship between religion and death attitudes as complex and
multifaceted. The intercorrelations of the two sets of factors sup-
ported some of the hypotheses that different religious orientations
were associated with the alleviation or exacerbation of different
death concerns. It was observed that some death attitudes appeared
to be more salient for one religious orientation than another. It
was also observed that even the strongest correlations accounted for
a low percentage of the variance.

Further research is needed to continue to establish the validity
of multidimensional measures of religiosity and of death attitudes.
Past research seems to have oversimplified both the dimensions of these

variables and their interrelationships. Multivariate analyses may prove to be helpful in this regard, by developing complex methods for measuring each of these variables and by incorporating other variables that can account for more of the variance and provide a more meaning-ful context for understanding the relationship between religiosity and death attitudes.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. & Ross, J. M. Personal religious orientation and
    prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967,
    5, 432-443.

Batson, C. D. Religion as prosocial: Agent or double agent? Journal
    for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1976, 15, 29-45.

Batson, C. D., Naifeh, S. J., & Pate, S. Social desirability, reli-
    gious orientation, and racial prejudice. Journal for the
    Scientific Study of Religion, 1978, 17, 31-41.

Becker, E. The denial of death. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Budner, S. Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable.
    Journal of Personality, 1962, 30, 29-50.

Cremins, J. J. Perceptual style and religious orientation as indices
    of the fear of death in junior high school students. Disserta-
    tion Abstracts International, 1979, 40, 1331.

Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe, D. A new scale of social desirability in-
    dependent of pathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960,
    24, 349-354.

Durlak, J. A. Using the Templer Scale to assess "death anxiety":
    A cautionary note. Psychological Reports, 1982, 50, 1257-1258.

Durlak, J. A. & Dorsher, M. R. Assessing the validity of self-report
    death scales. Submitted for publication.

Durlak, J. A. & Kass, R. A. Clarifying the measurement of death
    attitudes: A factor analytic evaluation of fifteen self-
    report death scales. Omega: Journal of Death & Dying, 1981,
    12, 129-141.

Everts, P. L. Differences in fear of death among self-actualized,
    intrinsically-religious groups and a control group. Disserta-
    tion Abstracts International, 1978, 39, 2473-2474C.

Feifel, H. & Branscomb, A. B. Who's afraid of death? Journal of
    Abnormal Psychology, 1973, 81, 282-288.

Feifel, H. & Nagy, V. T. Another look at fear of death. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1981, 49, 278-286.

Gibbs, H. W. & Achterberg-Lawlis, J. Spiritual values and death anxiety: Implications for counseling with terminal cancer patients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25, 563-569.

Hoelter, J. W. & Epley, R. J. Religious correlates of fear of death. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1979, 18, 404-411.

Hunt, R. A. & King, M. The intrinsic-extrinsic concept: A review and evaluation. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1971, 10, 339-356.

Kahoe, R. D. Intrinsic religion and authoritarianism: A differentiated relationship. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1977, 16, 179-183.

Kahoe, R. D. & Dunn, R. F. The fear of death and religious attitudes and behavior. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1976, 14, 379-382.

Kass, R. A. & Durlak, J. A. Clarifying and re-clarifying the measurement of death attitudes: A comment. Omega: Journal of Death & Dying, 1982, 12, 147-149.

Leming, M. R. Religion and death: A test of Homan's thesis. Omega: Journal of Death & Dying, 1980, 10, 347-364.

Livingston, P. & Zimet, C. Death anxiety, authoritarianism, and choice of speciality in medical students. Journal of Neurological and Mental Disorders, 1965, 140, 222-230.

Minton, B. & Spilka, B. Perspectives on death in relation to powerlessness and form of personal religion. Omega: Journal of Death & Dying, 1976, 7, 261-267.

Patrick, J. W. Personal faith and the fear of death among divergent religious populations. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1979, 18, 298-305.

Rigdon, M. A. & Epting, F. R. Re-clarifying the measurement of death attitudes. Omega: Journal of Death & Dying, 1982, 12, 143-146.

Spilka, B. Death and personal faith: A psychometric investigation. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1977, 16, 169-178.

Sullivan, W. J. Effect of religious orientation, purpose in life, and locus of control on the death anxiety of college students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38, 382.

Templer, D. I. Death anxiety in religiously very involved persons. Psychological Reports, 1972, 31, 361-362.

APPENDIX A

ATTITÚDES ABOUT RELIGION   SCALE R1

The statements below represent a variety of opinions and beliefs about religion. We want to know how people differ on these questions and statements. Please read each item carefully and indicate with the code given below which most accurately expresses your true feeling. Sometimes people tend   to make such statements in a way which would be most socially acceptable, rather than the way they really feel. We want the latter for your true feeling.

Please answer in the way that best represents how your personally feel and please do not leave any unanswered.

NOTE: If any item is not particularly pertinent to your church or faith, try answering it as you feel you would if it were appropriate for you.

STRONGLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	MILDLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
1	2	3	4	5	6

1. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life. _____

2. The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships. _____

3. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being. _____

4. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services. _____

5. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life. _____

6. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private thought and meditation. _____

7. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life. _____

8. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life. _____

9. What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike. _____

10. One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.

_____

11. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.

_____

12. Although I am a religious person I refuse to let religion considerations influence my everyday affairs.

_____

13. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.

_____

14. The primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity.

_____

15. Occasionally I find. it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.

_____

16. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.

_____

17. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in my life.

_____

18. I read literature about my faith or church.
    1. Yes.
    2. No

19. If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join (1) a Bible study group or (2) a social fellowship.
    1. I would prefer to join (1).
    2. I probably would prefer to join (1).
    3. I probably would prefer to join (2).
    4. I would prefer to join (2).

20. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church.
    1. More than once a week.
    2. About once a week.
    3. Two or three times a month.
    4. Less than once a month.

SCALE R2

This questionnaire includes some commonly heard statements about one's religious life. They are very diverse. Your task is to rate your agreement or disagreement with each statement on a 9-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (9). Try to rate each of the statements, not leaving any blank. If you find a statement particularly difficult to rate or ambiguous, please circle your response and explain the difficulty in the margin. Work fairly rapidly, not brooding over any one statement too long. There is no consensus about right or wrong answers; some people will agree and others will disagree with each of the statements.

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　—disagree———agree———

1. The church has been very important for my
   religious development.　　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

2. Worldly events cannot affect the eternal
   truths of my religion.　　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

3. My religious development is a natural res-
   ponse to the innate need of man for devo-
   tion to God.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

4. It might be said that I value my religious
   doubts and uncertainties.　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

5. My minister (or youth director, camp coun-
   selor, etc.) has had a profound influence
   on my personal religious development.　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

6. God's will should shape my life.　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

7. On religious issues, I find the opinions
   of others irrelevant.　　　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

8. It is necessary for me to have a religious
   belief.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

9. When it comes to religious questions, I
   feel driven to know the truth.　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

10. I find my everyday experiences severely
    test my religious convictions.　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

11. A major factor in my religious development
    has been the importance of religion for my
    parents.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

12. I do not expect my religious convictions
    to change in the next few years.　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

13. Religion is something I have never felt
    personally compelled to consider.　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　8　9

14. I have been driven to ask religious questions out of a growing awareness of the tensions in my world and in my relation to my world.

--disagree-------agree----
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

15. My religion serves to satisfy needs for fellowship and security.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

16. My religious development has emerged out of my growing sense of personal identity.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

17. My religion is a personal matter, independent of the influence of organized religion.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

18. Whether I turn out to be religious or not does not make much difference to me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

19. Certain people have served as "models" for my religious development.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

20. I have found it essential to have faith.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

21. It is important for me to learn about religion from those who know more about it than I do.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

22. God wasn't very important for me until I began to ask questions about the meaning of my own life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

23. I find it impossible to conceive of myself not being religious.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

24. The "me" of a few years back would be surprised at my present religious stance.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

25. Questions are far more central to my religious experience than are answers.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

26. Outside forces (other persons, churches, etc.) have been relatively unimportant in my religious development.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

27. For me, religion has not been a "must."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

SCALE R3

Each of the following statements expresses a belief. As on the previous statements, indicate your agreement or disagreement with the belief stated. If you are unclear as to the meaning of any statement, please raise your hand and I will attempt to clarify it. Again, there are no right or wrong responses, except as you do or do not accurately represent your own beliefs.

		--disagree------agree----
1.	I believe in the existence of a just and merciful personal God.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2.	I believe God created the universe.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
3.	I believe God has a plan for the universe.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
4.	I believe Jesus Christ is the Divine Son of God.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
5.	I believe Jesus Christ was resurrected (raised from the dead).	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
6.	I believe Jesus Christ is the Messiah promised in the Old Testament.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
7.	I believe one must accept Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior to be saved from sin.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
8.	I believe in the "second coming" (that Jesus Christ will one day return to judge and rule the world).	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
9.	I believe in "original sin" (man is born a sinner).	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
10.	I believe in life after death.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
11.	I believe there is a transcendent realm (an "other" world, not just this world in which we live).	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
12.	I believe the Bible is the unique authority for God's will.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Please circle the number (1 through 6) which most closely describes your response to the following sixteen statements. Use the scale below:

Scale

1 = Strong Disagreement

2 = Moderate Disagreement

3 = Slight Disagreement

4 = Slight Agreement

5 = Moderate Agreement

6 = Strong Agreement

* *

1. What we are used to is always preferable to what is unfamiliar. 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. It is more fun to tackle a complicated problem than to solve a simple one. 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. The sooner we all acquire similar values and ideals the better. 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. I like parties where I know most of the people more than ones where all or most of the people are complete strangers. 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. I would like to live in a foreign country for a while. 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. A good teacher is one who makes you wonder about your way of looking at things. 1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Often the most interesting and stimulating people are those who don't mind being different and original. 1 2 3 4 5 6

8. People who fit their lives to a schedule probably miss most of the joy of living. 1 2 3 4 5 6

9. Many of our most important decisions
are based upon insufficient information. 1   2   3   4   5   6

10. An expert who doesn't come up with a
definite answer probably doesn't
know too much. 1   2   3   4   5   6

11. A person who leads an even, regular
life in which few surprises or un-
expected happenings arise, really
has a lot to be grateful for. 1   2   3   4   5   6

12. A good job is one where what is to be
done and how it is to be done are
always clear. 1   2   3   4   5   6

13. People who insist upon a yes or no
answer just don't know how com-
plicated things really are. 1   2   3   4   5   6

14. Teachers or supervisors who hand out
vague assignments give a chance for
one to show initiative and originality. 1   2   3   4   5   6

15. In the long run it is possible to get
more done by tackling small, simple
problems rather than large, com-
plicated ones. 1   2   3   4   5   6

16. There is no such thing as a problem
that can't be solved. 1   2   3   4   5   6

PERSONAL REACTION INVENTORY

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is <u>True</u> or <u>False</u> as it pertains to you personally. If the item is True, circle T; if the item is False as it pertains to you, Circle F. Do not spend too much time on any one item and <u>do not skip any items</u>.

T   F   Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.

T   F   I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.

T   F   It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.

T   F   I have never intensely disliked anyone.

T   F   On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.

T   F   I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

T   F   I am always careful about my manner of dress.

T   F   My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.

T   F   If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.

T   F   On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.

T   F   I like to gossip at times.

T   F   There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.

T   F   No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

T   F   I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.

T   F   There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.

T   F   I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

T   F   I always try to practice what I preach.

T   F   I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.

T   F   I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.

T   F   When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.

T   F   I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

T   F   At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.

T   F   There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.

T   F   I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.

T   F   I never resent being asked to return a favor.

T   F   I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.

T   F   I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.

T   F   There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.

T   F   I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.

T   F   I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

T   F   I have never felt that I was punished without cause.

T   F   I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserve.

T   F   I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

SCALE D1

The first few sets of questions are designed to assess your personal feelings about death and dying. Read each statement and decide how you feel about the item. Then indicate the strength of your agreement or disagreement, but note that the scale changes for some of the questions. Unless otherwise indicated, consider the death in each question to refer to your own death. Please try to answer each question.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Rating 1-5

1. Seeing a dead body would not bother me. _____

2. I would touch a dead body. _____

3. Funerals do not affect me much. _____

4. I like the thought of walking through a graveyard. _____

5. I could sleep in the room with a dead body. _____

6. Being alone in a completely dark room for several hours would be relaxing for me. _____

7. It does not make me nervous when people talk about death. _____

8. I could lie down in a coffin without experiencing any negative feelings. _____

Strong Disagreement	Moderate Disagreement	Slight Disagreement	Slight Agreement	Moderate Agreement	Strong Agreement
1	2	3	4	5	6

Rating 1-6

9. I would experience a great loss if someone close to me died. _____

10. I would never get over the death of someone close to me. _____

11. If someone close to me died I would miss him(or her) very much. _____

12. I could not accept the finality of the death of a friend. _____

13. I would easily adjust after the death of someone close to me. _____

14. I would not mind having to identify the corpse of someone I knew. _____

15. It would upset me to have to see someone who was dead. _____

SCALE D2

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Rating 1-5

1. I am very much afraid to die.   _____

2. Everyone in his right mind is afraid to die.   _____

3. Everyone should fight against death as much as possible.   _____

4. I am afraid to be put to sleep for an operation.   _____

5. I worry a lot about dying a painful death.   _____

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

Rating 1-4

6. The prospect of my own death arouses anxiety in me.   _____

7. The prospect of my own death depresses me.   _____

8. I envision my own death as a painful, nightmarish experience.   _____

9. I am afraid of dying.   _____

10. I am afraid of being dead.   _____

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Margaret R. Dorsher has been read and
approved by the following committee:

    Dr. Joseph A. Durlak, Director
    Associate Professor, Psychology, Loyola

    Dr. Michael J. O'Brien
    Professor, Psychology, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis
and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any
necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is
now given final approval by the Committee with reference to
content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____12/14/82_____   _____
Date   Director's Signature