



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago  
Loyola eCommons

---

Master's Theses

Theses and Dissertations

---

1987

## Religiosity, Ego Development and Concept of God

Diane Lin

*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses)



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Lin, Diane, "Religiosity, Ego Development and Concept of God" (1987). *Master's Theses*. 3519.  
[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses/3519](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3519)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1987 Diane Lin

**RELIGIOSITY, EGO DEVELOPMENT AND CONCEPT OF GOD**

by

**Diane Lin**

**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**

**1987**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deep appreciation to my committee, Dr. Dan McAdams, Dr. Alan DeWolfe, and Dr. Eugene Kennedy, for their valuable assistance, helpful suggestions, and their support in carrying out and completing this research project.

I would like to thank the following people for their generous assistance in the collection of the data used in this study: Dr. Jim Johnson, Dr. Richard Bowen, Ms. Jean. Bradt, Dr. Scott Tindale, and Dr. Robert Nicolay. A special appreciation is extended to those college undergraduates without whose participation this study would not have been possible. Special thanks to Dr. Marvin Acklin for his early suggestions for the research project and for the generous use of materials. Thank you also to my Doyle Center supervisors, Dr. Michael Downs and Dr. John Paoletta, whose insight, humor, and helpful and supportive input have contributed to this project's completion in more ways than they may ever realize.

I would also like to thank my family and friends whose love and support were especially encouraging and sustaining throughout this endeavor.

## VITA

Diane Lai Sheong Lin, the daughter of Edmund Yat Ming and Margaret Tung Sun (Mow) Lin, was born in Honolulu, Hawaii on November 24, 1960. She graduated from Wallace Rider Farrington High School in Honolulu, Hawaii in 1978. She attended Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois, graduating in June 1982 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Humanities, specializing in Chinese and Japanese civilization.

After completing her undergraduate degree and prior to beginning graduate study, Ms. Lin was employed as an administrative assistant to Hawaii State Senator Charles Campbell and as a dormitory head resident at Chaminade University of Honolulu. She also took classes at the University of Hawaii and served as a volunteer youthworker for Hawaii Youth for Christ during this time.

Ms. Lin began her graduate studies in clinical psychology in 1984 at Loyola University of Chicago. For two years, between 1985 and 1987, she was a psychology intern at the Charles Doyle Child Guidance Center and Loyola Day School.

While continuing graduate studies toward her doctorate at the present time, Ms. Lin is employed as a

research assistant at Mount Sinai Hospital's Department of Pediatrics and engaged in a psychological testing externship at Illinois Masonic's Child Abuse Unit for Studies, Education, and Services (C.A.U.S.E.S). She is a volunteer peer counselor with Vineyard Christian Fellowship of Evanston's Counseling Center.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
VITA.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES.....	vii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE.....	5
Religiosity.....	5
Ego Development.....	12
Concept of God, Self, and Persons of Differing Religiousness.....	23
Specific Hypotheses.....	25
METHOD.....	28
Subjects.....	28
Measures.....	29
Procedure.....	39
RESULTS.....	44
DISCUSSION.....	67
SUMMARY.....	79
REFERENCES.....	81
APPENDIX A.....	90
APPENDIX B.....	92
APPENDIX C.....	97
APPENDIX D.....	102

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of Ego Development Level by Religious Orientation.....	45
2. <u>F</u> -test and <u>t</u> -test Results Comparing Various Groups on Number of Extreme Scores .....	47
3. <u>F</u> -test and <u>t</u> -test Results Comparing Various Groups on Congruence Scores Between Ratings.....	50
4. <u>F</u> -test and <u>t</u> -test Results Comparing Groups on Ratings of God.....	53
5. <u>F</u> -test and <u>t</u> -test Results Comparing Groups on Favorableness-of-Self Ratings and Self-Identification.....	56
6. Distribution of Religious Orientation by Gender.....	60
7. Distribution of Ego Development Level by Gender.....	61
8. Distribution of Religious Affiliation by Religious Orientation.....	62
9. Distribution of Religious Affiliation by Ego Development Level.....	63
10. Distribution of Amount of Religious Activity by Religious Orientation.....	64
11. Distribution of Amount of Religious Activity by Ego Development Level.....	65

## CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A	
Demographic Data Sheet.....	91
APPENDIX B	
Washington University Sentence Completion Test	
Form 81.....	93
Form 81/2.....	95
APPENDIX C	
Allport's Religious Orientation Scale	
Scale.....	98
Scoring Criteria.....	101
APPENDIX D	
Semantic Differential Scale	
Instruction Sheet.....	103
Self.....	105
Highly Religious Person.....	106
Sinner.....	107
Average Person.....	108
God.....	109



## INTRODUCTION

"In the name of religion, what deed has not been done? For the sake of religion, men have earnestly affirmed and contradicted almost every idea and form of conduct. In the long history of religion appear chastity and sacred prostitution, feasting and fasting, intoxication and prohibition, dancing and sobriety, human sacrifice and the saving of life in orphanages and hospitals, superstition and education, poverty and wealthy endowments, prayer wheels and silent worship, gods and demons, one God and many gods, attempts to escape and to reform the world. How can such diametrical oppositions all be religious?"

-Paul Johnson (1959)

The way people approach, think about, and practice their personal religion has long been a focus of psychological curiosity and inquiry. One of the earliest psychology journals, for example, was the American Journal of Religious Psychology and Education (1904-1911). (Dittes, 1969) How people's ideas, thoughts, and practices of religion interface with personality and behavior is of particular interest to psychologists. Part of this interest stems from the tremendous, sometimes contradictory, diversity in religious ideas and behavior as suggested by the quotation above.

Religion, as defined by William James, is the "feelings, acts, and experiences of individual men in

their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine." (1961) The relationship between religion, on one hand, and personality and behavior, on the other, has been studied from various vantage points. Dittes (1969) lists several psychological processes which have been the focus of studies exploring this relationship, including the development and change of attitude and belief, the arousal and reduction of anxiety and guilt, personality change (the development of integrative and self-referent processes in personality), the interrelation between cognitive and motivational variables, and the interactions between group processes and personality.

Psychological inquiry into the realm of religious ideas and behavior has often carried with it an underlying interest in the practical, evaluative question: "Religion: For Better or Worse?" William James, for example, discusses the pros and cons of both "healthy-minded" religious temperament, which seeks to deliberately minimize evil in the world, and the "sick soul" which believes that the evil aspects of life are at its very essence. (1961) Batson and Ventis (1982), in their social-psychological review of empirical

studies about the religious experience, organize their discussion of the literature around such headings as "Personal Freedom or Bondage?", "Mental Health or Sickness?", "Brotherly Love or Self-Concern?", and "Implications: Is Religion on Our Side?" Indeed, most psychological studies about religion can and do easily fall into one of Batson and Ventis's categories.

Similarly, this current study of religiosity, ego development, and concept of God must also admit to a latent interest in evaluating religiousness. This study explores first, the relationship, if any, between different forms of religiosity, intrinsic and extrinsic, and levels of ego development or character development and maturity. Theory-based predictions would have intrinsic religiosity associated with a higher character development than extrinsic religiosity. Second, this investigation explores if different forms of religiosity are related to distinctive ways of viewing God, especially the extent to which God is seen as more or less punitive and rigid. Third, intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity and high and low ego development or maturity are viewed in terms of their relationship, if any, to the manner in which the concepts of "self", "highly religious person", "average person", and

"sinner" were perceived. The intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity constructs and the construct of ego development would lead one to predict that there would be a noticeable difference in the way these various concepts are viewed, particularly the self-concept, by itself, and in relation to the other concepts.

## REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

### Religiosity

It seems most expedient to use here the working definition of religion formulated by Batson and Ventis (1982) in their social psychological study of religion: "whatever we as individuals do to come to grips personally with the questions that confront us because we are aware that we and others like us are alive and that we will die." Their definition of religion is stated so as to reflect the uniqueness, complexity, and diversity of the religious experience as well as to be heuristic, inviting and encouraging a social-psychological analysis by emphasizing the way that religion fits into the ongoing life of the individual (Batson & Ventis, 1982).

The concept of differing kinds of religiosity has tended to be widely discussed and emphasized in Christian doctrine. In Christian doctrine, the preferred form of religiosity is seen as a commitment to the full moral code of God, including the important principles behind it of genuine compassion, justice, humility, sober self-awareness of personal weaknesses, shortcomings, and wrongdoing. The other, less desirable

form of religiosity in Christian doctrine, is hypocritical, performing religious ritual emptily, being enamored with the status quo of being a "holy" person, having an inconsistent outward show of morality, legalistically restricting behavior, and artificially inflating self-concept.

The particular concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity to be used in this study were formulated by Gordon Allport and his associates. Gordon Allport believed that religion could either enhance or inhibit the mature personality. He enumerates three qualities of the mature personality (1937): a) "interest in ideals and values beyond immediate physical needs" b) "the ability to objectify oneself, including an ability to see oneself from others' point of view and to laugh at oneself;" and c) "the possession of some unifying philosophy of life, although it need not be religious in character, articulated in words, or entirely complete." (Allport, 1950; Batson & Ventis, 1982)

Allport initially labelled religion enhancing the mature personality as "mature" and religion inhibiting the mature personality as "immature." Mature religious sentiment is "(1) well-differentiated; (2) dynamic in character in spite of its derivative nature; (3)

productive of a consistent morality; (4) comprehensive; (5) integral; and (6) fundamentally heuristic" (Allport, 1950). It is also characterized by "complex, critical reflection on religious issues." (Batson & Ventis, 1982) Allport also writes that mature religion "provides direction to life as a 'master motive', it is flexible and responsive to new information, neither fanatic nor compulsive. It deals openly and honestly with 'matters central to all existence', including the difficult questions of ethical responsibility and evil. It produces the ability to act wholeheartedly even without absolute certainty. It can be sure without being cocksure." (Allport, 1950)

Immature religious sentiment, on the other hand, has not evolved past impulsive self-gratification. It serves either a wish-fulfilling or soporific function for the self-centered interests. It does not promote self-objectivity; it is "unreflective and fails to provide a context of meaning in which the individual can locate himself and with perspective, judge the quality of his conduct. Immature religion also does not unify the personality. Instead, it excludes and segments whole regions of experience, and is spasmodic. Even when fanatically intense, immature religion only

partially integrates the personality." (Allport, 1950)

Allport and his students worked on an empirical method to identify mature and immature religion--namely, an objective questionnaire that could identify and separate the two ways of being religious. They ended up with the Religious Orientation Scale (ROS), changing from the value-laden terms of "mature" and "immature" to "intrinsic" and "extrinsic" as well as changing the concept definitions slightly. (Batson & Ventis, 1982)

Intrinsic religiosity "relates to all of life and is tolerant, unprejudiced, mature, integrative, unifying, and meaning-endowing and promotes mental health." The intrinsically religious person "lives" his religion. (Allport & Ross, 1967)

On the other hand, extrinsic religiosity is more "compartmentalized, prejudiced, exclusionary, immature, dependent, comfort and security-seeking, instrumental, utilitarian, self-serving, and is used as a defense or escape mechanism." The extrinsically religious person "uses" his religion. (Allport & Ross, 1967)

Of specific importance for this study is intrinsic religiosity's characteristic of a mature, integrative, unifying, and well-differentiated personality and view of the world (higher stage of ego development) and



extrinsic religiosity's immature, compartmentalized, self-gratifying view of the world and personality (lower stages of ego development).

An important finding to note is that intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity have been found to be orthogonal to each other. They are not related to each other and have not been found to be bipolar opposites as the theories may seem to suggest and as has been popularly assumed. (Batson & Ventis, 1982; Donahue, 1985)

There have been numerous studies studying correlates of intrinsic religiosity (I) and extrinsic religiosity (E). In terms of their relationship with subjects' rating of the importance of religion or religious commitment, the correlation with I is .76 while the correlation with E is .03 across four studies (Batson, 1976; Batson & Ventis, 1982; Jackson, 1981; Spilka, et al., 1968).

A large volume of work has investigated the relationship of I and E with prejudice. The findings are that I is uncorrelated (which is not to mean negatively correlated) with prejudice, while E is positively correlated with prejudice, but not as strongly as Gordon Allport's theories might suggest. (Donahue, 1985)

Since Allport's conceptualizations have suggested that I should be related to openmindedness and E to closedmindedness, several studies have looked at I and E and their correlation with Rokeach's (1960) dogmatism scale. Extrinsic religiosity is positively correlated with this dogmatism measure while intrinsic religiosity is uncorrelated. (Hoge & Carroll, 1973; Kahoe, 1974; Kahoe & Dunn, 1975; Paloutzian, Jackson, & Crandall, 1978; Thompson, 1974) An interesting finding suggests that I may be related to parts of the dogmatism concept rather than the entire construct. In particular, Kahoe (1977), looking at I and Krug's (1961) dimensions of F (authoritarianism), found I uncorrelated with subscales of cynicism, aggression, projectivity, and good versus bad people, but related to conventionalism (.35) and superstition and stereotypy (.31). (Donahue, 1985)

Studies on fear of death and death anxiety have been done to measure in part the claim that extrinsic religiosity is neurotic and serving as an escape or defense mechanism and that intrinsic religiosity promotes mental health. The assumption is that fear of death tends to be correlated with neurotic preoccupations (Lester, 1967) and as such, E should be

positively correlated and I should be negatively correlated with fear of death. The majority of evidence suggests that this is indeed the case. (Donahue, 1985)

Also, in regards to the relationship of I and E to mental health, I is negatively correlated and E is positively correlated with trait anxiety (Baker & Gorsuch, 1982; Lovekin & Malony, 1977). Also, internal locus of control is positively correlated with I (Kahoe, 1974; Morris & Hood, 1981; Strickland & Shaffer, 1971), as well as purpose in life (Crandall & Rasmussen, 1975). Perceived powerlessness is positively correlated with E and uncorrelated with I (Minton & Spilka, 1976; Spilka & Mullin, 1977).

Studies correlating I and E with altruism measures have found E to be uncorrelated with altruism (Batson & Gray, 1981; Benson et al., 1980). Batson and Ventis (1982), in their review, found that in eight studies using self-report and self-rating measures of helping, religious involvement had a positive, but weak correlation with helpfulness. Five different studies using behavioral measures of helping (such as attempting to help after hearing a ladder fall, possibly injuring a young woman--a confederate in the study) found no reliable differences between degree of religious

involvement and helping. More religious people were not any more helpful, by behavioral measures, than less religious people. (Batson & Ventis, 1982) More specifically, there was little difference between those classified as I and those classified as E in actual helping behavior (Annis, 1975; Annis, 1976). Usually, nearly half of those classified as intrinsics and half of those classified as extrinsics attempted to help in the Annis studies.

In terms of social desirability, with the expectation that the showy hypocrite will be more an E than an I, a 1978 study by Batson and his colleagues found that I correlated .36 and E correlated .17 with social desirability. Other studies have found, to the contrary, that there is no relationship between social desirability and intrinsic religiousness while a slight relationship is indicated between social desirability and E (Greenwald, 1975; Hunsberger & Ennis, 1982; Stewin & Anderson, 1974).

Lacking in previous studies is the correlation of I and E with any measure of personality unification and organization (ego development) or any concept of God.

### Ego Development

The concept of ego development used in this

study is the one put forth by Jane Loevinger. Her view (sharing similarities with various ego theorists such as Harry Stack Sullivan and yet different) defines ego as a "self-system." Ego is a relatively stable framework of meaning; it is the process of searching for coherent meanings in the universe. This search is not merely ego's function but is ego itself. Ego is a group of functions including such aspects as personality unity, individuality, method of facing problems, opinion about oneself and problems of life, impulse control, interpersonal relations, and the whole attitude toward life. (Hauser, 1976; Loevinger, 1966; Loevinger & Wessler, 1970)

Loevinger and her colleagues developed a projective measure, the Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT) and a scoring system to assess ego development. Ego development is seen as both a normal developmental sequence and a dimension of individual differences in any given age cohort. Loevinger's model of ego development proposes seven consecutive stages and three transitional phases which are defined independently of chronological age even though they might be correlated with age. The stages are arranged in an unvarying hierarchy. Each

progressive stage is more complex than the last and none can be skipped. (Hauser, 1976; Loevinger & Wessler, 1970)

The first stage (code symbol I-1) has a presocial and a symbiotic phase. In the presocial phase, the infant is only aware of immediate needs being gratified. Animate and inanimate portions of the environment are indistinguishable. In the symbiotic phase, the child is strongly attached to the mother or mother substitute, distinguishing this figure from the rest of his environment. The child, however, has not differentiated himself from mother. This first stage ends when language use begins and thus, it is not measurable by verbal methods as the WUSCT. (Hauser, 1976)

The second stage (I-2) is characterized by impulsiveness. Impulses dominate the individual's life and this yields defective or undependable results. Rules are not recognized, and actions are deemed "bad" or "good" because of punishment or reward. The individual is consciously preoccupied with satisfying physical needs (including sexual and aggressive wishes). At this stage, the world view is egocentric and concrete. This stage is the first one measurable through the WUSCT. (Hauser, 1976)

The third stage (Delta) is self-protective. Rules are recognized and obeyed, provided they gratify self-interest and garner immediate advantage. Morality is governed by expediency. Interpersonal relationships are exploitative and manipulative, but less dependent than at the impulsive level (I-2). Individuals at this stage are consciously concerned with control, "getting into trouble", domination, and deception. (Hauser, 1976)

The stage Delta/3 is a transition between the self-protective (I-2) and conformist stages (I-3). Responses to the WUSCT that fit this stage are not complex enough to receive a higher stage rating nor impulsive enough to justify a Delta stage rating. (Hauser, 1976)

The fourth stage (I-3), the conformist one, is where most people move to at some time during childhood or adolescence. Rules are obeyed just because they are rules. Disapproval and shame for breaking rules are an important issue for someone at this stage. Interpersonal relations are seen in terms of actions and concrete events rather than feelings and motives. Conscious preoccupations involve material things, status, reputation, and appearance. When inner states are expressed, they are usually stereotypes, cliches, and moralistic judgments. (Hauser, 1976)

The transition (I-3/4) between conformist (I-3) and conscientious stages (I-4) is where morality relative to a context first appears. (Hoppe, 1972) An action's "rightness" is considered to be a function of the individual's time and place. Introspective abilities begin at this stage. A developing understanding of psychological causation, self-awareness, and self-criticism emerges. With the growing self-awareness, the outside social group no longer provides absolute guidelines for the I-3/4 person's behavior. The contingencies recognized at this stage are global and banal. The later stages are where more subtle differentiations take place. (Hauser, 1976)

The fifth stage (I-4) is the conscientious stage where morality has become internalized. Inner rules are preferred over those generated or enforced by peers or authority figures. Guilt is what limits rule transgression. Interpersonal relations are viewed as consisting of feelings and motives rather than actions. Social interaction is experienced as more vivid and meaningful than in earlier stages. The broad stereotypes of previous stages give way to the perception of individual differences. Conscious preoccupations at this stage include obligations,



ideals, traits, and achievements as measured by internal standards instead of external recognition. New at this stage is the ability to be self-critical.

The I-4/5 stage is a transition between I-4 and I-5. The I-4/5 level responses' complexity exceeds that of previous stages. People at this stage begin to be able to tolerate "paradoxical relationships between events" (Hoppe, 1972), especially in conceptualizing interpersonal interactions. In earlier stages, the tendency is to reduce paradoxes to polar opposites. Interpersonal relationships are highly valued in contrast to the cherishing of ideals and achievements at I-4. (Hauser, 1976)

The sixth stage (I-5) is the autonomous one. The prototypical issue at this stage is coping with inner conflict, conflicting needs, conflicts between needs and ideals, and conflicting perceptions. These issues are, for the first time, faced head-on and dealt with at this stage. The growing awareness of inner conflict spawns an increased toleration for others' choices and solutions. This is in contrast to the moral condemnation found in earlier stages. Interpersonal relationships involve the recognition of mutual interdependence as well as the other person's need for

autonomy. A person at this stage sees the need for others to learn from their own mistakes. The focus of conscious thoughts revolve around themes dealing with the complexity of options, role differentiation, individuality, and self-fulfillment. (Hauser, 1976)

The last and highest stage (I-6) is the integrated one where the person goes beyond coping with conflicts to reconciling conflicting demands and, when necessary, renouncing the unattainable (Loevinger, 1966). Individual differences are now treasured instead of being tolerated. (Hauser, 1976)

Loevinger's model of ego development assumes that the sequence can be interrupted at any point in development. At such point of interruption emerges a character style corresponding to the features of the particular stage where progression stopped. However, every individual, in principle if not in actuality, displays behavior at more than one level. It is just that one level of ego development is more characteristic of an individual's behavior than any other level. (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970) It is of special note that various studies have shown more people at the I-3/4 stage than at any other (Haan et al., 1973; Harakel, 1971; Lambert, 1972; Redmore & Waldman, 1975).

Also, the stage I-6 has no more than 1% of persons from most social groups at its level (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970).

The WUSCT and Loevinger's ego development scoring system have been used to study ego development's relationship to a variety of things including development of moral reasoning and judgment (Loevinger, 1979; Rest, 1986), social class and ethnicity (Cox, 1974; Hauser, 1976), political reasoning (Candee, 1974), sociometrically rated maturity (Rootes, Moras, & Gordon, 1980), individual differences in personality traits (Rozsnafszky, 1981), conformity behavior (Hoppe, 1972); and structural complexity in life stories, frequency of nuclear episodes in life stories, and religious ideology status (McAdams, 1985).

There has been some correlation found between stages of ego development and Kohlberg's stages of moral development according to a review of studies by Rest (1986). Cox (1974) found black subjects had lower ego development. Candee (1974) found ego development unrelated to content of political beliefs, but related to the rationale behind such beliefs. The politics of college student leftists at the lower stages of ego development were global, concrete, and simplistic, while

higher ego-stage leftists were more complex and mature in their views of justice and politics.

A relationship between sociometrically rated maturity and ego stage was found particularly when ratings of impersonal domains such as career and community involvement were used (McCrae & Costa, 1980).

Rozsnafszky (1981) found impressive evidence for the construct validity of the ego development measure. Personality ratings of hospitalized male veterans were found to correspond in the theoretically-predicted ways with level of ego development. The Rozsnafszky study was designed to study whether certain milestone traits are indeed associated with certain ego levels. Observer and self Q-sort trait ratings of subjects' personalities (using an 80-item Q-set of personality descriptors--the Minnesota Q-set) were compared with subjects' ego levels as measured by the WUSCT. 91 hospitalized male veterans (65 alcoholics and 26 medical patients) completed the WUSCT. The subjects were also rated with the Minnesota Q-set by their nurses and/or therapists and themselves. Psychologist-raters also used the Minnesota Q-set to describe theoretical milestone traits for each of the seven major ego levels. For example, the Minnesota Q-sort statement: "Values his own and others'

individuality and uniqueness" was descriptive of an I-4/5 or I-5 level while the Q-sort statement: "Does things mostly out of a need to get back at someone or avoid punishment" indicated an I-2 ego level. The Minnesota Q-sort was developed from J. Block's (1961) 100-item California Q-set, a general instrument for rating personality. The results of this study showed that certain traits, as rated by self and observers, are associated with certain ego levels. The Pre-Conformist (I-2 and Delta) alcoholic, for example, was rated by observers as typically unpredictable, seeing what behavior he could get away with, having difficulty thinking logically, and acting mostly out of a need to get revenge on someone. The Pre-Conformist (I-2 and Delta) medical patient was also frequently seen as having difficulty thinking logically as well as being hostile and tending to blame others or bad luck for personal problems. The Post-Conformist (I-4, I-4/5, and I-5) alcoholic was seen as concerned with philosophical problems and having insight into personal motives and behavior while the Post-Conformist medical patient was also seen as having such insight, but in addition, ability to cope with inner conflict, valuing self and others' individuality, and being socially

perceptive of a wide range of interpersonal cues. Conformist (I-3 and I-3/4) alcoholics were observed as being dependable, responsible, and believing strongly in following rules. Thus, Minnesota Q-set items which, by psychologist ratings, differentiated criterion ego levels, also differentiated alcoholics grouped by ego level and medical patients grouped by ego level. The set of differentiating items were, as shown by the example, different for the two groups of veterans. The critical items emerging from observer ratings differed, yet overlapped with key items derived from self-ratings.

Hoppe (1972) studied adolescent boys, using the ego development measure and various methods and measures of conformity, and found the predicted curvilinear trend in conformity with maximum conformity behavior at the ego stage levels of I-3 and I-3/4.

McAdams' work (1985) found that ego development is related to greater life story narrative complexity (and thus, greater identity differentiation) and related to religious ideology status (based on Erikson's concept of identity).

There has not been published any study using both Allport and Ross's (1967) ROS and Loevinger's Ego Development Scoring Scale on the WUSCT.

Concept of God, Self, and Persons of Differing  
Religiousness

The rationale for including a measure about the concept of God and the way it will be looked at in relation to the ego development and religiosity measures is derived from the psychoanalytically-based theory and clinical investigations of Ana-Maria Rizzuto (1979). Using a semi-structured interview method to gather information about the concept of God of various psychiatric patients and normals, she found evidence that religious beliefs, particularly those dealing with the nature of God, reflect an individual's basic process of object representations and style of object relationships. In psychoanalytic theory, object relations, concept of the object, and object representation all refer to a developmental understanding of the self-concept, the concepts of others, and the nature and quality of interpersonal relationships. Experiences result in these three things (self-concept, concepts of others, and the quality of interpersonal relationships) being internalized as cognitive representations. These cognitive representations affect current interpersonal relations. Early object relationships with significant others lead

to the development of intrapsychic structures (object representations or "complex mental schemata of significant objects encountered in reality") which are part of the personality structure, influencing and coloring interpersonal involvements. (Blatt et al., 1976)

It is assumed that a person's perceived concept of God is influenced by cultural norms and religious dogma as well as the internalized representations of significant others--particularly parents and parental figures. For example, the powerful, authoritarian, and disciplinarian God reflects the stereotype of the father figure, while the supportive and forgiving nature of God reflects the stereotype of a mother figure. Also contributing to the concept of God is one's personal creative fantasy.

The concept of God projective questionnaire and adapted forms have been used primarily to study the object relations of patient populations (Rizzuto, 1979). The findings have been generally consistent in that more primitive and more complex concepts of God have been associated with more disorganized personalities and more organized, higher-functioning personalities, respectively.



The concept of God measurement to be used in this current study will employ the method of the semantic differential developed by Osgood and his colleagues as a research tool to measure the psychological meaning of constructs (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957). Also, concept of self and persons of differing religiousness have been included using the same semantic differential as the concept of God. The semantic differential, developed and adapted for this particular study, looks at the degree to which a person's God concept (as well as self-concept and concept of persons with differing religiousness) can be ascribed certain attributes which are arranged by bipolar opposite pairs. These attributes are of three types: evaluative, potency-related, and activity-related. An evaluative type of attribute pair would be "good-bad." "Strong-weak" is an example of a potency-related attribute pair, while "active-passive" is an activity-related pair.

### Specific Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. Intrinsically religious persons have a higher level of ego development than extrinsically religious persons. Allport and Ross (1967) assert that intrinsic religiosity is tolerant, mature, integrative, and unifying while extrinsic

religiosity is compartmentalized, prejudiced, and immature.

Hypothesis 2. Extrinsic will have more extreme, definitive, and rigid views of themselves, God, and others than intrinsic who view the world in a more unifying and integrative fashion.

Hypothesis 3. People with lower ego development will have more extreme, definitive, and rigid views of themselves, God, and others than people with higher ego development who are capable of perceiving greater relativity, complexity, and paradox in people and the world.

Hypothesis 4. Intrinsic will view people of differing religiousness (highly religious person, sinner, and average person) as more like each other than extrinsic. The intrinsic's tolerant and unifying world views would lead them to see more similarities between different people than the extrinsic whose tendency, theoretically, is to compartmentalize and exclude.

Hypothesis 5. The extrinsic view God as more punitive and rigid than the intrinsic who conceive of God as more forgiving and flexible. If views of God are reflective of people's perceptions of themselves and others and their interpersonal relationships, as Rizzuto

(1979) claims, then Allport and Ross's (1967) theory would predict that intrinsics and extrinsics would view God differently, specifically in characteristics such as flexibility and tolerance.

Hypothesis 6. The intrinsics will view themselves more modestly and be more willing to identify their weaknesses and shortcomings as sinners than the self-righteous, exclusionary extrinsics.

## METHOD

### Subjects

An N of 60 volunteer subjects were recruited from Loyola University of Chicago college undergraduate summer psychology classes.

Instructors who consented to allow the experimenter to recruit volunteer subjects from their classes helped decide how recruitment would take place. In some cases, subjects received extra classwork credit for their participation. In most cases, subjects did not receive extra classwork credit. The experimenter visited 9 classes either at the end or beginning to give a short introduction of the project. Subjects were kept blind to the hypotheses of the study, but were told that the project was attempting to study "religious ideas and practices and their relationship to other things." After introducing the project, questionnaires were distributed. 141 questionnaires were distributed in this manner. In general, subjects, with the exception of one class (N=9), filled out the questionnaires on their own time and returned the questionnaires to the instructor of the class or to conveniently-located labelled boxes and manila velopes. The one class

noted above filled the questionnaires in class and returned them directly to the experimenter.

Of 141 questionnaires distributed, 61 were returned. The return rate was 43%. One of the returned questionnaires was incomplete and therefore, not included for analyses. Thus an N of 60 was arrived at.

The subjects ranged in age from 18 through 43 years with a mean age of 22.8 years and a modal age of 20 years. There were 15 male respondents (mean age=21.73 years) and 45 female respondents (mean age=23.15). Of the respondents, 31 identified their religious affiliation as Catholic. 13 were Protestant, while five were Jewish. Six had no religious affiliation, and five fell into the category of "other". Of those who fell in the "other" category, two specified that they were Greek Orthodox, one was Buddhist, one was Hindu, and one was a Christian Scientist. Amount of self-reported religious activity, according to responses on a multiple-choice question, ranged widely in gradations from "never" to "several times a day" with the modal response being "several times a year" (N=19).

### Measures

The questionnaires distributed to subjects to fill out were all paper-and-pencil forms. Included in the

questionnaire was a statement of informed consent and an instructional cover sheet which included information on how to contact the experimenter to answer questions about the study as well as a place for subjects to fill in their name and address should they wish to receive an abstract of the study and findings in the Fall of 1987. Also included was a data sheet asking about age, gender, religious affiliation, and amount of participation in religious activities. Following the data sheet was an 18-item Washington University Sentence Completion Test (the 36-item Form 81 was divided into two equivalent forms which were used alternately) to be scored for ego development by Loevinger's (1970) system. Allport and Ross' (1967) Religious Orientation Scale was included next. It was followed by an instruction sheet on the Semantic Differential Scale and seven pages of semantic differential ratings for two buffer items ("one of worst high school teachers" and "one of favorite high school teachers") and five dependent variable items ("yourself", "average person", "highly religious person", "sinner", and "God").

Washington University Sentence Completion Test (Form 81) and Loevinger's ego development scoring system (1970):

The 18-item WUSCT is actually a 36-item revised form that can be split in half and used as alternate 18-item forms. (Loevinger, 1985) This form can be used with both male and female adults. Subjects' responses to these eighteen items are individually assigned to one of nine ego development levels by matching them with response categories provided in a scoring manual (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970). These response categories are based on specific characteristics of the successive stages. The scoring assumes that each person has a core level of ego functioning. Thus, the scoring involves assigning an ego development level to a person, based on his/her scores on the 18 items. Each item response is assigned an ego development level irrespective of what the other item responses are. That is, each item receives a separate and independent ego development level rating--indeed, each item has its own scoring system. After all items are scored the total protocol rating (TPR) is assigned by examining the distribution of the item scores; various standard ogive rules have been established by Loevinger and Wessler (1970) to score total protocols according to the item score distributions. Thus, each protocol is assigned an ego development level in this way. The experimenter trained

herself to score the WUSCT using the self-training exercises and instructions provided in the manual (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970).

Studies have shown that the manual is clear enough such that high agreement can be maintained across different scorers who have been trained only by the manual itself; also, close agreement can be reached between personally trained (by Loevinger) and self-trained raters. (Hauser, 1976) When five personally trained and two self-trained raters were compared on their total protocol ratings for 100 protocols, median interrater correlations ranged between .89 and .92. The median percentage agreement on item ratings for personally trained and self-trained raters was 78% (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970).

Redmore and Waldman (1975) conducted two studies on the reliability of the sentence completion test looking at test-retest, split half, and internal consistency indices. Ninth graders and undergraduate psychology students were used in two separate studies. Test-retest correlations for the undergraduates ranged from .44 for the total protocol to .64 for item sum scores. Test-retest correlations for the ninth graders ranged from .79 for the total protocol to .91 for item



sum scores. These correlations were significant, but it was noted that the second testing yielded significantly lower scores in both populations. Split-half reliability correlations for the groups, in both studies with no time interval between test halves were .90 and .85; a week-long interval however lowered this to an  $r$  of .68. Internal consistency coefficients (using either the first tests or the combined halves) ranged from .80 to .89 for both studies. (Hauser, 1976) Thus, both studies report significant reliabilities using three different indices and three different scoring systems, but these must be regarded with some tentativeness as the sample sizes were rather small ( $N$  of 17 and 26, respectively).

Findings have found that the sentence completion test is measuring something different from mere intelligence or verbal fluency (Blasi, 1972; Hoppe, 1972; Loevinger & Wessler, 1970). Thus, some of ego development's discriminant validity is established. Studies comparing ego development with selected personality and cognitive measures (Blasi, 1972; Candee, 1974; Haan et al., 1973; Hoppe, 1972; Lambert, 1972; Lucas, 1971; Redmore and Waldman, 1975; Sullivan et al., 1970) offer limited evidence for construct

validity. It is suspected that methodological factors have influenced these unequivocal results. A strong finding is that age has a great effect on the correlations between ego development and other variables. (Hauser, 1976)

Allport and Ross' (1967) Religious Orientation Scale (ROS):

The ROS is a 25-item scale of statements pertaining to religious ideas and practices. Each of these statements is rated on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Scores range from 11 to 99 for the Extrinsic scale, and from 9 to 81 for the Intrinsic scale, with higher scores indicating a stronger orientation. 11 of the statements are scored for the extrinsic scale, 9 of the statements are scored for the intrinsic scale, and five of the statements serve as buffers. Since research has shown that intrinsic and extrinsic orientations are two independent continua and not bipolar ends of a single dimension, it is most useful to classify the scores into a fourfold typology of intrinsic (high on intrinsic, low on extrinsic), extrinsic (high on extrinsic, low on intrinsic), indiscriminately religious (high on both), and nonreligious (low on both). On the intrinsic scale,

scores of 45 and below were considered low while all scores above 45 were considered high. On the extrinsic scale, scores of 55 and below were considered low while all scores above 55 were considered high.

The ROS has been used extensively and has been established to have an acceptable level of reliability (Batson & Ventis, 1982; Meadow & Kahoe, 1984; Paloutzian, 1983).

In terms of construct, one of the most important findings is that the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations are unrelated dimensions (Donahue, 1985). This is in marked contrast to Allport's original conceptualization. There is some evidence for the construct validity of intrinsic religiosity as it was originally conceived in that it measures religious commitment, distinct from religious belief, church membership, and liberal-conservative theological orientation. (Donahue, 1985) It also correlates with such variables as internal locus of control (Kahoe, 1974), purpose in life (Crandall & Rasmussen, 1975), and lack of anxiety (Baker & Gorsuch, 1982). Extrinsic religiosity demonstrates some construct validity as well with its positive correlation with prejudice, dogmatism (Hoge & Carroll, 1973), trait anxiety (Baker & Gorsuch,

1982), and fear of death (Minton & Spilka, 1976). It is also uncorrelated with altruism (Batson and Gray, 1981; Benson et al., 1980; Donahue, 1985).

Concept of God, Self, Average Person, Highly Religious Person, and Sinner as measured with the same Semantic Differential Scale:

The semantic differential scale used in this study consists of 15 bipolar opposite pair of adjectives which will be rated on a seven-point as to whether the concept is more closely related to one or the other of the pair of opposites. Intercorrelations and factorial analyses of the original set of 50 scales by Osgood revealed three major factors: evaluative, with high loadings on such scales as good-bad, and valuable-worthless, potency, with high loadings on scales such as strong-weak, and activity, seen in such scales as active-passive and fast-slow. (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957). Thus, according to the amount of variance these factors have been found to account for, the 15 items include 10 evaluative items, three potency items, and two activity items. The 10 evaluative items in this semantic differential scale include good-bad, ineffective-effective, cruel-kind, foolish-wise, worthless-valuable, repentant-unrepentant,

pleasant-unpleasant, selfish-unselfish, honest-dishonest, and punishing-forgiving. The three potency items include strong-weak, tenacious-yielding, and prohibitive-permissive. Active-passive and fast-slow are the two activity items.

Responses on the semantic differential can be assigned numerical values (similar to a Likert scale), and the overall similarity of any two concepts for an individual or a group can then be measured in terms of their positions on all the scales. The connotations of all concepts rated by a single individual can be investigated by computing the "score" of each concept in the three principal factors--evaluative, potency, and activity. (Anastasi, 1982) In addition, congruence and identification of self with other concepts and other concepts with each other can be measured by computing the sum of squared differences for each of the 15 items for pairs of concepts. For example, to see how alike or congruent ratings of an "average person" might compare with a "sinner", the differences between these two concepts' ratings on each of the 15 items are squared and summed for each individual respondent. The larger this sum of squared difference is, the greater the incongruence or dissimilarity between the "average person" and "sinner" rating.

The Semantic Differential, which is easily comparable and flexibly adapted for different purposes, has been used in many research contexts, including problems such as clinical diagnosis and therapy, vocational choices, cultural differences, and consumers' reactions to products and brand names (Anastasi, 1982; Snider & Osgood, 1969). It has been used as a measure of identification in many studies.

Test-retest studies have found a reliability coefficient of .85 across 100 subjects scoring 40 items each. Using a method of probability limits, for all types of items (evaluative, potency-related, and activity-related), a difference of more than 2 scale units can be considered significant at about the 5% level on the grounds that deviations this large occur only this proportion of the time when randomly selected subjects repeat their judgments of randomly selected items. Also, a change in factor score of more than 1.00 for the evaluative factor, more than 1.50 for the potency factor, and more than 1.33 for the activity factor is significant at about the 5% level. (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957)

Ideally, to study validity, some correlation should be derived between semantic differential scores

and some independent criterion of meaning. There is no commonly accepted quantitative criterion of meaning, and so, the reliance here is on face validity. There is evidence that an approximate equality of intervals between scales and a similar placement of rating across scales have some basis beyond mere assumption. (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957)

### Procedure

After the collection of the questionnaires from volunteer subjects, the informed consent statements with subject signatures were removed and the data coded by number. The WUSCT was scored according to Loevinger's ego development scoring manual (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970) and each subject was assigned an ego development level. The range of ego development levels were from I-2 through I-4/5 with the mode being I-3/4, consistent with previous findings. The subjects were then divided into two groups of higher ego development (I-4 and above) and lower ego development (I-3/4 and below).

The ROS was scored and the subjects divided into four groups: intrinsic religiosity, extrinsic religiosity, nonreligious, and indiscriminately religious. There is an empirical precedent for dividing up the subjects into these four groups. Donahue (1985)

concludes that considering the two measures (intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity) simultaneously produces considerable explanatory power and further, when other variables are viewed in the context of the four different types of religiosity, stronger and more meaningful relationships are revealed. Thus, inferences can be made with greater confidence given that the division of groups is more specific.

The semantic differentials for the five concepts of self, God, average person, highly religious person, and sinner were scored in the following ways to be most relevant to the hypotheses and questions of interest. For each subject, the number of extreme scores (number of ones and sevens which were the "very" responses) were counted up. Congruency of concept ratings were obtained for each subject by computing the sum of squared differences for the following pairs of ratings: average person-highly religious person, average person-sinner, and highly religious person-sinner. Degree of self-identification was also obtained for each subject by computing the sum of squared differences for the following pairs of ratings: yourself-sinner, yourself-God, yourself-average person, yourself-highly religious person. Favorableness of self rating was scored for



each individual by totaling scores on the ten evaluative items (one constituted a "very" rating for the unfavorable descriptor, seven constituted a "very" rating for the favorable descriptor, while four was neither or equal of the bipolar descriptors) and finding a mean which was the evaluative factor score. The higher the score, the more favorable the self rating. Individual scores were recorded for each subject as to how they rated God on the specific items of punishing-forgiving, tenacious-yielding, and prohibitive-permissive. The higher scores identified ratings that scored God as more forgiving, more yielding, and more permissive, respectively.

Age was coded by number in years, while sex, religious affiliation, and amount of religious activity were coded into numbers designating separate categories.

First, frequencies and barcharts were obtained for the variables of religious orientation, ego development level, number of extreme scores, evaluative scores for yourself ratings, the scores of God on the items of punishing-forgiving, tenacious-yielding, and prohibitive-permissive, age, gender, religious affiliation, and amount of religious activity.

Second, crosstabulations and chi-square contingency tests were performed on the following

variable combinations: religious orientation by gender, ego development level by gender, religious orientation by religious affiliation, ego development level by religious affiliation, religious orientation by religious activity, ego development level by religious activity, and religious orientation by ego development level.

Third, two-way analyses of variance were performed on the following dependent variables by the independent variables of religious orientation and ego development level: age, number of extreme semantic differential scores, sum of squared differences between average and highly religious person ratings, sum of squared differences between average person and sinner ratings, sum of squared differences between highly religious person and sinner ratings, evaluative factor of yourself rating, sum of squared differences between yourself and sinner ratings, sum of squared differences between yourself and God ratings, sum of squared differences between yourself and average person ratings, sum of squared differences between yourself and highly religious person ratings, rating of God on punishing-forgiving item, rating of God on tenacious-yielding item, and rating of God on prohibitive-permissive item.

Fourth, t-tests were also performed. Groups of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation were tested as to their significant differences on all the variables derived from the semantic differential ratings. Groups of high and low ego development level were tested as to their significant differences on all the variables derived from the semantic differential ratings. Remaining t-tests paired different religious orientations and compared them as to their significant difference on the number of extreme scores on semantic differential ratings.

## RESULTS

The distribution of high (I-4 and above) and low (I-3/4 and below) ego development scores by religious orientation is summarized in Table 1. A chi-square contingency test was used to analyze if there was a relationship or not between religious orientation and ego development level. The results indicate that these two variables are not significantly related,  $\chi^2 (3) = 3.044$ ,  $p > .05$ , contrary to predictions in Hypothesis 1.

Differences between various groups in their number of extreme scores on the semantic differentials were examined in two ways. First, a 2 x 4 analysis of variance with the independent variables of ego development level and religious orientation was carried out. There was no statistically significant interaction between religious orientation and ego development level,  $F(3,52) = 1.0354$ ,  $p > .05$ . There was no significant difference in the mean number of extreme semantic differential scores for students of differing religious orientations (that is, intrinsic, extrinsic, nonreligious, and indiscriminately religious),  $F(3,52) = 2.449$ ,  $p > .05$ . There was also no significant

Table 1

Distribution of Ego Development Level by Religious  
Orientation

Religious Orientation	Ego Development Level		Total
	Low (I-3/4 and below)	High I-4 and above)	
Intrinsic	10	10	20
Extrinsic	3	6	9
Nonreligious	11	6	17
Indiscriminately Religious	9	5	14
TOTAL	33	27	60

difference in the mean number of extreme semantic differential scores for students with higher ego development level (I-4 and above) as compared to those with lower ego development level (I-3/4 and below),  $F(1,52) = 1.146, p > .05$ .

Second, one-tailed  $t$ -tests using separate variance estimates were used to compare the group means and one-tailed  $F$ -tests were used to compare the group variances. Thus, groups were examined by pairs. The results are summarized in Table 2.

Significant results were found indicating that intrinsics had significantly more extreme scores on the semantic differentials than extrinsics, contrary to predictions in Hypothesis 2. Also, subjects who were indiscriminately religious had significantly more extreme scores on the semantic differentials than the extrinsics. The number of extreme scores on the semantic differential did not differ significantly for subjects with lower ego development as compared with those with higher ego development.

The similarity of ratings for sinner, average person, and highly religious person was compared between and among various groupings of subjects. A series of  $2 \times 4$  analyses of variance were performed with the

Table 2

F-test and t-test Results Comparing Various Groups on Number of Extreme Scores

Groups Compared	F-test and/or <u>t</u> -test results	Significant Finding
Intrinsics vs. Extrinsics	$\underline{t}(23.61)=2.42, p < .05$	Yes, intrinsics have significantly more extreme scores than extrinsics
Low vs. High Ego Development	$\overline{F}(32,36)=1.16, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(53.88)=-.63, p > .05$	No
Intrinsics vs. Nonreligious	$\overline{F}(19,16)=1.19, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(32.9) = .67, p > .05$	No
Intrinsics vs. Indiscriminately Religious	$\overline{F}(19,13)=1.02, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(28.31)=-.84, p > .05$	No
Extrinsics vs. Nonreligious	$\overline{F}(8,16) =2.99, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(23.69)=-1.51, p > .05$	No

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Groups Compared	F-test and/or <u>t</u> -test results	Significant Finding
Extrinsics vs. Indiscriminately Religious	$\underline{t}(21.0) = -3.06, \underline{p} < .01$	Yes, indiscriminately religious have more ex- treme scores than extrinsics
Nonreligious vs. Indiscriminately Religious	$F(16, 13) = 1.21, \underline{p} > .05$ $\underline{t}(28.68) = -1.40, \underline{p} > .05$	No



independent variables of ego development level and religious orientation. On the congruence score for average person-highly religious person, no main effects or interactions were found. On the congruence score for average person-sinner, a significant main effect due to religious orientation was found,  $F(3,51) = 3.11$ ,  $p < .05$ . A significant main effect also due to religious orientation,  $F(3,51) = 3.353$ ,  $p < .05$ , was found in looking at the congruence scores for the highly religious person-sinner.

The groups of foremost interest (intrinsic and extrinsic, and low and high ego development level) were paired up and their congruence scores for average person-highly religious person, average person-sinner, and highly religious person-sinner compared using one-tailed  $t$ -tests (using separate variance estimates) and one-tailed  $F$ -tests. The findings are summarized in Table 3.

The table indicates that the extrinsic, as a group, rated average and highly religious persons as being more alike than the intrinsic. This is contrary to Hypothesis 3's predictions. Also, those with lower ego development rated average and highly religious persons as being more alike than subjects with high ego

Table 3

F-test and t-test Results Comparing Various Groups on Congruence Scores

Groups Compared	Congruence Score Between:	F-test and/or <u>t</u> -test results	Significant Finding
Intrinsics vs. Extrinsics	avg-high r	$F(19,8) = 7.88, p < .01$ $\underline{t}(26.27) = 2.77, p < .01$	Yes, extrinsics scored average and high r persons more alike than intrinsics
Intrinsics vs. Extrinsics	avg-sinner	$F(19,8) = 2.14, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(22.19) = .24, p > .05$	No
Intrinsics vs. Extrinsics	high r-sinner	$F(19,8) = 1.10, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(14.86) = -.18, p > .05$	No
Low Ego Development vs. High Ego Development Level	avg-high r	$F(31,26) = 1.87, p < .05$	Yes, low scored average and high r persons more alike than high
Low Ego Development vs. High Ego Development Level	avg-sinner	$F(31,26) = 1.06, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(55.87) = .57, p > .05$	No

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Groups Compared	Congruence Score Between:	F-test and/or t-test results	Significant Finding
Low Ego Development vs. High Ego Development Level	high r-sinner	$\underline{F}(31,26)=2.57, \underline{p} < .01$	Yes, high scored high r persons and sinners as more alike than low

development level. On the other hand, those with high ego development levels rated highly religious persons and sinners as more alike than those with lower ego development.

Ratings of God on the critical scales of punishing-forgiving, tenacious-yielding, and prohibitive-permissive were examined to see if there was any significant amount of variance due to a certain group attribute by a series of 2 x 4 analyses of variance with the independent variables of ego development level and religious orientation. No significant main effects or interactions were found.

Ratings of God on these critical scales were then examined to see if there were any significant differences between designated groups in their ratings of these items. One-tailed  $t$ -tests (using separate variance estimates) and one-tailed  $F$ -tests were performed on pairs of groups with the results summarized in Table 4.

Subjects with low and high ego development levels did not differ significantly from each other in the way they scored God on the scales of punishing-forgiving, tenacious-yielding, and prohibitive-permissive. The only significant difference found was that intrinsics

Table 4

F-test and t-test Results Comparing Groups on Ratings of God

Groups Compared	God Rating Item	F-test and/or t-test results	Significant Finding
Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic	punishing-forgiving	$F(19,8) = 1.66, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(12.54) = 1.59, p > .05$	No
Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic	tenacious-yielding	$\underline{t}(23.71) = 2.04, p < .05$	Yes, intrinsics rate God as more yielding than extrinsics
Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic	prohibitive-permissive	$F(19,8) = 1.67, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(19.86) = .65, p > .05$	No
Low Ego Development vs. High Ego Development Level	punishing-forgiving	$F(31,26) = 1.01, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(55.42) = .64, p > .05$	No
Low Ego Development vs. High Ego Development Level	tenacious-yielding	$F(31,26) = 1.12, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(56.23) = 1.00, p > .05$	No
Low Ego Development vs. High Ego Development Level	prohibitive-permissive	$F(31,26) = 1.39, p > .05$ $\underline{t}(57.0) = .32, p > .05$	No

score God as more yielding on the tenacious-yielding item than extrinsics. This is consistent with predictions in Hypothesis 5.

Favorableness of self ratings and self-identification were looked at by focusing on the evaluative scores for self, and on various congruency scores (essentially sums of squared differences between ratings of different concepts) for the following concept pairs: yourself-sinner, yourself-God, yourself-average person, and yourself-highly religious person. First, 2 x 4 analyses of variance were performed with the independent variables of ego development level and religious orientation with the above scores as dependent variables. A main effect in variance of evaluative scores for self was found due to religious orientation,  $F(3,52) = 3.329$ ,  $p < .05$ . Significant two-way interactions between religious orientation and ego development level was found to affect the variance of yourself-God congruency scores,  $F(3,51) = 3.741$ ,  $p < .05$ . Also, a significant main effect due to ego development level was found to affect variance of yourself-highly religious person congruency scores,  $F(3,51) = 4.22$ ,  $p < .05$ . No significant main effects or interactions due to religious orientation or ego

development levels were found in the variance of the yourself-sinner and yourself-average person congruency scores.

Second, one-tailed t-tests using separate variance estimates and one-tailed F-tests were used to compare favorableness of self ratings and self-identification between key groups of interest--namely, the intrinsics compared with the extrinsics, and low and high ego development level compared with each other. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 5.

The significant findings, in comparing intrinsics with extrinsics, are that intrinsics rate themselves more favorably than extrinsics do. This contradicts predictions in Hypothesis 6. Also, intrinsics rate themselves as more like God and more like highly religious persons than extrinsics do, while extrinsics rate themselves as more like the average person than the intrinsics do, contrary to Hypothesis 6's suggestions.

In comparing low and high ego development levels, significant findings were that those with lower ego development levels rate themselves as more like God and more like highly religious persons than those with higher ego development levels.

Various analyses were conducted to see if there was any relationship between the independent variables

Table 5

F-test and t-test Results Comparing Groups on Favorableness-of-Self Ratings and Self-Identification

Groups Compared	Score of Interest	F-test and/or t-test ratings	Significant Finding
Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic	favorableness of self	$F(19,8)=4.17, p < .01$ $\bar{t}(9.77)=2.85, \underline{p} < .01$	Yes, intrinsic rate selves as more favorable than extrinsic
Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic	yourself-sinner	$F(19,8)=1.97, p > .05$ $\bar{t}(21.42)=-.36, \underline{p} > .05$	No
Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic	yourself-God	$\bar{t}(13.37)=-1.93, p < .05$	Yes, intrinsic rates selves as more like God than extrinsics
Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic	yourself-average person	$F(19,8)=3.53, p < .05$	Yes, extrinsic rate selves as more like average person than intrinsic

(continued)



Table 5 (continued)

Groups Compared	Score of Interest	F-test and/or $\bar{t}$ -test results	Significant Finding
Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic	yourself-highly-religious person	$F(19,8)=11.33, p < .01$	Yes, intrinsic rate selves as more like highly religious persons than extrinsics
Low Ego Development vs. High Ego Development Level	favorableness of self	$F(31,26)=1.77, p > .05$ $\bar{t}(57.62)=-.13, p > .05$	No
Low Ego Development vs. High Ego Development Level	yourself-sinner	$F(31,26)=1.23, p > .05$ $\bar{t}(56.74)=.16, p > .05$	No
Low Ego Development vs. High Ego Development Level	yourself-God	$F(31,26)=2.37, p < .05$	Yes, low rate selves as more like God than high
Low Ego Development vs. High Ego Development Level	yourself-average person	$F(31,26)=1.15, p > .05$ $\bar{t}(56.40)=-.05, p > .05$	No

(continued)

Table 5 (continued)

Groups Compared	Score of Interest	F-test and/or t-test results	Significant Finding
Low Ego Development vs. High Ego Development Level	yourself-highly religious person	$F(31,26)=6.47, p < .01$ $\bar{t}(32.76)=-1.82, p < .05$	Yes, low rate selves as more like highly-religious person than high

and demographic variables (age, gender, religious affiliation, and amount of religious activity). No significant relationships were found between religious orientation and gender,  $X^2 (3) = 4.629$ ,  $p > .05$ , or ego development level and gender,  $X^2 (1) = .5612$  and  $1.10$ ,  $p > .05$ . However, a summarization of the distributions of religious orientation and ego development by gender are presented in Table 6 and Table 7.

No significant relationships were found between religious orientation and religious affiliation,  $X^2 (12) = 11.69$ ,  $p > .05$ , or between ego development level and religious affiliation,  $X^2 (4) = 7.24$ ,  $p > .05$ . The distribution of religious affiliation by religious orientation and ego development level is shown in Tables 8 and 9, respectively.

Although there was no significant relationship found between ego development level and amount of religious activity,  $X^2 (8) = 13.38$ ,  $p > .05$ , there was a significant relationship found between religious orientation and amount of religious activity,  $X^2 (24) = 48.498$ ,  $p < .01$ . The distribution of amount of religious activity by religious orientation and ego development level are shown in Table 10 and Table 11.

Table 6

Disbribution of Religious Orientation by Gender

Religious Orientation	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
Intrinsic	3	17	20
Extrinsic	3	6	9
Nonreligious	7	10	17
Indiscriminately Religious	2	12	14
TOTAL	15	45	60

Table 7

Distribution of Ego Development Level by Gender

---

Ego Development Level	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
Low (I-3/4 and below)	10	23	33
High (I-4 and above)	5	22	27
TOTAL	15	45	60

---

Table 8

Distribution of Religious Affiliation by Religious Orientation

Religious Orientation	Religious Affiliation					Total
	Catholic	Protestant	Jewish	None	Other	
Intrinsic	13	3	1	1	2	20
Extrinsic	4	2	1	1	1	9
Non-religious	7	2	3	3	2	17
Indiscriminately Religious	7	6	0	1	0	14
TOTAL	31	13	5	6	5	60

Table 9

Distribution of Religious Affiliation by Ego Development Level

Ego Development Level	Religious Affiliation					Total
	Catholic	Protestant	Jewish	None	Other	
Low	18	5	1	5	4	33
High	13	8	4	1	1	27
TOTAL	31	13	5	6	5	60

Table 10

Distribution of Amount of Religious Activity by Religious Orientation

Amount of Religious Activity	Religious Orientation				Total
	Intrinsic	Extrinsic	Nonreligious	Indiscriminately Religious	
Never	0	1	1	0	2
Once every few years	0	0	6	0	6
Once a year	0	3	4	2	9
Several times a year	5	4	3	7	19
Once a month	0	0	0	0	0
Several times a month	1	0	3	2	6
Once a week	8	1	0	2	11
Several times a week	3	0	0	1	4
Once a day	2	0	0	0	2
Several times a day	1	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	20	9	17	14	60



Table 11

Disbribution of Amount of Religious Activity by Ego Development Level

Amount of Religious Activity	Ego Development Level		Total
	Low (I-3/4 and below)	High (I-4 and above)	
Never	2	0	2
Once every few years	2	4	6
Once a year	5	4	9
Several times a year	12	7	19
Once a month	0	0	0
Several times a month	5	1	6
Once a week	6	5	11
Several times a week	0	4	4
Once a day	0	2	2
Several times a day	1	0	1
TOTAL	33	27	60

A 2 x 4 analysis of variance of age by the independent variables of religious orientation and ego development level found a significant main effect due to ego development level,  $F(1,52) = 7.112, p < .05$ . As well, a one-tailed t-test and one-tailed F-test found ego development levels to differ significantly by age,  $F(32,26) = 12.01, p < .01$ ;  $t(29.55) = -2.55, p < .01$ . Higher ego development levels were associated with an older age.

## DISCUSSION

The results did not support Hypothesis 1. In this study, intrinsics did not have a statistically significantly higher ego level than other religious orientations, including extrinsics.

Although the small sample size necessitates conservative interpretation of results, this study nonetheless indicates that religious orientation, as measured by Allport's Religious Orientation Scale is not related to ego development level, as measured by Loevinger's system. Religious orientation does not tell one anything about character development or maturity, and ego development level does not indicate anything about religious orientation. The two may very well be two totally unrelated constructs. Thus, there may need to be a redefinition or at least a reclarification of intrinsic religiosity's "mature" and "integrative" aspects and of extrinsic religiosity's "compartmentalized" and "immature" aspects (Allport & Ross, 1967). In future studies, other measures and alternative constructs of maturity/immaturity and compartmentalized/integrative world views might be studied with the Religious Orientation Scale.

Contradicting Hypothesis 2's prediction, intrinsic scorers of their concepts of self, God, and persons of differing religiousness in more extreme ways than extrinsic scorers. Hypothesis 3 was not supported in that subjects with lower ego development levels did not score the concepts of self, God, and persons of differing religiousness in more extreme ways than those with higher ego development level. The original rationale for hypotheses 2 and 3 was that extrinsic scorers, who are theoretically and to an extent, empirically, more prejudiced and compartmentalized in their thinking, and people with lower ego development, who are theoretically immature and less complex, would score the concepts in terms of greater absolutes and broad generalizations rather than more tentative, balanced responses.

Given the findings, it might be that the number of extreme scores in this study may not measure rigidity and lack of complexity so much as confidence in scoring the very particular concepts of self, God, and persons of differing religiousness. This may be a function of greater familiarity, as intrinsic scorers, theoretically and empirically, tend to be more consistent churchgoers than extrinsic scorers. Thus, they are more involved in a culture and lifestyle where "God", "average person",

"yourself", "sinner", and "highly religious person" are common concepts with rather rote, "party-line" attributes. The extrinsics' prejudice is directed more to prominent outsiders to their immediate culture of interest. This would more often mean someone of a different ethnic or socioeconomic background rather than someone of a different degree of religiousness. It would make sense that the intrinsics who "live their religion" (Allport & Ross, 1967) would be more compartmentalized in their view of those in and out of their religious subculture and in their view of various classes of people differing in religiousness. Future research might explore the issue of prominence of religious subcultures and its relationship, if any, to stereotyping of and prejudice towards religious and nonreligious persons. The four different kinds of religious orientation might be studied in this light. It may mean that the "prejudice" of the extrinsic must be qualified and specified further, especially if intrinsics are found to be more prejudiced toward nonreligious persons.

Religious orientation was found to influence the variance of the average person-sinner and highly religious person-sinner congruency scores. More

specifically, it was found that extrinsics rated average and highly religious persons as being more alike than intrinsics, contrary to Hypothesis 4's prediction. The prejudiced, rigid extrinsic was predicted in the hypothesis to compartmentalize and put into separate boxes the average person, highly religious person, and sinner. This was not the case. Instead, the intrinsics seem to have compartmentalized in particular the two concepts of average person and highly religious persons. (There was not a similar finding for congruency scores of average person-sinner and of sinner-highly religious person).

One possibility may be that the intrinsic may more closely identify with being a highly religious person than an extrinsic might and as such the distinction between an average person and highly religious person would be a more salient one than for the extrinsic. In other words, there is a hierarchy of these concepts, with highly religious person at the top, average person in the middle, and sinner at the bottom. Most people could probably agree and rate highly religious person and sinner as somewhat different. However, to make a more extreme distinction between average person and sinner and/or average person and highly religious person

may require that there be a personal investment in one of these concepts and in it being quite different from the others. An intrinsic may see himself or herself as highly religious and it being above average and out-of-the-ordinary in the mainstream culture; this would be expected for someone whose religiosity is all-encompassing and meaning-endowing and who "lives his religion" (Allport & Ross, 1967). Likewise, it would not be expected for the extrinsic who "uses his religion" as a means to an end. (Allport & Ross, 1967)

Of interest was that those with higher ego development levels rated highly religious persons and sinners as more alike than those with lower ego development. Also, those with lower ego development rated average and highly religious persons as being more alike than those with higher ego development. It may be that those with higher ego development do indeed have less of a range of difference when looking at highly religious persons, average persons, and sinners because they see people as generally more alike because of their greater maturity, integration, and capacity to deal with complexity. However, they apparently see more of a difference between average and highly religious persons than those with lower ego development.

Meaningfulness may be the crucial issue here. It is speculative and would require further study, but it could very well be that those with higher ego development may be invested in viewing persons of differing religiousness, at extreme ends of the continuum, as more equal and similar than those of lower ego development. Also, those with lower ego development may be particularly sensitive to even very subtle situations of superiority-inferiority, status, and authority that might have led to wanting to make the average person and highly religious person more equal. Persons with lower ego development theoretically and empirically conform more to social dictates and are less individualistic and as such it might have been socially desirable to believe or to rate the average person as being quite similar to a highly religious person. In general, in dealing with a rather neutral concept like "average person", the person with low ego development, except for the lowest levels, tends to have a positive, uncomplex way of approaching concepts. The person with higher ego development would probably approach a neutral concept positively, but in a more balanced, tentative, and complex fashion.



The significant finding that intrinsics score God as more yielding on the tenacious-yielding item than extrinsics is mildly supportive of Hypothesis 5. Intrinsics and extrinsics did not significantly differ in their ratings of God on the punishing-forgiving and prohibitive-permissive items. The extrinsics' God may be more tenacious, but He is not necessarily more punitive, rigid, and negative than the intrinsics' God, contrary to Hypothesis 5's suggestions. Other studies might compare the concepts of God among the different religious orientation groups, including the nonreligious and indiscriminately religious in comparison with each other and the intrinsics and extrinsics. Allport's theory does not address what the concept of God might look for the different religious orientations, so the work in this area would be exploratory. A more fruitful, theory-based approach to studying the concept of God may be to standardize and perhaps develop a scoring system for Ana-Maria Rizzuto's semi-structured interview (1979). The most promising theory base for looking at and predicting a person's concept of God comes from object relations theory--essentially, a person's concept of God will be deeply influenced by an individual's internalized concepts of significant others throughout development (parental figures in particular).

Religious orientation does affect favorableness of self rating, but not in the direction predicted in Hypothesis 6. Intrinsic rated themselves more favorably than extrinsics. Intrinsic also rated themselves as more like God and more like highly religious persons than extrinsics, while extrinsics rated themselves as more like the average person than the intrinsic.

It may be intrinsic and/or extrinsic may have a very accurate self-view or it may be that intrinsic have a favorable bias toward themselves and/or extrinsic prefer a more modest status. Perhaps extrinsic might not be able to see themselves as being out of the ordinary. Of these possible explanations, the amount of self-enhancing ratings of the intrinsic would indicate a favorable bias in looking at themselves. It is not surprising, given religious culture, that the sincere and devout intrinsic would identify himself more closely with God and a highly religious person. The extrinsic's identifying more with an average person, but not a sinner, may be indicative of religion's not-so-central place in the extrinsic's life. The extrinsic may be wanting to avoid close identification with God and the highly religious; for the extrinsic, it might mean one is fanatical,

unbalanced, and too unmainstream, and maybe it is even disadvantageous to personal goals to so closely identify with God and the highly religious. It is not a value of the extrinsic to make his religion all-encompassing. For the intrinsic, on the other hand, it is desirable and valuable to aspire to be highly religious and God-like.

Interestingly, those with lower ego development rated themselves as more like God and highly religious persons than those with higher ego development level. These ratings may be accurate self-views, but it would seem that those with lower ego development level would be theoretically more motivated to enhance themselves and to be socially desirable than those with higher ego development levels.

Future studies might make more of a conscious effort to measure or control social desirability in looking at these self ratings. Of course, an important assumption is that to be more God-like and to be highly religious is more socially desirable than being an average person or a sinner. This assumption cannot be lightly or quickly made. There might be a greater agreement that it is desirable to have more popular qualities of God such as perfection, compassion, and

goodness, but other qualities such as omnipotence and judgmental would be less boldly embraced. A highly religious person can conjure images up of snobbish hypocrites, television evangelists after power, fame and wealth, a self-righteous prudish individual as well as images of the quiet, longsuffering devout, of saints, and of martyrs. Future study might explore what public sentiment is stirred with the concept of "highly religious".

It was found that religious activity and religious orientation were related. This is consistent with other studies which found intrinsics were more regular church attenders than extrinsics (Batson, 1976; Batson & Ventis, 1982; Jackson, 1981; Spilka, et al, 1968).

Age and ego development level were also found to be related. Older subjects tended to have higher ego development levels. This finding is consistent with other studies which have found age to have a great effect on correlations between ego development and other variables (Hauser, 1976).

The measures, which were all self-report, were certainly limited by social desirability and other factors which might have influenced the findings. Use of more behavioral measures as a way of gauging

personality rigidity and flexibility would be very helpful in exploring some of the issues addressed in this study. Another alternative would be to obtain personality ratings from objective others, such as clinicians, or personality ratings from friends, acquaintances, and family.

Self-report, particularly in this area of study, may lead subjects to stray from revealing personal concepts and instead, presenting the socially-prevalent concept or the institutionally-advocated concept. For example, a person may not stop and think about their personal concept of God, but instead may mark attributes of God according to some religious tradition that is acceptable to them. The concepts of self, God, highly religious person, sinner, and average person may be so elusive, as well, that subjects may not be able to easily define these. The 15 bipolar adjectives on the semantic differentials may also have been too limiting and thus, unable to capture the important complexities of these concepts that would be relevant to ego development and religiosity. In terms of these concepts, then, a more specifically worded questionnaire might be able to tap into personalized conceptions better as well as allowing for greater complexity. This

may be the best route as studying the concept of God and persons of differing religiousness is still in the exploratory stages. A useful alternative to the semantic differential in measuring self-concept may be using one of the more widely used and standardized self-concept and self-esteem measures. The established reliability and validity of these measures may more effectively explore the issue of inflated self-concept of extrinsics as compared with intrinsics.

Of the measures, the ego development level scored by Loevinger's system, has been shown to be most correlated with behaviors in the predicted theoretical direction. The religious orientation and concept of God constructs offer opportunities for theoretical development in terms of behaviors associated with different religiosity types and concepts of God, as well as the opportunity to explore validity along these lines.

## SUMMARY

The major finding of this study is that, as measured by the instruments used, religiosity is not related to character development or maturity in any way. Religiosity does influence one's concept of God as more yielding than tenacious if one is an intrinsic as opposed to an extrinsic. Ego development level does not influence differing concepts of God. Intrinsic view themselves more favorably than extrinsics, while intrinsic and those with lower ego development will identify themselves more with highly religious persons and God than will extrinsics and those with higher ego development.

Most of the results were in the opposite direction of the predictions. The hypotheses were based largely on theoretical claims as well as on previous findings from empirical studies. It is curious, then, how such a large portion of these current findings contradict the hypotheses. It may be that the sample in this study, undergraduates from a primarily Catholic University with half being Catholic, may be distinctive in how ego development level and type of religiosity are unrelated and in how ego level and religiosity are related to

concept of God, self, and persons of differing religiousness.



## REFERENCES

- Allport, G.W. (1937). Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Holt.
- Allport, G.W. (1950). The Individual and His Religion. New York: MacMillan.
- Allport, G.W., & Ross, J.M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 432-443.
- Anastasi, A. (1982). Psychological Testing (fifth edition). New York: MacMillan.
- Annis, L.V. (1975). Study of value as a predictor of helping behavior. Psychological Reports, 37, 717-718.
- Annis, L.V. (1976). Emergency helping and religious behavior. Psychological Reports, 39, 151-158.
- Baker, M., & Gorsuch, R. (1982). Trait anxiety and intrinsic-extrinsic religiousness. Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion, 21, 119-122.
- Batson, C.D. (1976). Religion as prosocial: Agent or double agent? Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 15, 29-45.

- Batson, C.D., & Gray, R.A. (1981). Religious orientation and helping behavior: Responding to one's own or to the victim's needs? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 511-520.
- Batson, C. D., & Ventis, W.L. (1982). The Religious Experience: A Social-Psychological Perspective. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Benson, P.L., Dehority, J., Gorman, L. Hanson, E., Hochschwender, M., Lebold, C., Rohr, R., & Sullivan, J. (1980). Interpersonal correlates of nonspontaneous helping behavior. Journal of Social Psychology, 110, 87-95.
- Blasi, A. (1972). A developmental approach to responsibility training. Doctoral dissertation, Washington University.
- Blatt, S.J., Brenneis, C.B., Schimek, J., & Glick, M. (1976). Normal development and the psychopathological impairment of the concept of the object on the Rorschach. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 85, 264-273.
- Candee, D. (1974). Ego developmental aspects of new left ideology. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 620-630.
- Cox, N. (1974). Prior help, ego development, and helping behavior. Child Development, 45, 594-603.

- Crandall, J.E., & Rasmussen, R.D. (1975). Purpose in life as related to specific values. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 31, 483-485.
- Dittes, J. E. (1969). Psychology of religion. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.) The Handbook of Social Psychology (Vol. 5). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Donahue, M. J. (1985). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 400-419.
- Greenwald, A.G. (1975). Consequences of prejudice against the null hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 82, 1-20.
- Haan, N., Smith, B., & Block, J. (1968). Moral reasoning of young adults. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 183-201.
- Haan, N., Stroud, J., & Holstein, J. (1973). Moral and ego stages in relationship to ego processes: A study of "hippies". Journal of Personality, 41, 596-612.
- Harakel, C. (1971). Ego maturity and interpersonal style: A multivariate study of Loewinger's theory. Doctoral dissertation, Catholic University.

- Hauser, S.T. (1976). Loevinger's model and measure of ego development: A critical review. Psychological Bulletin, 80, 928-955.
- Hoge, D.R., & Carroll, J.W. (1973). Religiosity and prejudice in Northern and Southern churches. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 12, 181-197.
- Hoppe, C. (1972). Ego development and conformity behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University.
- Hunsberger, B., & Ennis, J. (1982). Experimenter effects in studies of religious attitudes. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 21, 131-137.
- Jackson, S.E. (1981). Measurement of commitment to role identities. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 138-146.
- James, W. (1961). The varieties of religious experience. New York: MacMillan.
- Johnson, P.E. (1959). Psychology of Religion (revised edition). New York: Abingdon.
- Kahoe, R.D. (1974). Personality and achievement correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 812-818.

- Kahoe, R.D. (1977). Intrinsic religion and authoritarianism: A differentiated relationship. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 16, 179-183.
- Kahoe, R.D., & Dunn, R.F. (1975). The fear of death and religious attitudes and behavior. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 14, 379-382.
- Krug, R.E. (1961). An analysis of the F scale: I. Item factor-analysis. Journal of Social Psychology, 53, 285-291.
- Lambert, H. (1972). Comparison of cognitive development theories of ego and moral development. Proceedings of the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 7, 115-116.
- Lester, D. (1967). Experimental and correlational studies of the fear of death. Psychological Bulletin, 67, 27-36.
- Loevinger, J. (1966). The meaning and measurement of ego development. American Psychologist, 21, 195-206.
- Loevinger, J. (1979). Construct validity of the sentence completion test of ego development. Applied Psychological Measurement, 3, 281-311.

- Loevinger, J. (1985). Revision of the Sentence Completion Test for Ego Development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 420-427.
- Loevinger, J., & Wessler, R. (1970). Measuring ego development. 1. Construction and use of a sentence completion test. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lovekin, A., & Malony, H.N. (1977). Religious glossolalia: A longitudinal study of personality changes. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 16, 383-393.
- Lucas, R. (1971). Validation of a test of ego development by means of a standardized interview. Doctoral dissertation, Washington University.
- McAdams, D.P. (1985). Power, intimacy, and the life story: Personological inquiries into identity. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. (1983). Psychological maturity and subjective well-being: Toward a new synthesis. Developmental Psychology, 19, 243-248.
- Meadow, M.J., & Kahoe, R.D. (1984). Psychology of religion: Religion in individual lives. New York: Harper & Row.
- Minton, B., & Spilka, B. (1976). Perspectives on death in relation to powerless and form of personal religion. Omega, 7, 261-267.

- Morris, R.J., & Hood, R.W., Jr. (1981). The generalizability and specificity of intrinsic/extrinsic orientation. Review of Religious Research, 22, 245-254.
- Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., & Tannenbaum, P.H. (1957). The measurement of meaning. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Paloutzian, R.F. (1983). Invitation to the psychology of religion. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Paloutzian, R.F., Jackson, S.L., & Crandall, J.E. (1978). Conversion experience, belief system, and personal and ethical attitudes. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 6, 266-275.
- Redmore, C., & Waldman, K. (1975). Reliability of a sentence completion measure of ego development. Journal of Personality Assessment, 39, 236-243.
- Rest, J.R. (1986). Moral development: advances in research and theory. New York: Praeger.
- Rizzuto, A. (1979). The birth of the living God: A psychoanalytic study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). The open and closed mind: Investigations into the nature of belief systems and personality systems. New York: Basic Books.

- Rootes, M.D., Moras, K., & Gordon, R. (1980). Ego development and sociometrically evaluated maturity: An investigation of the validity of the Washington University sentence completion test of ego development. Journal of Personality Assessment, 44, 613-620.
- Rozsnafszky, J. (1981). The relationship of level of ego development to Q-sort personality rating. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 99-120.
- Snider, J.G., & Osgood, C.E., eds. (1969). Semantic differential technique: A sourcebook. Chicago: Aldine.
- Spilka, B., Pelligrini, R.J., & Dailey, K. (1968). Religion, American values and death perspectives. Sociological Symposium, 1, 57-66.
- Spilka, B., & Mullin, M. (1977). Personal religion and psychological schemata: A research approach to a theological psychology of religion. Character Potential, 8, 57-66.
- Stewin, L., & Anderson, C.C. (1974). Cognitive complexity as a determinant of information processing. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 20, 233-243.



- Strickland, B.R., & Shaffer, S. (1971). I-E, I-E, & F. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 10, 383-393.
- Sullivan, E.V., McCullough, G., & Stager, M. (1970). A developmental study of the relationship between conceptual, ego, and moral development. Child Development, 41, 399-411.
- Thompson, A.D. (1974). Open-mindedness and indiscrimination (sic) antireligious orientation. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 13, 471-477.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

Code No. \_\_\_\_\_

How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_

Are you:           (    ) male                           (    ) female

What is your religious affiliation?

- |                   |                             |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| (    ) Catholic   | (    ) None                 |
| (    ) Protestant | (    ) Other-please specify |
| (    ) Jewish     |                             |

If you are Protestant, what denomination are you (Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, etc.)?

\_\_\_\_\_

If you belong to a special sect of your religion, please list it below:

\_\_\_\_\_

How often do you participate in religious activities (for example, attend synagogue, church, pray, etc.)?

- |                              |                             |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (    ) Never                 | (    ) Once a week          |
| (    ) Once every few years  | (    ) Several times a week |
| (    ) Once a year           | (    ) Once a day           |
| (    ) Several times a year  | (    ) Several times a day  |
| (    ) Once a month          |                             |
| (    ) Several times a month |                             |

**APPENDIX B**

Code No. \_\_\_\_\_

## SENTENCE COMPLETION (form 81)

Instructions: Please complete the following sentences.

1. When a child will not join in group activities
2. Raising a family
3. When I am criticized
4. A man's job
5. Being with other people
6. The thing I like about myself is
7. My mother and I
8. What gets me into trouble is

10. When people are helpless

11. Women are lucky because

12. A good father

13. A girl has a right to

14. When they talked about sex, I

15. A wife should

16. I feel sorry

17. A man feels good when

18. Rules are

Code No. \_\_\_\_\_

SENTENCE COMPLETION (Form 81/2)

Instructions: Please complete the following sentences. If you are female, use the gender terms as they are. If you are male, use the gender terms in parentheses ( ) when they appear; otherwise use the gender terms as they are when parentheses do not appear.

1. Crime and delinquency could be halted if
2. Ment are lucky because
3. I just can't stand people who
4. At times she (he) worried about
5. I am
6. A woman feels good when
7. My main problem is
8. A husband has a right to

9. The worst thing about being a woman (man)
10. A good mother
11. When I am with a man (woman)
12. Sometimes she (he) wished that
13. My father
14. If I can't get what I want
15. Usually she (he) felt that sex
16. For a woman a career is
17. My conscience bothers me if
18. A woman (man) should always



APPENDIX C

## Allport's Religious Orientation Scale

Code No. \_\_\_\_\_

Rate your personal agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements by circling the number on the scale which best represents the way you feel. Rate all the statements; leave none blank. SD means strongly disagree (number 1), D means disagree (number 4), A means agree (number 6), SA means strongly agree (number 9), while number 5 is neutral. The following questions concern the prevalence of various religious ideas and practices. There is no consensus about right or wrong answers; some people will agree and others will disagree with each of the statements.

- | SD | D |   | A |   | SA |   |   |   |  |
|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|--|
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in life.           |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 2. Church is important as a place to go for comfort and refuge from the trials and problems of life. |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 3. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.       |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 4. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.                          |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 5. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church.                                   |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 6. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.                                   |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 7. The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships.                   |

- | SD | D |   |   |   | A |   |   |   | SA |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |    |   |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | 8. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.   |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | 9. What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike.  |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | 10. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.  |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | 11. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services. |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | 12. Although I am a religious person I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.          |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | 13. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity.                    |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | 14. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being.                                  |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | 15. I read literature about my faith (or church).   |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | 16. Prayer influences my dealings with other people.  |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | 17. I pray even when I have no problems.  |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | 18. Nothing is as important to me as serving God as best I know how.  |

- | SD | D |   |   | A | SA |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 |   |
|    |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   | 19. One should seek God's guidance when making very important decisions.  |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 20. If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join a Bible Study group rather than a social fellowship.            |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 21. Occasionally I find it necessary to compromise religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being. |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 22. One reason for being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.              |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 23. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.  |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 24. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.                     |
| 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 25. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.   |

## Religious Orientation Scale

Buffer Items: 2, 16, 17, 18, 19

Extrinsic Scale: 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 21, 22, 25

Intrinsic Scale: 3, 5, 8, 11, 14, 15, 20, 23, 24

Scoring of scales

Intrinsic scale:       Score of 45 and below--low  
                          Score of 46 and above--high

Extrinsic scale:       Score of 55 and below--low  
                          Score of 56 and above--high

intrinsic:   high on intrinsic scale, low on extrinsic  
                          scale

extrinsic:   high on extrinsic scale, low on intrinsic  
                          scale

nonreligious: low on intrinsic and extrinsic scale

indiscriminately religious: high on intrinsic and  
                          extrinsic scale

APPENDIX D

## SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE

Instructions: At the top of each of the following seven pages, you will find a different person or thing to be judged, and beneath it, fifteen sets of words which we would like you to use in making your judgments. For an example, look at the next page. The person we would like you to judge here is "one of your worst high school teachers." This word appears at the top of the page.

If you think that this particular teacher is very GOOD or very BAD, place a check mark or "X" directly above the short line closest to the word GOOD or the word BAD.

1. GOOD X \_\_\_\_\_ BAD
1. GOOD \_\_\_\_\_ X BAD

If you think that this certain teacher is somewhat GOOD or somewhat BAD, you would put your check mark in the following positions:

1. GOOD \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ OR \_\_\_\_\_ BAD
1. GOOD \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ BAD

If you think that this teacher is only slightly GOOD or slightly BAD, you would put your check mark in one of the following positions:

1. GOOD \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ OR \_\_\_\_\_ BAD
1. GOOD \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ BAD

If you think that this teacher is neither GOOD nor BAD, or that this teacher is equally GOOD and BAD, you would write in "neither" or "equal" above the middle short line.

1. GOOD \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ OR \_\_\_\_\_ BAD
1. GOOD \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ OR \_\_\_\_\_ BAD

In the same way, we would like you to give your judgments on one of your worst teachers in high school using the remaining 14 pairs of words: INEFFECTIVE-EFFECTIVE, CRUEL-KIND, and so on, until you have completed the page.

Please give your opinions about each of the persons listed at the top of each page. Please do the pages in order, and in each case complete the entire page.

On all of these, we are interested mainly in your FIRST opinions. Therefore, we ask you to work as rapidly as possible.



Code No. \_\_\_\_\_

## Yourself

---

 Very   Some   Slightly   Neither   Slightly   Some   Very
 

---

- |                 |             |
|-----------------|-------------|
| 1. GOOD         | BAD         |
| 2. INEFFECTIVE  | EFFECTIVE   |
| 3. CRUEL        | KIND        |
| 4. FOOLISH      | WISE        |
| 5. WORTHLESS    | VALUABLE    |
| 6. REPENTANT    | UNREPENTANT |
| 7. PLEASANT     | UNPLEASANT  |
| 8. SELFISH      | UNSELFISH   |
| 9. HONEST       | DISHONEST   |
| 10. PUNISHING   | FORGIVING   |
| 11. STRONG      | WEAK        |
| 12. TENACIOUS   | YIELDING    |
| 13. PROHIBITIVE | PERMISSIVE  |
| 14. ACTIVE      | PASSIVE     |
| 15. FAST        | SLOW        |

Code No. \_\_\_\_\_

## Highly Religious Person

---

 Very    Some    Slightly    Neither    Slightly    Some    Very
 

---

- |                 |             |
|-----------------|-------------|
| 1. GOOD         | BAD         |
| 2. INEFFECTIVE  | EFFECTIVE   |
| 3. CRUEL        | KIND        |
| 4. FOOLISH      | WISE        |
| 5. WORTHLESS    | VALUABLE    |
| 6. REPENTANT    | UNREPENTANT |
| 7. PLEASANT     | UNPLEASANT  |
| 8. SELFISH      | UNSELFISH   |
| 9. HONEST       | DISHONEST   |
| 10. PUNISHING   | FORGIVING   |
| 11. STRONG      | WEAK        |
| 12. TENACIOUS   | YIELDING    |
| 13. PROHIBITIVE | PERMISSIVE  |
| 14. ACTIVE      | PASSIVE     |
| 15. FAST        | SLOW        |

Code No. \_\_\_\_\_

## Sinner

---

 Very   Some   Slightly   Neither   Slightly   Some   Very
 

---

- |                 |             |
|-----------------|-------------|
| 1. GOOD         | BAD         |
| 2. INEFFECTIVE  | EFFECTIVE   |
| 3. CRUEL        | KIND        |
| 4. FOOLISH      | WISE        |
| 5. WORTHLESS    | VALUABLE    |
| 6. REPENTANT    | UNREPENTANT |
| 7. PLEASANT     | UNPLEASANT  |
| 8. SELFISH      | UNSELFISH   |
| 9. HONEST       | DISHONEST   |
| 10. PUNISHING   | FORGIVING   |
| 11. STRONG      | WEAK        |
| 12. TENACIOUS   | YIELDING    |
| 13. PROHIBITIVE | PERMISSIVE  |
| 14. ACTIVE      | PASSIVE     |
| 15. FAST        | SLOW        |

Code No. \_\_\_\_\_

## Average Person

---

 Very   Some   Slightly   Neither   Slightly   Some   Very
 

---

- |                 |             |
|-----------------|-------------|
| 1. GOOD         | BAD         |
| 2. INEFFECTIVE  | EFFECTIVE   |
| 3. CRUEL        | KIND        |
| 4. FOOLISH      | WISE        |
| 5. WORTHLESS    | VALUABLE    |
| 6. REPENTANT    | UNREPENTANT |
| 7. PLEASANT     | UNPLEASANT  |
| 8. SELFISH      | UNSELFISH   |
| 9. HONEST       | DISHONEST   |
| 10. PUNISHING   | FORGIVING   |
| 11. STRONG      | WEAK        |
| 12. TENACIOUS   | YIELDING    |
| 13. PROHIBITIVE | PERMISSIVE  |
| 14. ACTIVE      | PASSIVE     |
| 15. FAST        | SLOW        |

Code No. \_\_\_\_\_

## God

---

 Very   Some   Slightly   Neither   Slightly   Some   Very

- |                 |             |
|-----------------|-------------|
| 1. GOOD         | BAD         |
| 2. INEFFECTIVE  | EFFECTIVE   |
| 3. CRUEL        | KIND        |
| 4. FOOLISH      | WISE        |
| 5. WORTHLESS    | VALUABLE    |
| 6. REPENTANT    | UNREPENTANT |
| 7. PLEASANT     | UNPLEASANT  |
| 8. SELFISH      | UNSELFISH   |
| 9. HONEST       | DISHONEST   |
| 10. PUNISHING   | FORGIVING   |
| 11. STRONG      | WEAK        |
| 12. TENACIOUS   | YIELDING    |
| 13. PROHIBITIVE | PERMISSIVE  |
| 14. ACTIVE      | PASSIVE     |
| 15. FAST        | SLOW        |

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Diane Lin has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Dan P. McAdams, Director  
Associate Professor, Psychology, Loyola

Dr. Alan S. DeWolfe  
Professor, Psychology, Loyola

Dr. Eugene Kennedy  
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.

11/24/87  
Date

Dan P. McAdams  
Director's Signature