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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For many people religion is a strong influence in life. Religious beliefs provide explanation and interpretation of the natural world. Religious practices serve to express and enhance these beliefs. Religious beliefs can also provide guidelines and ideals for living, e.g., justice, peace, brotherhood.

Furthermore, religious belief or faith, as it incorporates the spiritual dimensions or commitments of a person, can itself be considered as an ideal. That is, people can think of their religious belief as a goal or ideal which they strive to achieve. Such ideals can be described by an individual as being mature or immature. And there is a reasonable assumption that individuals would prefer, and try to move towards, mature faith. The description of mature or immature faith may vary, but the movement towards, or away from, a religious ideal can be recognized. In this perspective, faith is regarded as a developmental process, analogous to any recognized phase of personality development.

It is possible to conceptualize and measure religion or faith in absolute or objective terms, e.g., behaviors like church attendance or test data interpreted in the light of validated norms. However, the present study, influenced by self theory and the importance of the self-concept, is concerned with religious maturity from a subjective or phenomenological point of view. That is, what is the subject's
experience--feeling or awareness--of success in striving to achieve the religious ideal he personally espouses. For example, does he feel more or less close to his ideal; does he feel he is making progress? If religious belief is considered a childish fixation, presumably personality development and religious development are inversely related; but if religion can promote personal growth (Jung, 1933), then the relationship may be positive.

Finally, the questioning, the re-evaluating and the reforms within religious groups during the past decade suggest that an individual's religious outlook or style or orientation may be an important personality variable. For example, would a person who is strongly committed to traditional dogmas of faith and/or closely aligns himself with the external structure (i.e., practices, customs) of the church be particularly affected during a period of reform and change? Such a mentality is frequently considered conservative, as opposed to liberal.

The purpose, then, of this research is to study religious maturity in relation to personality development and liberal-conservative religious orientation.

Religious maturity is considered from a phenomenological perspective (MacLeod, 1958; Rogers, 1951; Snygg & Combs, 1949; Wylie, 1961), i.e., a description of the essential characteristics of the "most mature" and the "most immature kind of faith" in terms of one's own assumptions, perceptions, values and goals (Cantril, 1965; Struck, 1967). Religious maturity is operationally defined by a self-rating of successful striving towards this faith-ideal on the Maturity of Faith Scale (Kennedy & Heckler, 1971).
Personality development is conceived not as adjustment, but as personal growth or self-actualization, which is a related but different construct (Freeman & Giovannoni, 1968; Murphy, 1972). Self-actualization is operationally defined by the Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom, 1963). The self-actualized person is described as living a fuller, more enriched life because he uses his capabilities more productively, integrates past, present and future more effectively, functions with greater autonomy, and is less troubled by inhibition and emotional confusion (Shostrom, 1968).

Liberal-conservative religious orientation is conceived in terms of acceptance of orthodox doctrine versus individual conscience, the desire for traditional forms and roles, and rejection of human sources of faith. This orientation is operationally defined by the Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale (Kupst, 1972).

This study is undertaken in the light of conclusions drawn from a review of the literature which indicated: a) a need to clarify the relationship between personality development and religious development; b) the psychological and theological significance of the liberal-conservative religious orientation; c) the appropriateness of measuring one's self-perceived level of striving towards greater maturity of faith; d) the possibility of controlling certain variables that have complicated the interpretation of other studies.

The literature review suggests three hypotheses, which are developed in the following section, but can briefly be stated here:

1. Self-actualization is positively related to religious development;
2. A more liberal religious orientation is positively related to religious development;
3. Among the more self-actualized subjects, liberals and conservatives do not differ significantly on religious development.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Nature of Self-actualization

Self-actualization (SA) is a collection of ideas and assumptions, with some empirical basis, about the nature of man (Maslow, 1954). It is a product of many diverse influences, e.g., phenomenology, gestalt psychology and an organismic view of the person (Cofer & Appley, 1967).

Maslow

Maslow (1968), who was probably the outstanding proponent of SA, referred to a number of formulations, e.g., self-development, individuation, autonomy, productiveness, self-realization, self-actualization, as being "crudely synonymous" (p. 24) in describing an area that could not be sharply defined at the present time, although a solid core of agreement was perceptible:

All definitions accept or imply, a) acceptance and expression of the inner core or self, i.e., actualization of these latent capacities and potentialities, full functioning, availability of the human and personal essence. b) They all imply minimal presence of ill health, neurosis, psychosis, or loss or diminution of the basic human and personal capacities (p. 197).

On the basis of a small amount of empirical research and diverse clinical experiences, Maslow claimed that SA could be adequately described and measured. Among the objectively describable and measurable characteristics were the following: clearer and more efficient perception of reality, more openness to experience, increased
integration, wholeness and unity of the person; increased spontaneity
and expressiveness; a real self, firm identity, autonomy; increased
objectivity, detachment and transcendence of the self; recovery of
creativity; ability to fuse concreteness and abstractness; democratic
character structure; ability to love. Among the subjective experiences
that confirm or reinforce SA are the following: feelings of zest in
living, serenity, joy, responsibility, confidence in one's ability to
handle stress and anxiety.

Most, and perhaps all, people tend toward SA, at least in
principle. However, by Maslow's criteria, less than one per cent of the
adult population reach SA. Such rare success is explained in terms of
an assumed hierarchy of needs with SA at the top, and a further
assumption that prior satisfaction of the lower needs, i.e., physio-
logical, safety, love and esteem needs, necessarily precedes satisfaction
of the highest need. The major obstacle to SA is contemporary life
which does not provide adequate circumstances for development.

From a critical point of view, relatively little is known about
Maslow's sample or methodology for evaluating such SA individuals;
secondly, the empirical evidence for his ideas is limited and fre-
quently equivocal; thirdly, many of the concepts, while colorful, are
vague; finally, the rarity of SA makes its innate, universal quality
questionable. Nevertheless, this model of man offers a welcome contrast
and balance to the Freudian and behavioristic conceptions. At the
present time, it is essential to operationalize the concept of SA, to
study in greater detail persons who live this kind of "higher life,"
and to research predictions based on the theory.
Shostrom and the Personal Orientation Inventory

Shostrom (1964, 1968) pursued Maslow's suggestion that psychological health can best be understood by studying persons with a high degree of fulfillment, and developed the Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom, 1963) to measure the values and behavior important in the development of self-actualization.

The Personal Orientation Inventory consists of 150 paired comparative judgments about values and behavior integral to the concept of SA. These items are based upon several therapists' judgments about healthy and troubled patients, and upon research and theoretical formulations of many writers in humanistic, existential and gestalt psychology. There is agreement that the items are related to Maslow's concept of SA, to Riesman, Glazer and Denny's (1950) system of inner and other-directedness, and to May, Angel and Ellenberger's (1958) concept of time orientation.

Of the 150 items, 127 are scored for Inner Direction, and 23 for Time Competency. Thus, Inner Direction (ID), sometimes referred to as Inner Support, and Time Competency (TC) form the major scales. These same 150 items are scored a second time to establish ten subscales considered to be conceptually important elements of SA. The subscales are apparently formed on the basis of face validity.

The brief elaboration of the subscales may help to clarify the concept of SA and to show what the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) measures: Self-Actualizing Values, holds the values of self-actualizing persons; Existentiality, ability to react to situations without rigid adherence to principles; Feeling Reactivity, sensitivity to one's own
needs and feelings; Spontaneity, ability to express feelings in spontaneous behavior; Self-Regard, liking oneself because of one's worth as a person; Self-Acceptance, acceptance of self despite weaknesses or deficiencies; Nature of Man, regarding man as essentially good; Synergy, seeing the opposites of life as meaningfully related; Acceptance of Aggression, accepting feelings of anger or aggression as natural; Capacity for Intimate Contact, ability to develop meaningful, deep relationships unencumbered by expectations and obligations.

(Confer, Appendix A)

The major scales of Inner Direction and Time Competency can also be clarified. In his time orientation, the non-self-actualized person is excessively concerned with the past due to guilt, regret, blaming or resentment; and/or with the present due to his meaningless activity and unreflective pre-occupations that keep him from facing himself; and/or the future due to idealized expectations, fears or obsessive worries. The SA person is less burdened by guilt and resentment, and his aspirations are meaningfully tied to present working goals; therefore, he can tie the past and future to the present in more meaningful continuity.

The inner-directed person is guided by an inner core of principles and character traits that operate like a psychic gyroscope. The other-directed person is primarily concerned with pleasing others, thus insuring constant acceptance and approval. The SA person is more autonomous and self-supportive than the non-self-actualized person, more willing to expand earlier principles of living. Thus, the SA person strikes a creative balance between inner and outer-direction.
For example, while he is sensitive to people's affection, approval and good will, the source of his actions is essentially internal. While no one can be time-competent and inner-directed all of the time, the self-actualized person is one who more characteristically acts in such a way.

**Validity Studies of the Personal Orientation Inventory**

The pattern of results from a number of studies provides evidence for the validity of the POI.

The basic requirement is that the POI discriminate between actualized and non-actualized subjects. Practicing, certified clinical psychologists carefully selected a group of self-actualized (N = 29) and a group of non-self-actualized (N = 34) subjects (Shostrom, 1964). These groups differed significantly (p < .01) on the major scales of ID and TC, and on eight of the subscales (for a ninth subscale, p < .05).

Apparently the author assumed the validity of the clinical ratings of SA. Secondly, it is not clear how many judges rated each client. Since this was the standardizing population, and since clinical diagnosis and assessment is frequently debatable, a second rating to complement that given by the subject's own therapist would have been desirable.

Several studies compared SA with various kinds of pathology. Hospitalized psychiatric patients of both sexes (N = 185) were compared with normal, self-actualized and non-self-actualized groups (Fox, Knapp & Michael, 1968). All POI scales differentiated the patients from the normal and SA groups. The major scales, though not some of the subscales, differentiated (p < .01) the patients from the non-self-actualized group. Thus, patients are characterized by insufficient
self-realization, inadequate use of time, and relatively non-autonomous functioning.

Psychopathic felons were compared to normals and psychiatric patients (Fisher, 1968). The felons scored lower than the normals except on Self-Regard, which was higher, and Self-Actualizing Values and Capacity for Intimate Contact, which did not differ. Secondly, the felons scored higher than the patients. In addition, there was no significant correlation between age and the POI scales. Between Inner-Direction and IQ there was a small positive correlation (r = .22). When asked to simulate in order to make a good impression, the felons obtained lower scores than previously. Apparently, felons feel they possess a greater degree of actualization than is normative or conventional (Fisher, 1969).

Persons with neurotic symptoms and behavior would, theoretically be less SA than persons without such symptoms. Knapp (1965) administered the POI and the Eysenck Personality Inventory to 136 college students. A high neurotic group scored significantly higher on all scales of the POI than a low neurotic group. The expectation that SA persons would be relatively free of neurotic symptoms was confirmed.

Effective therapy presumably leads to greater psychological health. Shostrom and Knapp (1966) compared a beginning outpatient group and an advanced outpatient group on the POI and the MMPI. The advanced group was less pathological than the beginning group on the MMPI, and more self-actualized on the POI. The authors conclude that, as therapy progresses, pathology decreases; the improvement in psychological health is indicated by the POI.
Ratings of SA on the POI were found to concur with ratings made by observers familiar with Maslow's description, e.g., experiencing fully, making growth choices, listening to one's inner voice (McLain, 1970). Subjects were rated on a scale from one to six. The combined ratings correlated significantly with 11 of 14 POI measures, e.g., correlation of .69 with Inner Direction.

The theoretical description suggests that SA individuals would be liberal rather than conservative, open-minded, and non-authoritarian. Landes (1966) confirmed this expectation on a group of New York teachers (N = 128), correlating the POI with the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, the California F-Scale, The Dogmaticism Scale (Rokeach), and a Liberal-Conservative scale. Multiple correlation of the four attitude scales with the combined POI yielded correlations between .47 and .68 (p < .01).

Sensitivity groups, inasmuch as these may be considered to be growth experiences, suggest a possible area in which to validate the POI. Thus far, the results are not clear. Young and Jacobsen (1970) tested college students, seven participants and seven controls, four days before and four days after a 15 hour marathon. Both groups showed significant increase on re-testing, with no significant differences between the groups. The study may be criticized for its small sample, but it did show the importance of control groups in such studies. Guinan and Foulds (1970) compared a control group of 10 "volunteers for an experiment" with 10 "volunteers for a 30 hour week-end marathon." Subjects were controlled for age, sex, college class, but apparently not for motivation. The experimental group
showed significant gain ($p < .01$) on Inner Direction and six of the sub-
ccales. Because there was some, at least, short-term gain, and because
the experimental group did not differ significantly from two thousand
college students in the standardization data, increases on the POI may
reflect the results of a "growth" experience. However, the conclusion
is restricted because the control group was more actualized on the
pre-test; hence the possibility of both groups showing an improvement
on the post-test, and not differing, as in the previous study, could
not be controlled. A study such as this requires a larger sample,
with a control group method on all necessary variables, including
volunteering for a marathon experience.

The final study in this section is an important criticism of
the subscales of the POI. Klavetter and Hogan (1967), while accepting
the validity and stability of the major scales of Inner Direction and
Time Competency, investigated the usefulness of retaining the subscales.
Moderate to high intercorrelations, approximating the scales' reli-
bilities, were found. This indicates that many of the subscales lack
unique variance. Most striking were the consistently high correlations
of the other subscales with Inner Direction, and to a lesser extent
with Time Competency and Self-Actualizing Values. These three scales
account for almost all of the test variance. Since 127 of the 150
items are scored for Inner Direction, the results are not surprising.
The statistical redundancy indicates that test performance could be
expressed more accurately in terms of fewer dimensions. The research
implications of the statistical overlap were brought out by Damm (1969)
who showed that Inner Direction, by itself, is a very adequate overall
Reliability Studies

Test-retest reliability coefficients for the two major scales of ID and TC were .91 and .93, respectively (Shostrom, 1965). Klavetter and Mogar (1967) retested 48 college students after a one week interval and obtained a coefficient of .77 for ID and .71 for TC. Subtest reliabilities were from .52 to .82, with most of them moderately high. Shostrom (1968) offered coefficients of .84 for ID and .71 for TC based on the same data.

Ilardi and May (1967) retested 46 female nursing students after approximately 50 weeks and obtained correlations of .71 for ID and .55 for TC. Subscale coefficients were from .32 to .71 (median $r = .58$). The authors found these figures well within the range of somewhat comparable studies on the MMPI and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and found the results encouraging for a ground-breaking effort in this new area, although by no means completely satisfactory. Furthermore, they suggest, with some empirical basis, that factors like the stress of nursing education and maturation may have contributed to the lower reliabilities. Regarding the effect of maturation, eight of the twelve significant differences on retest were in the direction of greater psychological health.

Summary of Validity and Reliability Studies

The validity studies indicate that the POI makes a number of necessary discriminations between various kinds of groups: self-actualized and non-self-actualized; psychopaths, psychiatric patients and normals; subjects high and low on neurotic symptoms and behavior;
beginning and advanced therapy patients. Secondly, expected correlations were found between the POI and various other measures, e.g., MMPI, authoritarianism, dogmatism, liberalism-conservatism, trained observers. Thirdly, POI ratings concur with clinical ratings. In most studies the results are clearer or more pronounced for the major scales of Inner Direction and Time Competency.

Reliability coefficients are adequate, although not as high as first reported by Shostrom (1963). Stability coefficients for the subtests are generally high; however, some of the intercorrelations approximate the reliability coefficients, indicating that a number of scales lack unique variance. Almost all of the variance is accounted for by Inner Direction, Time Competency and Self-Actualization Values. Test results could, therefore, be expressed in fewer dimensions, e.g., factors interpreted as how one thinks and how one feels in terms of self-actualization (Silverstein & Fisher, 1968), or a unitary trait related to a desire to feel free and to act accordingly (LeMay & Damm, 1970). It is suggested that the subscales not be used independently in profile analysis.

Methodologically, a number of weaknesses characterize many of the studies, e.g., small samples, absence of control groups, lack of controls for age, sex, intelligence and/or social status.

Very little information has been published about the criterion groups of self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals. Nothing is stated about age, educational level or socio-economic status. Secondly, the criteria used by the clinical psychologists have not been clarified, except that the judges were asked to list two or three
adjectives describing the persons nominated.

Thus, there are limitations in the test, itself, and in some validating studies. The POI appears to operationalize adequately at least some of the dimensions of self-actualization suggested by Maslow and others. The POI represents a good step towards assessing normal persons, without resorting to clinically-oriented scales like the MMPI.

Relevance of Self-actualization to Maturity of Faith

The general impression of the self-actualized person is someone who "puts it all together" more constructively, at least in terms of the values implicit in the concept (Levy, 1970). More specifically, the theoretical description of SA includes several pertinent notions. The self-actualized person, in contrast with the less self-actualized, is marked by the following characteristics: a) increased autonomy and a greater tendency to make the growth choice (Maslow, 1967); b) more effective use of time with less concern about the past and the "way things used to be," and a greater concern with the continuing pursuit of future-oriented goals (Shostrom, 1968); c) greater self-support with less concern about pleasing others (Maslow, 1967); d) greater willingness to expand earlier principles of living and to tolerate conflicts between one's own understanding and that of others.

The relevance of such characteristics is enhanced in view of the discussions, polemics and reforms which have taken place within institutional religion, and particularly within Roman Catholicism, during the past decade (Hadden, 1969; McBrien, 1970; National Opinion Research Center, 1971).
Self-actualization theory suggests, therefore, that self-actualized persons may be more growth-oriented in their religious development as well; that they may be less dependent upon the institutional church and less disturbed by changes and turmoil within the church; and that they may be more interested in enriching their religious life style.

Maslow (1970) and Shostrom (1967) complement this argument by suggesting that religion, if it is geared to growth needs, can help, in a reciprocal way, in the achievement of higher levels of personality development. Shostrom (1967) describes this role of "religion in the actualized sense" as fostering self-direction and self-growth by stressing that the kingdom of God is within the person and that trusting one's nature is the highest form of religion because one is trusting God's handiwork. While such a theology may not be acceptable to all, the positive relationship between personal growth and religious development is underlined. The ideas of Maslow and Shostrom are presented here to conclude the consideration of self-actualization and to introduce the discussion of the religion variable. The major emphasis at this point is that more self-actualized persons are higher in religious development than less self-actualized persons. This hypothesis receives further support from the following discussion of religion and personality.

Religion and Personality

Four points are discussed in this section: a) the description of the "religion" variable and its relationship to personality; b) the concept of maturity of faith and its measurement; c) the liberal-
conservative religious orientation and its measurement; d) the appropriateness of a sample of Roman Catholic priests.

I. There is no theory which successfully organizes the considerable body of data about the psychology of religion. Numerous psychological descriptions of the religious construct have merited more or less acceptance. The description of the "religion" variable in a particular study must be carefully noted. The operational definition reflects the researcher's underlying philosophy or what he considers important for his purposes. Some variables are more objective, e.g., particular affiliation, specific practices, frequency of attendance; others are more subjective, e.g., personal attitudes, intensity of commitment, fundamental motivations.

Several studies, particularly those employing factor analysis, have sharpened the description of the "religion" variable. The number of dimensions or factors included in the concept of religion is unclear. Earlier studies, summarized by Brown (1966), explored the area of broad secular attitudes and found a large general religious factor, while more specifically religious studies have emphasized the multi-dimensional nature of the concept. Several of these can be reviewed.

Broen (1957) selected 133 statements representing the religious attitudes of five religious types described in the literature. On a small sample he isolated two factors: nearness to God and fundamentalism-humanitarianism. More importantly, he concluded that previous studies investigating the relationship between general religiosity and other classes of variables might have shown different results if religion had been broken down into its more basic dimensions. Glock (1962), later,
clarified five such dimensions: belief content, practices such as worship, feelings or experiences, knowledge, and effects. In a study specifically designed to test whether religion was uni-dimensional, King (1967) isolated Glock's first three factors, along with eight others, on a large sample of Methodists in Dallas.

Multiple factors were also found by Cline and Richards (1965) in their analysis of 58 variables derived from interview, questionnaire and projective data gathered from a random sample of adults in Salt Lake City. These multiple factors were found to be similar for both Mormons and non-Mormons; however, major sex differences did emerge. It is noteworthy that the major factor, regarding church attendance and frequency of prayer, did not significantly correlate with other variables, such as "having love and compassion for one's fellow man" and "being a good Samaritan." The authors conclude that there are many ways to be religious and to express this in behavior.

Finally, Keene's (1967) sophisticated study isolated several personality variables, such as neurotic/adaptive, spontaneous/inhibited, worldminded/ethnocentric, self-accommodating/group-accomodating; and several religious variables, such as salient/irrelevant, concerning the importance of religion in modern life, spiritual/secular, concerning intangibles like belief in an after-life and praying, orthodox/personal, concerning emphasis on doctrine and ritual versus personal experience. Patterns of personality variables were interrelated with patterns of the religious variables by canonical analysis. Five groups, matched for sex, education, age and socio-economic status, were compared; these included Jews, Protestants, Catholics, Baha'is and non-affiliates.
There were significant differences between the groups both on the
various factors and on the patterns of interaction between the religion
and personality variables. The results are too complicated to be
summarized here, but they do point out the complexity of the religion
variable and interfaith differences in the relationship between religion
and personality.

Several relevant conclusions can be drawn from these studies.
In general, a large common religion factor emerged when diverse
attitudes were studied and samples were heterogeneous; however,
multiple factors emerged when samples were homogeneous, e.g., committed
individuals or members of a particular religious group, and when items
were specifically religious. Secondly, multiple factors, some of them
replicated, have been found; thus the religion variable can be broken
down in many ways. In other words, there are many different aspects
to a person's religion, many different areas in which one may be more
or less mature. Thirdly, these aspects of religion are not the same
for men and women. Finally, the pattern of relationships between the
various aspects of religion and several personality variables are not
the same across diverse religious groups.

The present study accepts the multi-dimensionality of the
religion variable, but does not require any decision about the most
appropriate number of dimensions. The pertinent issue now is the
relationship between the religion variable and personality. This
relationship has been described in both positive and negative terms.

The possibility of a negative relationship has been widely noted
in the literature (Allport, 1950; Branden, 1969; Committee on Psychiatry
and Religion, 1969; Freud, 1934; Keene, 1967; Pruyser, 1968; Sadler, 1970). On the other hand, the existence of a positive relationship is suggested from several sources: the empirical research of Allport (1963; Allport & Ross, 1967) concerning religion and prejudice; the empirical research of Martin and Nichols (1962) who did not confirm the negative results of previous studies; the investigations of William James (1902) into the salutary effects of religious conversion and mysticism; the independence of religious and personality factors (Brown, 1966); and pertinent distinctions and refinements of the religion concept by many authors (Allen & Spilka, 1967; Allport, 1950, 1963; Allport & Ross, 1967; Dittes, 1967; Frankl, 1955; Keene, 1967; Maslow, 1954, 1970; Shostrom, 1967).

This lack of agreement can be partially clarified by noting the operational definition of the religion variable. When the definition involves mere institutional affiliation or adherence to conservative doctrine, the association is negative. In this case, Dittes (1969) notes:

The psychological research reflects an overwhelming consensus that religion...is associated with awareness of personal inadequacies, either generally or in response to particular crisis or threat situations; with objective evidence of inadequacy, such as low intelligence; with strong responsiveness to the suggestions of other persons or other external influences; and with an array of what may be called desperate and generally unadaptive defensive maneuvers (p. 636).

For example, when religion was described in terms of monthly attendance at church, churchgoers were more dogmatic than non-churchgoers (Kilpatrick, Sutker & Sutker, 1970); or when it was described in terms of liberal-conservative religious beliefs, conservative Baptist
ministers were less self-actualized (Stewart & Webster, 1970); or when religion was defined in terms of Glock's Dimensions of Religious Commitment Scale, more religious, Protestant college students were less self-actualized than the less religious students (Graff & Ladd, 1971).

The complicated results of Keene's (1967) study, described previously, provide a notable illustration of both the positive and negative relationship between religion and personality. Among Catholics, full religious participation (i.e., emphasizing the importance of religion and the spiritual dimensions of life) is positively related to adaptive behavior and equalitarian concern for mankind; but if this full participation is combined with an emphasis on doctrine and ritual, rather than personal experiences and attitudes, then the correlation switches to more neurotic behavior and narrowmindedness. Thus, two kinds of religious behavior (orthodox and salient), both prevalent in the same religious group, can have opposite effects on the personal well-being of its members, as expressed by the neurotic-adaptive factor and the worldminded/ethnocentric factor.

Several of the studies supporting a positive relationship between religion and personality can be explained in further detail. First, Martin and Nichols (1962), using a college sample, did not replicate previous findings that described the religious believer as suspicious, defensive and authoritarian. Second, Allport and Ross (1967) studied the correlates of intrinsic-extrinsic religious orientation—a distinction emphasizing the "living" versus the "using" of religion—and found a curvilinear relationship between religion and prejudice. While churchgoers as a group were more prejudiced than
non-churchgoers, the intrinsic group was less prejudiced than the extrinsic group. Furthermore, the intrinsic group participates more regularly (Allport & Ross, 1967), and feels a sense of active mastery over what happens and tends to move actively to achieve goals (Strickland & Shaffer, 1971). This contradicts, in part, the suggestion that religious persons tend to be more dependent (Graff & Ladd, 1971). It, also, indicates the importance of studying, not religion in general, but particular types of orientations. The value of this approach is supported by Kennedy and Heckler's (1971) study on the same sample involved in the present research. They found a positive relationship between Allport's concept of intrinsic religion, as rated by clinical judges using self-report data, and psychological development, as rated by clinical judges using interview data.

A final set of studies relevant to the relationship between religion and personality are the factor analyses of Brown (1966) and Cline and Richards (1965). Brown, factoring 24 religious and personality variables on 227 male and female college students, found a single religious factor to which a number of religious variables, e.g., beliefs, practice, motivation, are related. An important finding was that the religious factor was functionally independent of the personality measures, e.g., authoritarianism, rigidity, neuroticism, and of the attitudes to the social world. The multiple religious factors of Cline and Richards support Brown in this regard. They found that dogmatic authoritarianism, neuroticism and political conservatism were not related to whether one was religious or not. These two studies emphasize the importance of Hokeach's (1960) distinction between the content of a
belief and the way a belief is held. Brown (1966) concludes that the affective concomitants of religious belief are probably not specific to religion but influence the way an individual expresses any belief or "unbelief." Gilmore (1969) provides some support for this interpretation. He found that, among Pentecostals, only those who were close-minded manifested a lack of adjustment.

At this point, by way of summary and conclusion, it can be suggested that the relationship between religion and personal development is unclear in the literature, precisely because religion is multi-dimensional. Some correlational studies indicate that mere attendance at church or affirmation of conservative theological ideas are negatively associated with personal development; while other studies indicate that certain types of religious persons, e.g., intrinsic subjects or high level participators, are psychologically healthy. Some studies indicating a negative relationship have not included pertinent moderator variables, e.g., open and closed-mindedness. The factor analytic studies show that the religion variable—whether it is a large single factor or broken down into 14 factors—is statistically independent of the other personality measures in the matrix.

In view of the results, that there are many aspects to the religion variable, that there are sex differences and intergroup differences, that level of participation and religious type or orientation are significant; the present study focuses upon one aspect of religion, namely, successful striving towards one's faith ideal, among Roman Catholic men, who are high level participants. The relevance of the liberal-conservative orientation will be explained later.
No single study in this section dictates the first hypothesis. However, there is no solid reason for thinking the relationship between psychological development and religious maturity is negative. Moreover, the accumulated evidence indicates that religious maturity is positively related to psychological development (Kennedy & Heckler, 1971), healthy attitudes (Allport & Ross, 1967), and adaptive behavior (Keene, 1967). This evidence, particularly in view of the earlier considerations about the growth orientation of the self-actualized person, supports the hypothesis of a positive relationship between religious and personality development, as defined in this study.

II. The second major point in this section on religion and personality is the concept of self-perceived maturity of faith and its measurement. No previous research on self-perceived success in striving towards one's faith ideal has been found.

The assumption is that religion or faith, not only provides ideals for living, but also can be conceptualized as a goal or ideal towards which one grows. Thus, just as we think of personality development, we can also think of faith development, i.e., progress towards one's faith ideal. That subjects think in such terms was confirmed in a preliminary analysis of the data on the Maturity of Faith Scale (Kennedy & Heckler, 1971). Subjects were able to describe their idea of mature and immature faith and to rate themselves in terms of these descriptions.

Three points need to be discussed: the importance of self-perception regarding faith, a description of the scale, and the anticipated value of the scale.
According to self theory, the understanding and prediction of behavior requires knowledge of the subject's conscious perceptions of the environment and of the self in relation to the environment (Combs, 1971; Wylie, 1961), and also knowledge of the subject's ideals and his self-evaluation in relation to these ideals (Hilgard & Atkinson, 1967). Religion and/or church can be important facets of one's environment; secondly, a religious ideal can be an important element in developing or "becoming" by providing the "forward intention" (Allport, 1955).

The present study has the subject ask himself a straightforward question: How do I feel about myself in relation to my understanding of mature faith...where do I stand? But first, the subject is required to describe his own faith world, his faith ideal, the spiritual dimensions of his life. Since "religion" has different meanings for different people, and since there are so many ways in which to be religious and to express religion in behavior (Cline & Richards, 1965), it is advisable to avoid establishing categories whose meaning or value may be minimal for an individual (MacLeod, 1958) and, instead, to get at the unique form the religious sentiment takes in every life (Allport, 1963).

This phenomenological approach, with its strong reliance on self-report, is characteristically Rogerian (Patterson, 1961; Rogers, 1954). It represents one perspective of a person, with limited value, in the nature of, what MacLeod (1964) considers, a propaedeutic to the science of psychology.

The analysis of this data can indicate whether there are differences in levels of successful striving towards maturity of faith,
as there are in other areas of psychology, e.g., psychopolitics (Cantril, 1965); and whether these differences can be related to certain theoretically antecedent variables, such as self-actualization and liberal-conservative religious orientation.

The Maturity of Faith Scale is a self-anchoring device for the study of self-perceptions of religious maturity, adapted from Strunk (1967). Each subject describes for himself the two ends of a continuum, namely, the essential characteristics of the most mature kind of faith and the essential characteristics of the most immature kind of faith. The subject does this from his own point of view, in terms of his own perceptions, goals and values. Then the subject is asked to rate himself on a graphic ladder on which step 10 represents the most mature kind of faith, and step 0 at the bottom represents the most immature kind of faith. The subject rates himself in terms of several questions, including where he really is, where he stood five years before, and where he thinks he will be five years later. (The exact instructions and questions are presented in the Methodology section. Confer Appendix B for a copy of the scale.)

This method of scaling was developed by Kilpatrick (Kilpatrick & Cantril, 1960) and used by Cantril (1965, 1967), who referred to preliminary studies to determine the validity of the data by testing the intrinsic reasonableness of the data produced and by comparing replies from persons with different social, economic and political problems. Free and Cantril (1967) found the method highly reliable in their study of American political beliefs. Strunk (1967) demonstrated the method in a study comparing the religious maturity of Negro and
Caucasian college girls; he suggested its feasibility for research and comparative studies of religious maturity. Cantril (1965) used this method to rate the importance of religion and then correlate this with an entire pattern of daily, human concerns. No other studies of religious maturity using this method have been found.

Several other considerations enhance the value of this method. Criticisms of the methodology due, for example, to the naivete of such self-reports were not supported by Cantril's (1965) examination of the data. The assumptions of the method are similar to those of the Q-sort regarding the extent to which one possesses and values a trait; these latter assumptions have some empirical support (e.g., Turner & Vanderlippe, 1958). Secondly, research in other areas indicates that evaluation of the self (Prim, 1961; Bailey & Gibby, 1971) and formation of the self-concept improve with age, intelligence, education and socioeconomic status (Loevinger, 1966). The present sample rates favorably on all these characteristics. Thirdly, there is the possibility of deliberate deception or lack of insight; these are dangers, minimized by the relative anonymity of the testing and the use of mature subjects. Finally, Mischel's (1972) recent review of the literature and comparison of direct and indirect methods of personality assessment indicates that direct self-reports, even simple ones, can be stable and useful. These considerations strongly suggest that mature subjects using this method of scaling can provide limited, reasonably accurate, meaningful data.

In conclusion, the Maturity of Faith Scale is an appropriate instrument because, as Allport (Evans, 1970) notes, it avoids structuring a subject's thoughts and safeguards the uniqueness of one's
perceptions. Secondly, the scale appears to be an adequate instrument for initial investigation in this area.

III. The third major point in this section on religion and personality is the relevance and measurement of a liberal-conservative religious orientation.

The importance of religious types or orientations, e.g., intrinsic-extrinsic, liberal-conservative, was mentioned previously. The purpose, here, is to describe the liberal-conservative position in greater detail and to develop the second and third hypotheses.

Previous research indicates that a distinction between a liberal and conservative outlook has theological and psychological significance (Dittes, 1969; Keene, 1967; Kupst, 1972; Rokeach, 1960; Stewart & Webster, 1970). The conservative religious person restricts his spontaneous personal expression, affirms conventional orthodox beliefs, relies strongly upon the institutional church, its authority, guidelines and ritual. The liberal person is more humanistic, less dependent upon the institution, more concerned with personal freedom and openness to the world. This distinction flows readily from studies of social and political attitudes; however, religious conservatism is not necessarily predictable from social or political conservatism (Cline & Richards, 1965).

The religious conservative is frequently found to be less developed psychologically than the liberal; however, there are some pertinent exceptions. Specifically, the conservative is found to be less growth-oriented (Barron, 1968), less self-actualized as priest (Kupst, 1972) or Baptist minister (Stewart & Webster, 1970), more
neurotic if Catholic (Keene, 1967), less willing to admit deficiencies (Weima, 1965), more constricted and resistant to change (Dittes, 1969). Theologically, the conservative is closer to the church-as-institution, adhering to traditional ideas and customs, emphasizing external structures, and rejecting whatever questions the established church (Weima, 1965).

On the other hand, these negative characteristics may apply more to a particular type of conservative. Ranck (1961) incorporated a dozen scales in his study of 800 male, Protestant theological students, and concluded that the religious conservative is not a single type. The immature conservative is excessively dependent, authoritarian, with externalized needs for security and status from the group. The mature conservative is genuinely autonomous in his beliefs and dependent upon a suprahuman figure who is loved rather than feared. Ranck found that only extreme conservatives are substantially authoritarian. The extremity of the position may be a critical dimension, since Brown (1966) also found that only subjects excessively dependent upon the institutional church are authoritarian. A final observation is that adherence to conventional beliefs, a conservative characteristic, and personality constriction are positively related only among subjects low on religious information.

In summary, then, religious conservatives as a group are described psychologically as being less adaptive. However, this characterization may apply more accurately or more substantially only to the extreme or the immature conservative, but not to the mature or self-actualized conservative. What are the implications of these
results in the pursuit of a religious ideal?

It is important to note that this question is being asked during the crisis of reform within Roman Catholicism since the Second Vatican Council. This period has been marked by manifold criticisms and changes in liturgical forms, in ascetical writing, (e.g., stress upon the finding of God and working out of one's salvation through other persons), and in re-thinking the nature of the church, its membership and authority. People were being asked to make, if not radical changes, at least decided shifts in emphasis (Greeley, 1967). They were being asked to re-examine the church, to modify or give up certain traditional ideas or customs, to deal with theological or organizational short-comings, to adjust to new ways of doing things. Quite likely such criticisms and changes caused many people to come to grips with, and perhaps to re-evaluate or modify, their understanding of religion and "mature faith."

This situation would, presumably, be difficult for most people, but especially for conservatives because of their theological and psychological characteristics. It is, therefore, hypothesized that religious liberals have greater maturity of faith than religious conservatives. This second hypothesis is illustrated by the following item from the liberal-conservative scale, an item which is more acceptable to liberals than to conservatives: The creative ferment in the Church today is bringing about a deepening of my Christian faith.

This second hypothesis looks at liberals and conservatives, as a group. The third hypothesis incorporates Ranck's (1961) concept of a
mature conservative and compares only those liberals and conservatives who are self-actualized. The existence of a "mature conservative" (Ranck, 1961), of a subject who adheres to traditional orthodox beliefs without being authoritarian, rigid (Brown, 1966), or constricted (Martin & Nichols, 1962), suggests that a self-actualized conservative would be able to respond more favorably, more creatively, during the period of church reform. As a conservative, this person considers the church important and holds traditional beliefs; as a self-actualized individual, he would be less dependent on the church for direction and identification, less defensive about the shortcomings in the church and the need to up-date, more willing to ask questions and to integrate the ecclesiastical reforms into his own understanding of mature faith. For the self-actualized conservative, the articulation and pursuit of a faith ideal would not be hampered by the less adaptive tendencies of the non-self-actualized conservative. Therefore, it is hypothesized that self-actualized conservatives and self-actualized liberals are not significantly different in maturity of faith.

The measure of liberal-conservative orientation in this study is the Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale, which was developed by Kupst (1972) on the present population. It was appropriate to develop this measure because such factors as liberalism-conservatism are partially predictable from the official doctrines of certain denominations (Broen, 1957; Keene, 1967) and because Catholics score higher than other groups on conservatism (Keene, 1967).

Kupst (1972) developed this scale with a larger sample of 348 priests from the National Opinion Research Center study on American
Original, 44 items were selected on the basis of face validity. Four out of five sophisticated judges successfully rated 38 of these items as liberal or conservative on the basis of content. After item analysis, 34 items were factor analyzed and yielded the following three factors: acceptance of orthodox doctrine versus individual conscience, rejection of human sources of faith, and desire for traditional forms and roles. Since the first factor accounted for most of the variance and had the highest loadings, the scale was interpreted in terms of the first factor, with a single score for each subject. Some validity data is available: predicted correlations with the subscales of the Personal Orientation Inventory were found; secondly, an expected negative correlation between conservatism and leaving the priesthood was confirmed. (Instructions and examples of the items are presented in the Methodology section.)

IV. The fourth major point in this section on religion and personality is the appropriateness of a sample of Roman Catholic priests.

The subjects of this study are 230 American Roman Catholic priests, participants in a larger project sponsored by the American Catholic Bishops Committee on Pastoral Research and Practice. This research was conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago and by Loyola University of Chicago.

Many other studies have used college students. For several reasons they may not be appropriate subjects: college students consider religion less important than older subjects do (Sieviking, Harrison,
Ackerman & Gorsuch, 1971); secondly, college students seem to be questioning many social institutions, including the church; thirdly, compared to their non-college peers, college students are reflecting upon and digesting more new ideas (Evans, 1970; Rokeach, 1968), and undergoing more personality change (Campana, 1971).

A population of priests is not completely representative either. However, it does provide limited controls for variables shown to be important, or complicating the interpretation of previous research, e.g., dogmatic content of beliefs (Strickland & Shaffer, 1971), membership in a particular denomination (Keene, 1967), education (Allport & Ross, 1967), level of knowledge (Martin & Nichols, 1962), sex (Cline & Richards, 1965; Shraugger & Silverman, 1971), active participation in church practices and ritual (Dittes, 1971). A sample of Roman Catholic priests is an appropriate group insofar as there are built-in controls for these variables, i.e., similar dogmatic content, a single denomination, four years undergraduate college work and approximately four years of formal theological training, high level of information about the faith, only males, high level of participation.

Furthermore, the methodology seems appropriate for this group since the subjects were being asked to describe religion or faith—the reality which gives meaning to their life and work. Secondly, the multifaceted reforms within the Catholic Church made the liberal-conservative dimension particularly salient among priests (Greeley, 1967; Kupst, 1972). Finally, priests are a representative group on
self-actualization; their scores on the Personal Orientation Inventory were found to be typical of many other groups in the standardizing population (National Opinion Research Center, 1971).

Thus, the characteristics of a population of priests and the relevance of the variables in this study indicate the appropriateness of priests as subjects.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects are 230 American Roman Catholic priests, selected from the approximately 60,000 American priests by a process of stratified sampling that was designed to give appropriate emphasis to various sub-groups and to avoid any systematic bias.

Average age is 44.16 years (standard deviation, 11.94). The present subjects are those who agreed to participate in an in-depth psychological interview. These subjects are slightly higher on self-actualization than those who refused to participate in the interview part of the study (Kennedy & Heckler, 1971). Their education includes four years of college plus approximately four years of formal theological training. Their socioeconomic status can probably best be described as middle class.

Occasionally a particular measure was not available or not completed; no bias was apparent.

Testing Instruments

The Personal Orientation Inventory was sent and returned by mail. In the statistical analysis a single overall measure of self-actualization, namely, Inner Direction, is used. This approach was suggested by Knapp (1965), used by many authors, e.g., Leib and Snyder (1967), and validated by Damm (1969).
The Maturity of Faith Scale was adapted from Strunk (1967). In a pilot study three phrases were compared: mature religion, mature religious belief, mature faith. "Mature faith" yielded the richest descriptions and, therefore, was employed in collecting the present data (Kennedy & Heckler, 1971).

The subject is given the following instructions:

Everybody has some idea of what having a mature faith means. Some people, we say, have a mature faith. Others, we claim, have an immature faith. From your point of view, what are the essential characteristics of the most mature kind of faith? (Take your time in answering; such things aren't easy to put into words.)

The subject writes his description. Then he is asked:

Now, again from your point of view, what are the essential characteristics of the most immature kind of faith? (Again, take your time in answering.)

After he writes this second description the subject sees a picture of a ladder with 11 rungs, numbered 0 to 10, and reads:

Below is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that at the top of the ladder (step number 10) is the most mature kind of faith you have just described; at the bottom of the ladder (step number 0) is the most immature kind of faith you have described.

1. Where on the ladder do you feel you stand as you really are? Step number ____.

2. Where on the ladder would you like to stand? Step number ____.

3. Where on the ladder do you feel your closest friends believe you stand? Step number ____.

4. Where on the ladder would you say you stood five years ago? Step number ____.

5. And where do you think you will be on the ladder five years from now? Step number ____.

The data analysis is concerned primarily with question 1, and
secondarily with questions 4 and 5. The following abbreviations are used: FS/present (i.e., Faith Scale) for question 1, FS/past for question 4, and FS/future for question 5.

The Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale consists of 34 of the original 44 items on question 37 of the National Opinion Research Center questionnaire. Subjects received the following instructions:

Below are a number of statements which are frequently made today. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each of them by CIRCLING ONE CODE ON EACH LINE. Items were rated on a five point continuum ranging from "Agree strongly" to "Disagree strongly." Examples of the conservative and liberal items include the following:

4. The relationship between laity and priests was much better before Vatican II when everyone knew just how he was supposed to act. (Conservative)

16. For me, God is found principally in my relationship with people. (Liberal)

19. Today's Christian must emphasize more than ever openness to the Spirit rather than dependence on traditional ecclesiastical structures. (Liberal)

24. I think of Jesus Christ as the God who humbled Himself by becoming man and dying for my sins. (Conservative)

The overall score is interpreted in terms of single factor, as Kupst (1972) suggested.

**Statistical Analysis**

Pearson product moment correlations are computed for the Personal Orientation Inventory subscales, for the Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale, and for age with FS/present. The multiple correlation is computed to determine the total per cent of FS/present variance accounted for. The intervals on the Maturity of Faith Scale
are assumed to be equal, a procedure that can safely be followed (Anderson, 1961; Cohen, 1965).

In order to provide a measure of self-perceived progress and anticipated progress, the differences across FS/past, FS/present and FS/future are analyzed by one way analysis of variance for repeated measures. Post hoc comparisons follow the method of Scheffé (Winer, 1971).
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Five aspects are discussed in this section: first, the relationship between self-actualization and maturity of faith; second, the relationship between liberal-conservative religious orientation and maturity of faith; third, the relationship between age and maturity of faith; fourth, the multiple correlation of self-actualization, liberal-conservative orientation and age with maturity of faith; fifth, progress in maturity of faith.

I. The means, standard deviations and sample size for all Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) subscales, the Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale (RLCS), age, and Maturity of Faith Scale (FS) variables are shown in Table 1. The significant relationships between the POI subscales and FS/present are shown in Table 2.

No significant relationship was found between self-actualization, as measured by POI/Inner Direction, and maturity of faith, as measured by FS/present (r = .06). This is contrary to the first hypothesis which had predicted a significant positive relationship. Several POI subscales, namely, Self-Actualizing Values, Feeling Reactivity, Self-Regard, and Acceptance of Aggression, are positively related to maturity of faith. Thus, subjects who hold self-actualizing values, who are sensitive to their own feelings and needs, who have high self-worth, and who accept feelings of anger, are slightly higher on
### TABLE 1

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Size for Personal Orientation Inventory, Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale, Age and Maturity of Faith Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POI/ID</td>
<td>81.87</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLCS</td>
<td>-15.39</td>
<td>23.77</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>44.16</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS/past</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 2**

Significant Pearson Product Moment Correlations for Personal Orientation Inventory, Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale, Age, and Maturity of Faith Scale/present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FS/present</th>
<th>RLCS</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLCS</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POI/ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.45***</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p .05, two-tailed test  
** p .01, two-tailed test  
*** p .001, two-tailed test

*Note: Other significant correlations between POI and age, and between POI and RLCS have been omitted.*
maturity of faith. However, the correlations are very low and reach significance only because of the large sample size. Such low correlations provide practically no predictive power.

A further analysis of the relationship between self-actualization and maturity of faith can be made by dividing the sample into three groups according to age and according to liberal-conservative religious orientation. The range, means and standard deviations for these groups are given in Table 3. Each group represents approximately one-third of the total sample.

There is a significant positive relationship ($r = .41, p < .001$) between self-actualization and maturity of faith for the younger group. The same is true for the liberal group ($r = .32, p < .001$). No significant relationship was found for the middle-aged group or the older group; nor for the medium or conservative group. Thus, among the younger group, the more self-actualized subjects are higher on maturity of faith than the less self-actualized. And, among the liberal group, the more self-actualized subjects are higher on maturity of faith than the less self-actualized.

In summary, the hypothesized positive relationship between self-actualization and maturity of faith was not confirmed, across the entire sample. However, for a liberal group (versus a moderate or conservative group) and for a younger group there is a positive relationship between self-actualization and maturity of faith.

II. A significant positive relationship was found between conservatism and maturity of faith ($r = .20, p < .01$). This is contrary to the second hypothesis which had predicted a positive
### TABLE 3
Means and Standard Deviations for All Groups on the Maturity of Faith Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>FS/past</th>
<th>FS/present</th>
<th>FS/future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POI/ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (88-112)</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med (76-87)</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (49-75)</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (-6 to 50)</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med (-28 to -7)</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (-56 to -29)</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old (49-78)</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid (38-48)</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yng (27-37)</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relationship between liberalism and maturity of faith. Note that positive scores on the Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale represent the conservative direction, while negative scores represent the liberal direction. Hence, the positive correlation, indicated in Table 2, shows that the more conservative subjects are higher on maturity of faith than the more liberal subjects. Again, however, the correlation is very low, indicating that liberal-conservative orientation explains relatively little of the variation on maturity of faith.

The issue regarding the third hypothesis is more complicated. The second hypothesis considered conservatives in general. The third hypothesis compared only those conservatives and liberals who are self-actualized. It was hypothesized that self-actualized liberals and self-actualized conservatives do not differ significantly on maturity of faith. And the results support this hypothesis ($r = .11$, not significant). However, recall the previous discussion that suggested the conservative orientation would be a drawback in the pursuit of one's religious ideal. It was presumed that conservatives would be lower on maturity of faith than liberals, at the lower levels of self-actualization; but that self-actualized conservatives would hold a conservative orientation in a less defensive and more growth-oriented way, thus achieving a level of maturity of faith similar to liberals. Contrary to this presumption, it was the liberals who had to "catch up," because, as was noted, over all subjects there is a slight positive relationship between conservatism and maturity of faith. Further analysis of the relationship between liberal-conservative outlook and maturity of faith at the various levels of self-actualization indicates
a significant positive relationship between the more conservative orientation and maturity of faith for both the medium \((r = .34, \ p < .01)\) and low \((r = .36, \ p < .01)\) self-actualized groups. Perhaps the best summary of these results is that the third hypothesis is de facto supported, but not for the reasons mentioned in the previous discussion of the literature.

Because of the moderate correlation between the Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale and the POI/Inner Direction scale \((r = .45, \ p < .001)\), which resulted in a sample biased in the liberal direction at the high level of self-actualization, a more precise test of the third hypothesis was made by comparing self-actualized subjects at the liberal \((N = 37, \text{Mean } 7.70, \text{SD } 1.51)\) and conservative \((N = 6, \text{Mean } 3.12, \text{SD } 1.40)\) extremes. The difference is not significant \((t = .71, df = 43)\). The result, therefore, is similar to the previous analysis, that self-actualized liberals and self-actualized conservatives do not differ on maturity of faith.

In summary, there is a slight tendency for conservatives to be higher than liberals on maturity of faith, when all subjects are compared; but there is no difference between them, when only the more self-actualized subjects are compared.

III. Age, which correlates .61 \((p < .001)\) with the Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale and -.28 \((p < .001)\) with POI/Inner Direction for this sample, is positively related to maturity of faith \((r = .22, \ p < .01)\). This low correlation indicates a slight tendency for older subjects to be higher than younger subjects on maturity of faith.
A further analysis of the relationship between age and maturity of faith can be made by dividing the sample into three groups according to level of self-actualization and according to liberal-conservative orientation, as indicated in Table 3. The positive relationship between age and maturity of faith is found only for the group low on self-actualization and for the middle group on liberal-conservative orientation. No other significant relationships are indicated. Thus, older subjects are more mature in faith than younger subjects only for the group low on self-actualization and for the group not clearly committed to a liberal or conservative outlook.

The strong positive correlation between age and conservatism, and the low negative relationship between age and self-actualization indicates that the extremes of the age variable are not being contrasted at the various levels of self-actualization and liberal-conservative orientation. Any generalizations, therefore, must be limited.

IV. To determine the combined explanatory power of these predictors, the multiple correlation of age, liberal-conservative orientation and self-actualization with maturity of faith was calculated, yielding a multiple $R$ of .28, which explains approximately eight per cent of the variance. This is a very low figure. As indicated in Table 4, age made the strongest initial contribution. This contribution is minimal; the added contribution from liberal-conservative orientation or self-actualization is almost negligible.

V. The progress made during the previous five-year period and the progress anticipated during the coming five-year period are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POI/ID</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLCS</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicated by a comparison between FS/present and FS/past, and between FS/future and FS/present. A one way analysis of variance with repeated measures is performed with post hoc comparisons following the method of Scheffe (Winer, 1971). In view of the comment by Edwards (1968) about the conservative nature of the Scheffe test, the F level was set at .025. This analysis was performed across all subjects and, also, at the high, medium and low levels of age, self-actualization and liberal-conservative orientation. Again, means and standard deviations are presented in Table 3.

The results of these analyses are uniform and can be succinctly presented. The analysis of variance yielded a significant F (p < .01) in every case: for the entire sample (Table 5), for each level of self-actualization (Table 6), liberal-conservative orientation (Table 7) and age (Table 8). The comparison of means yielded a significant difference (p < .025) between FS/present and FS/past, and between FS/future and FS/present, for all subjects (Table 9), and for each level of self-actualization (Table 10), liberal-conservative orientation (Table 11) and age (Table 12).

Thus, for all subjects and for each level of each variable, significant progress was made during the previous five-year period and anticipated for the coming five-year period.
TABLE 5
Analysis of Variance for All Subjects on Maturity of Faith Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>559.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>279.73</td>
<td>158.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>1460.46</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>652.16</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2672.08</td>
<td>602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
TABLE 6
Analysis of Variance on Maturity of Faith Scale for Low Level on Personal Orientation Inventory/Inner Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>110.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.35</td>
<td>30.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>204.00</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>847.22</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA on FS for Medium POI/ID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>142.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.47</td>
<td>37.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>500.83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>227.58</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>871.35</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA on FS for High POI/ID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>323.04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>161.52</td>
<td>122.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>404.06</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>173.32</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>900.42</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
**TABLE 7**

Analysis of Variance on Maturity of Faith Scale for Low Level on Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>313.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156.88</td>
<td>75.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>432.89</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>250.94</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>997.59</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA on FS for Medium RLCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>245.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122.61</td>
<td>74.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>520.84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>207.98</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>974.04</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA on FS for High RLCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>59.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.66</td>
<td>26.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>348.59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>132.88</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>540.79</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01**
### TABLE 8
Analysis of Variance on Maturity of Faith Scale for Young Subjects (Age 27-37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>307.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>153.83</td>
<td>99.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>475.66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>170.87</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>954.19</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA on FS for Middle-Aged Subjects (Age 38-48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>195.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97.68</td>
<td>60.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>435.90</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>841.26</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA on FS for Old Subjects (Age 49-78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>82.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.17</td>
<td>22.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>402.91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>226.68</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>711.93</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

** p < .01
TABLE 9

Differences between the Means of Maturity of Faith/past, Maturity of Faith/present and Maturity of Faith/future across the Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FS/present vs. past</td>
<td>211.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119.89*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS/future vs. present</td>
<td>86.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.86*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .025

*These comparisons according to method of Scheffe
TABLE 10

Differences between the Means of Maturity of Faith/past, Maturity of Faith/present and Maturity of Faith/future for High, Medium and Low Levels of Personal Orientation Inventory/Inner Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High POI/ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present vs. Past</td>
<td>148.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111.93*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future vs. Present</td>
<td>31.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.67*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium POI/ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present vs. Past</td>
<td>60.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.12*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future vs. Present</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.21*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low POI/ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present vs. Past</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.81*</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future vs. Present</td>
<td>36.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .025

a Post hoc comparisons according to the method of Scheffe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High RLCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present vs. Past</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.48*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future vs. Present</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.20*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium RLCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present vs. Past</td>
<td>86.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.31*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future vs. Present</td>
<td>42.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.98*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low RLCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present vs. Past</td>
<td>133.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.24*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future vs. Present</td>
<td>39.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.86*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .025

a Post hoc comparisons according to the method of Scheffé
TABLE 12

Differences between the Means of Maturity of Faith/past, Maturity of Faith/present and Maturity of Faith/future for Old, Middle-Aged and Young Subjects \(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old (49-78)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present vs. Past</td>
<td>26.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.38*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future vs. Present</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.67*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle-Aged (38-48)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present vs. Past</td>
<td>67.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.32*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future vs. Present</td>
<td>35.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.11*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young (27-37)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present vs. Past</td>
<td>135.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.30*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future vs. Present</td>
<td>34.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.51*</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .025 \)

\(^a\) *Post hoc* comparisons according to the method of Scheffé
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The hypothesized positive relationships of self-actualization and liberal orientation with maturity of faith were not confirmed. As a result, the theoretical structure surrounding the third hypothesis was not supported. The relationships that were found between conservatism and maturity of faith, and between age and maturity of faith, are minimal. The general impression is that relatively little is known about the psychological variables related to self-perceived maturity of faith.

For the present sample, with an assumed high level of commitment to religion, religious and personality development are not related across the total group; although they are positively related among younger subjects and among more liberal subjects. Secondly, conservatives are higher on maturity of faith than liberals, but not if the liberals are high on self-actualization. Thus, in no situation is self-actualization negatively related to religious development, and in some cases it is positively related. In other words, in the pursuit of a faith ideal, psychological growth is not a liability, and sometimes is an asset.

The absence of any significant relationship across all subjects between religious and personality development may appear to differ with Kennedy and Heckler's (1971) finding of a positive relationship between
personality development and religious maturity, and with Graff and Ladd's (1971) finding of a negative relationship between the Personal Orientation Inventory and religious commitment. Such a disparity is not surprising in view of Fiske's (1971) position that results are frequently specific to the conceptual model and measurement instrument employed in a particular study. However, there are other, more specific differences. Kennedy and Heckler employed an objective criterion, namely, judges' ratings of the intrinsic-extrinsic quality of the faith ideal, and found that more developed subjects, compared to less developed subjects, describe an ideal that is rated as more intrinsic, i.e., more mature. The present study did not control for the intrinsic-extrinsic quality of the faith ideal, but measured maturity in terms of a self-rating in relation to the ideal, whatever its quality. Hence, this self-rating seemed to have been very influential in determining the results of the present study. A control for the quality of the ideal could be introduced in future research, indicating what kind of person is at what level in relation to what kind of ideal. The implication of the present study, combined with Kennedy and Heckler, is that self-actualized subjects are equal to less self-actualized subjects on success of striving for the ideal, but that self-actualized subjects' religious ideal may be more mature, i.e., less geared to personal psychological needs. Finally, Graff and Ladd compared self-actualization and religious commitment, whereas the present study compared self-actualization and religious maturity while assuming an average-to-high level of commitment. Thus, the present results do not disagree with previous research.
Several observations are made concerning the concept and measurement of self-actualization. LeMay and Damm (1970) conclude that the Personal Orientation Inventory can be interpreted in terms of a unitary trait related to a desire to feel free and to act accordingly. More research is needed, but this interpretation seems to differ from the author's. If their interpretation is correct, then, in retrospect, it is not immediately clear whether or why the Personal Orientation Inventory would be positively related to maturity of faith. Thus, the present results would be more understandable. It is important, therefore, to investigate the relationship between the Maturity of Faith Scale and other measures of adjustment and development, e.g., clinical judgments or questionnaire data.

A second observation concerning the concept of self-actualization is based upon Levy's (1970) severe criticism of the concept because of its implicit value judgments about the nature of man, and his obvious preference for more empirically determined personality constructs. This suggests that the present study may involve more of a philosophical issue about the nature of human development rather than a psychological measure of maturity. While the validating data for the Personal Orientation Inventory are considered impressive by the present author, Levy's criticism, also, argues the need for investigating the relationship between the Maturity of Faith Scale and other measures of psychological development.

A final observation concerning the concept of self-actualization and its measurement by the Personal Orientation Inventory is rooted in Fiske's (1971) recommendation that personality constructs and their
measurement be specific rather than global. Perhaps the self-
actualization construct is too global, too general, to test adequately
the tendency to make the growth choice and the desire to enrich one's
lifestyle. These characteristics have particular relevance in the
present study. This is not to question the feasibility of a growth
model, i.e., that there is an inherent tendency towards greater self-
development which probably generalizes to one's various commitments,
e.g., faith. But there may be value in incorporating a more specific
measure, perhaps similar to King's (1967) Openness to Religious Growth
factor, thus permitting a more exact interpretation of the results.

The second major point to be discussed in this section is the
influence of a liberal-conservative orientation. Overall, psychological
development is not related to religious development. It is somewhat
understandable, then, that conservatives would not be lower than liberals
on maturity of faith, since this expectation was based, in part, upon
conservatives being less adaptive psychologically. But that con-
servatives are higher than liberals is more difficult to explain.

The moderately strong positive relationship between conservatism
and age, and the advantages of a conservative position during a crisis,
offer some explanation. First, conservatives are older, and, therefore,
could be closer to their faith ideal for reasons related to age but not
included in this study, e.g., longer religious experience, richer prayer
life, or for theological reasons not amenable to empirical research.
Second, the conservative outlook may be an advantage during the Roman
Catholic crisis of change, because it provides stability and clarity,
if maintained, and requires less personal re-organizing of the notion
of mature faith. The conservative outlook, which is probably more consonant with the strongly traditional and institutional characteristics of Catholicism, provides stability, clarity about goals, and more specific means for achieving a faith ideal. The liberal position, on the other hand, is new, not particularly characteristic of Catholicism, and in the process of evolving; it involves questioning, searching, and much re-integration; in the end, it may involve subtle complexities and some contradictions (Hitchcock, 1971). It is quite feasible, then, that the concept of mature faith and the means to achieve it were so unclear and hard to articulate that the religious development of liberals was complicated, at least temporarily. It is, also, pertinent that liberals, who are high on self-actualization, though characteristically a younger group, are as mature in faith as the older, more conservative group. Compared to less self-actualized liberals, their greater inner direction and flexibility of values may facilitate the evolution of their beliefs and the attainment of the faith ideal; whereas, subjects lacking such characteristics, may find it particularly difficult to incorporate a liberal orientation.

Ranck (1961) suggests another reason why liberals may have difficulty in the development of faith. They are usually dissenters from the status quo of religious convention. As a result they may be subject to feelings of anxiety, insecurity and/or guilt.

If it is true that liberals experience particular difficulty in re-organizing their understanding and pursuit of mature faith, it is also possible that the difficulty is becoming less. This is cautiously suggested by the finding that the superiority of the conservative in the
past and for the present is not found in the future. This may represent an effective solidification of the liberal position, with the result that liberals feel a growing sense of confidence about the meaning and achieving a mature faith. However, this result may also be attributable to a ceiling effect on the scale. Conservatives, being higher than liberals all along, simply have less room to grow in absolute scale points.

The value of controlling the quality, content and/or maturity of the religious ideal, noted previously regarding self-actualization, may, also, be of value regarding the liberal-conservative orientation. For example, a recent study found that the conservative orientation is basically formed in childhood and continues to be a response primarily to childhood conflicts, rather than an adult appropriation of Christian revelation (Helfaer, 1972). Furthermore, the analysis of the content of the religious ideal may be of value in determining whether, to what extent, and in what ways a liberal or conservative modifies the religious ideal over a period of years. It may be that more precise analysis, which involves both level of striving and type of ideal, can generate more meaningful data than the present study. Such sophisticated analysis or coding of the ideal would be analogous to what Cantril (1967) developed in socio-political research.

The final point concerns the pattern of development or progress from past to present to future. A gradual, steady maturing of faith is reported for each level of age, self-actualization, and liberal-conservative orientation. This provides support for the underlying assumption about striving towards a faith ideal and is meaningful from a
phenomenological perspective. Thus, subjects think about faith or religion in terms of growth; moreover, they feel they have grown and expect to continue growing. And this is true of different religious types or orientations. For example, both conservatives and liberals report significant progress, despite their psychological and theological differences. Even though conservatives, in general, tend to regard the past as better (Cantril, 1965), they continue to make statistically significant progress in pursuing their faith ideal. Perhaps conservatives feel they could have made greater progress if the church had been less reform-minded and, thus, be dissatisfied despite their progress. However, this question cannot be answered from the present data.

The overall pattern of progress masks the fact that approximately twenty per cent of the subjects do not report progress during the previous five-year period and/or do not anticipate progress during the coming five-year period. (Some of this latter group may be affected by the ceiling of the scale, since they rate themselves at step nine for the present.) Why this is so, or what it means is not clear from these data. But the no-progress phenomenon seems important, if only because some progress is necessary to generate an optimism about life. Cantril (1965, 1967) was able to make meaningful predictions for his purposes on the basis of the no-progress phenomenon. Perhaps the same is true in the psychology of religion. For example: What are the no-progress subjects like psychologically? How long do they keep trying before a feeling of futility or of spiritual depression, analogous to Seligman's (1973) "learned helplessness," sets in? Does lack of a
feeling of progress result in a modification of one's faith ideal? Does lack of progress relate to leaving the priesthood, and, if so, in what way? Are there individuals, less sophisticated than the present sample, who do not think of faith in terms of growth or progress?

There are several other questions for research concerning the experience of progress: Was progress made because of, or in spite of, recent changes? Are individuals satisfied with their rate of progress? How much progress is necessary to generate optimism about the future? The priest has a particular commitment to holiness, to spiritual maturity (Herr, 1965); does a similar pattern of progress exist among other populations? Conservatives are said to "lack the abundant life" (Webster & Stewart, 1969); does the experience of growing in their faith constitute an important exception? What is the relationship, if any, between the present data (including both levels of maturity and progress) and various religious practices (e.g., private or liturgical prayer), criticism of the institutional church and desire for change?

In addition to providing answers to such questions, further research is necessary to clarify the scientific, as distinct from the mere human interest, value of the self-report data in this study. This is said to emphasize Comb's (1971) point that self-report, in itself, is not identical with the self-concept, and that introspection is not science. The scientific value of the present data depends upon the network of relationships that can be determined, and upon the behavioral data which can be predicted and understood (Levy, 1970). This does not deny that people's awareness of greater or lesser success in striving towards a religious ideal is an interesting issue. However, any
judgment about the usefulness of such information is postponed pending further research, precisely because of the meager results of the present study.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The hypothesized positive relationships of personality development and liberal religious orientation with religious development are not supported in the present study, although there is some support for a positive relationship between religious and personality development among liberals and younger subjects. Conservatives are slightly higher than liberals on maturity of faith, but not if the liberals are high on self-actualization. Information about the level of self-actualization and liberal-conservative orientation does not allow for a much stronger prediction about maturity of faith than information about age alone. The results indicate that people—whether old or young, more or less self-actualized, liberal or conservative—think of faith or religion in terms of growth and development, and feel they have made progress and will continue to do so.

The pattern of results, or lack of results, indicates a) that relatively little information was obtained about the psychological variables related to self-perceived maturity of faith, and b) that the present results may have been particularly influenced by the self-rating employed. Even the statistically significant correlations are too low to contribute much to our understanding.

The data provide some evidence for, and no evidence that argues against, encouraging personality development in the pursuit of maturity
of faith. A high level of self-actualization is particularly important for persons of a liberal orientation. Perhaps the re-organization of ideas about faith required by the liberal position complicates religious development and makes considerable demands upon one's psychological resources; whereas the conservative position provides a clearer and more stable concept of mature faith, thereby facilitating development for those remaining conservative.

The Maturity of Faith Scale makes it possible not to impose categories or judgments about faith, but to allow for the unique perceptions of each individual, at least among Roman Catholic priests. However, the scientific value of such self-ratings, distinct from their interest as phenomenological descriptions, is open to question and requires considerable investigation.

Future research can analyze the ideals themselves, e.g., codifying the content, describing types of ideals, evaluating the maturity of the ideal. Secondly, the limitations of the self-actualization model indicate that religious maturity may profitably be related to other measures of personality development or adjustment. Thirdly, because priests have a particular commitment to religious maturity, other populations need to be studied. Fourthly, individuals reporting no progress could be studied in greater detail. Finally, levels of religious maturity and progress could be related to other personality variables, to particular religious experiences, and to other external behavior.
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APPENDIX A
APPENDIX A

Brief descriptions and abbreviations of the scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory:

Time Competent (TC): lives in the present rather than the past or the future

Inner Directed (ID): independent, self-supportive

Self-Actualizing Value (SAV): holds values of self-actualized persons

Existentiality (EX): ability to react to situations without rigid adherence to principles

Feeling Reactivity (FR): sensitive to one's own needs and feelings

Spontaneity (SP): ability to express feelings in spontaneous behavior

Self-Regard (SR): ability to like oneself because of worth as a person

Self-Acceptance (SA): acceptance of self despite weaknesses or deficiencies

Nature of Man (NM): sees man as essentially good

Synergy (SY): sees the opposites of life as meaningfully related

Acceptance of Aggression (AG): accept feelings of anger or aggression as natural

Capacity for Intimate Contact (CI): ability to develop meaningful, contactful relationships unencumbered by expectations and obligations
APPENDIX B
Everybody has some idea of what having a mature faith means. Some people, we say, have a mature faith. Others, we claim, have an immature faith. From your point of view, what are the essential characteristics of the most mature kind of faith? (Take your time in answering; such things aren't easy to put into words.)

(On a separate sheet of paper)

Now, again from your point of view, what are the essential characteristics of the most immature kind of faith? (Again, take your time in answering.)
Below is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that at the top of the ladder (step number 10) is the most mature kind of faith you have just described; at the bottom of the ladder (step number 0) is the most immature kind of faith you have described.

10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0

1. Where on the ladder do you feel you stand as you really are?
   Step number ________.

2. Where on the ladder would you like to stand?
   Step number ________.

3. Where on the ladder do you feel your closest friends believe you stand?
   Step number ________.

4. Where on the ladder would you say you stood five years ago?
   Step number ________.

5. And where do you think you will be on the ladder five years from now?
   Step number ________.
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to relate religious development to self-actualization and liberal-conservative religious outlook.

Religious development was defined within a phenomenological framework, as successful striving towards one's faith ideal. Each subject established the extremes of a ten-point continuum by describing the "most mature" and the "most immature kind of faith" in terms of his own perceptions and goals; and then rated himself as of the present, as of five years ago, and as of five years hence. The measure was the Maturity of Faith Scale (Kennedy & Heckler, 1971).

Self-actualization was operationally defined by the Personal Orientation Inventory (Snowdon, 1969). Liberal-conservative outlook was conceived in terms of acceptance of traditional doctrines versus personal conscience, desire for traditional forms and roles, and rejection of human sources of faith; and was operationally defined by the Religious Liberalism-Conservative Scale (Kupst, 1972).

The subjects were 230 American Roman Catholic priests.

The hypothesized positive correlations of liberal outlook and self-actualization with maturity of faith were not confirmed; the hypothesized absence of a significant difference between liberals and conservatives, who were both high on self-actualization, was supported, but not for the reasons suggested. Conservatives were slightly higher on maturity of faith than liberals, but not if the liberals were high on self-actualization. Analysis of variance for
repeated measures showed significant progress on maturity of faith from past to present to future, for high, medium and low levels of self-actualization, liberal-conservative outlook and age.

It was concluded that relatively little is known about the psychological variables related to self-perceived maturity of faith and that self-actualization can be an asset in the pursuit of one's faith ideal, particularly for liberals.

The possible advantage of the conservative position was discussed, as well as the need for future research to establish the usefulness of self-report data on the Maturity of Faith Scale. Specific areas for research were indicated.
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