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MEASURING RELIGIOUS MATURITY: A PROPOSED SCALE

Roger L. Dudley, Ed.D.  Robert J. Cruise, Ph.D.
Andrews University  Loma Linda University


Gordon Allport offered a rich and complex description of mature religion. More recently, Batson and Ventis have proposed that the scales constructed to measure Allport’s intrinsic orientation actually capture only part of the concept of maturity that he had in mind—religion as master motive. They have offered the quest orientation to account for the qualities of complexity, humility, and tentativeness. But quest seems as one-sided as intrinsic. In an attempt to construct a scale that would reflect the religious maturity Allport originally envisioned, a pool of items were written; combined with intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest items into the Personal Religion Inventory, and administered to 491 subjects. The resulting factor analyses produced the 11-item Religious Maturity Scale. It is offered as a further tool with which to test theory and conduct new research on personal orientations to religion.

Is religion generally a positive or a negative force in individual lives and in the larger society? Are some ways of being religious more beneficial than others? Since about the midpoint of the century the most common answer from the psychology of religion has been that there are two major orientations. The first merely uses religion as a means to gain other personal goals. Such religion is self-centered and does not contribute to either individual psychological health or to the betterment of society. The second orientation, however, defines a religion that is a controlling force in the life. It consists of a set of internalized principles that guide all interactions. Because such religion is an integrating force in the personality and because it guides conduct with fellow humans, it is viewed as a positive and beneficial influence in society.

These two ways of being religious have been most often labeled extrinsic and intrinsic according to the typology proposed by Gordon Allport (1960; 1966; Allport and Ross, 1967). An alternative but similar formulation is the difference between consensual and committed religion described by Allen and Spilka (1967). The two-orientations approach has generated much research. (See, for example, the Symposium in the 1985 Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 407-442.)

More recently, however, Batson and Ventis (1982) have proposed that this concept be modified in favor of a three-dimensional orientation to religion. They would, for the most part, accept the extrinsic orientation of Allport, calling it extrinsic-means. They would also retain the intrinsic-end orientation, but it would represent a much-more restricted concept than Allport originally envisioned for it. Most importantly, they would add a third way of being religious which they label quest. To understand the point of this paper, we must look briefly at their reasoning.
FROM MATURE TO INTRINSIC

Batson and Ventis point out that Allport began his work in this field by distinguishing between immature and mature religion. Mature religion is “(1) well differentiated; (2) dynamic in character in spite of its derivative nature; (3) productive of a consistent morality; (4) comprehensive; (5) integral; and (6) fundamentally heuristic” (Allport, 1950: 57). Quoting and paraphrasing from page 72, they explain that: “At the same time that it provides direction to life as a ‘master motive,’ it is flexible and responsive to new information, neither fanatic nor compulsive. It deals openly and honestly with ‘matters central to all existence,’ including the difficult questions of ethical responsibility and evil. It produces the ability to ‘act wholeheartedly even without absolute certainty. It can be sure without being cocksure’ ” (Batson & Ventis, 1982: 143).

In the process of developing his views Allport substituted extrinsic and intrinsic orientations for his immature-mature typology and developed the Religious Orientation Scale (ROS) to measure the variables. Batson and Ventis believe that in the scale development half of the definition of mature religion was overlooked. Nothing about the ROS Intrinsic Scale seems to measure the qualities of complexity, questioning, humility, tentativeness, and concern for others that are so much a part of mature religion. What remains is the “master motive” concept. Religion is important and satisfying because it makes meaning out of life; it provides answers to existential questions. Batson and Ventis hold that the type of person likely to score high on the Intrinsic Scale may be one who actually tends “to identify with and accept religious dogma, authority figures, or institutions in a rigid, uncritical, and dependent fashion” (146); one who has more in common with Hoffer’s (1951) concept of the “true believer” than Allport’s concept of mature religion.

THE FRACTURING OF A CONCEPT

At this point Batson and Ventis would appear to have had two options: develop a scale that would measure mature religion or divide the larger concept into two contrasting constructs. They chose the latter and have since attempted to measure, describe, and evaluate three ways of being religious: extrinsic-means, intrinsic-end, and quest. The intrinsic-end dimension retains the importance of religion for making meaning out of life and its integrative function for the personality. The quest dimension preserves the questioning, tentative, open, and flexible qualities of religion.

Throughout their work Batson and Ventis compare and contrast intrinsic-end and quest ways of being religious (little good has been said for extrinsic-means). The consequences of both as to freedom or bondage, mental health or sickness, and brotherly love or self-concern are explored. Each motivation has advantages and disadvantages. According to them, intrinsic-end orientations give purpose and meaning to life and provide an inner unity of personality. By being more involved with institutional religion these believers provide more help to the oppressed and needy of society. But they lack flexibility and are likely not to grow beyond the place where they first found satisfying answers. Their tolerance and concern for others are more likely to be in response to a need to be perceived that way than a genuine sensitivity to human concerns. People with a quest orientation, on the
other hand, are more open to personal growth and more sensitive to the needs of others, but they are more likely to suffer from existential anxiety since they have no final answers.

The claims for quest have elicited much discussion in the literature. Donahue (1985) has authored a large-scale review of the intrinsic-extrinsic concept which includes a conceptual critique of quest. He notes that Batson presents a picture of quest as being less dogmatic, less prejudiced, and more responsive to the true needs of others than is intrinsic. However, he finds three conceptual difficulties with quest: (1) Religious tradition. Quest is not in the line of the Hebrew prophets, as claimed. They were aligned with a formal creed and were more likely to deliver answers than to seek them. The prophets did not present their messages as part of their personal development; their words reflected their direct experience of the divine. (2) Allport’s writings. Quest departs from the concept of religion as a master motive. While Allport wrote that mature religion knows all the grounds for skepticism, he went on to say that it chooses commitment, gradually strengthening faith and causing doubt to disappear. (3) Nature of religiousness. Quest has consistently failed to correlate with any measure of religiousness. Perhaps it does not measure religiosity at all but might best be characterized as an agnosticism scale.

Hood and Morris (1985) dispute the claim of superiority of quest over intrinsic orientation on two conceptual grounds: (1) Batson and Ventis utilize a functional definition of religion which focuses on process rather than content. Thus that which is searching is defined as healthier than that which has found, ensuring that quest will come out ahead. (2) In constructing the dimension they define quest operationally in part by subtracting a weighted score for religious orthodoxy. Thus the content of faith is used to evaluate the process of faith. People with orthodox beliefs are predetermined to be relatively close minded and rigid. Batson and Ventis (1985) have replied that they do not present quest as “healthier” than intrinsic and that their reason for a functional definition was to allow for the diversity of religion. They also defend content and process as inseparable.

Finney and Maloney (1985) present empirical data that seem to suggest, contrary to Batson and Ventis’ claims, that means, end, and quest may be typologies rather than three independent dimensions of religious orientation unrelated to each other. Hilty, et al. (1985) criticize the factor techniques Batson and Ventis employed to extract the three dimensions and the component structure of the six scales. Spilka, et al. (1985) object to the use of samples that are poorly defined religiously. Kojetin, et al. (1987) find support for the hypothesis that the quest instrument might be more a measure of religious conflict and personal distress than the open-minded, searching orientation theorized by Batson and Ventis.

Given these objections, we do not think that quest measures religious maturity—at least not in the Allport tradition—although it may describe persons with a particular approach to religion and thus have merit on its own. What seems to be lacking is a way of being religious that combines the best qualities of both intrinsic and quest and therefore reflects Allport’s original definition of mature religion. It is true that Batson and Ventis point out that their method of determining the factors underlying each orientation (principal components analysis with orthogonal rotation) means that the factors are independent of each other, and that they are establishing dimensions not types (159). Thus any given person could be high on both intrinsic-end and quest.
Perhaps such a person could be considered to have a mature religious sentiment in terms of Allport’s formulation. However, in their illustrations and applications, Batson and Ventis never describe or discuss such an individual. Nor do they consider this possibility in their extensive discussions of the multiple consequences of the various religious orientations.

Such a person would be required to strongly agree with one set of items stressing commitment and the importance of faith while at the same time strongly agreeing with another set stressing religious doubts and uncertainties. To us this seems rather illogical, not to mention uncomfortable.

What is needed, in our opinion, is a scale that contains items that measure the complex ideas Allport was presenting in his description of mature religion. Such an orientation requires the individual to hold contrasting ideas in creative tension. But the contrast is not between faith and doubt. Nothing in Allport’s work suggests that doubters are more religiously mature. Rather, the tension is between commitment and tentativeness or openmindedness. Both are necessary, and any real measure of religious maturity must find a way to tap both.

THE CONCEPT OF MATURE RELIGION

Batson and Ventis judge each orientation on the basis of several personal and societal consequences such as psychological health and altruism. While they present the pros and cons of each and resist the temptation to make an overall judgment between them, it seems clear that they consider the quest orientation to be the most beneficial. They primarily prize the more complex cognitive structures and the openness to change that are involved. This is certainly understandable, especially since quest is their formulation. But it also assumes that there are no answers worthy of a life commitment. Suppose there are. Would this make a difference in what is more or less healthy?

Allow us to take this little game of “supposings” a step further. Suppose an all-wise God did create and does control this universe. Of course, we can neither prove this supposition nor disconfirm it scientifically, but we may theorize what might be expected if it were true. What if this God had a plan for each individual life? What if there is a final judgment and an afterlife in which destiny is determined by our response to God in this life? If this were true, would not agreement with statements like “God’s will should shape my life” and “It is necessary for me to have a religious belief” (intrinsic items) be a more reasonable approach to reality than agreement with “I value my religious doubts and uncertainties” or “I expect my religious convictions to change in the next few years” (quest items)?

Does this mean that we favor intrinsic-end over quest? No, for even if absolute truth and complete answers exist, we are never in total possession of them. Because we can never know the “Truth” (at least from a psychological perspective), an openminded and flexible belief system seems appropriate and adaptive.

But because one does not have final answers now is not to say that he/she can have no answers. Thus Allport’s heuristic criterion of religious maturity when combined with his dynamic criterion would seem to suggest that the mature religionist would say something like this:

“I have carefully studied the evidence available to me and have developed
some satisfying answers to existential questions. My religion makes sense to me; more sense than anything else I’ve considered. Therefore I am committed to believing in it and advancing it. However, I realize that it is incomplete. I will continue to study, and as new information becomes available to me and as I grow in understanding, it is very possible that I will see things in a somewhat different light. I want to be ready to progress in my understanding when a new piece of ‘truth’ becomes clear to me. In the meantime I will live by the light I have. And while on the basis of my present experience I prefer my religious beliefs over any others, I fully recognize that other people have a right to their beliefs and, given their perspective on truth, may be closer to reality than I am. This recognition, however, does not make me any less committed to my faith as I now understand it."

This approach to religion seems to incorporate the best of both intrinsic-end and quest and thus to come closer to Allport’s conception of mature religion than either of the present scales. Indeed, there is evidence that this is what Allport (1960) meant by the following discussion of intrinsic religion:

“Advancing thus into maturity, the individual does not necessarily lose his religious faith, nor even his belief in revelation and election. But dogma is tempered with humility: in keeping with biblical injunction, he withholds judgment until the day of the harvest. A religious sentiment of this sort floods the whole life with motivation and meaning. It is no longer limited to single segments of self-interest. And only in such a widened religious sentiment does the teaching of brotherhood take firm root” (265).

A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW SCALE

Allport had a valuable construct. As Batson and Ventis have noted, his instrument did not capture the fullness of that construct. But rather than split the concept in half, perhaps we should devise a better instrument. Or, better yet, we might leave intrinsic-end and quest in place to measure approaches that are one-sided and come up with a new scale for mature religion. With this in mind we set out to construct the Religious Maturity Scale.

We began by giving careful study to the seminal thought of Allport (1950), especially his chapter on “The Religion of Maturity.” From this study we derived a pool of 26 items that seemed to reflect one or more of his six criteria of religious maturity. We mixed these 26 items with 26 intrinsic or extrinsic items taken from Hoge’s (1972) list of 30 items (we selected the 26 that appeared on either Feagin’s 21-item list, Hoge’s 10 “best” items, or both). We added the six items from the quest interactional scale and came up with a 58-item instrument labeled the Personal Religion Inventory (PRI). Each item calls for a response on a five-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree (see Appendix).

We administered the PRI to 491 subjects. These were mostly students from two church-sponsored universities: Notre Dame (Catholic) and Andrews (Seventh-day Adventist). Many of the students attended the seminary at Andrews University, though other graduate and undergraduate students were also included. Also among the subjects were a group of about 70 older adolescents attending a state-wide, church-sponsored youth meeting and a smaller group of adults attending a mid-week prayer meeting.

The data from the 58-item PRI were factor analyzed, resulting in a loading of
items on factors that corresponded roughly to the original scales. Then the items to 
measure maturity which either had low (less than .25) loadings, loaded on more 
than one factor, or loaded on the wrong factor were eliminated. The remaining 11 
maturity items, along with 14 intrinsic and 7 extrinsic items, were factor analyzed 
using principal components analysis followed by varimax rotation with the rotation 
of three factors specified. Final loadings are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
FACTOR LOADINGS OF THE THREE-FACTOR CONSTRUCT 
OF THE INTRINSIC, EXTRINSIC, AND MATURITY ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic item loading</th>
<th>Extrinsic item loading</th>
<th>Mature item loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.* .79</td>
<td>25. .70</td>
<td>47. .55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. .76</td>
<td>34. .63</td>
<td>29. -.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. .74</td>
<td>18. .58</td>
<td>57. .49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. .71</td>
<td>20. .53</td>
<td>22. .48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. .70</td>
<td>52. .53</td>
<td>5. .48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. .69</td>
<td>27. .49</td>
<td>17. .47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. .68</td>
<td>23. .47</td>
<td>19. .42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. .67</td>
<td></td>
<td>45. -.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. .64</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. .36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. -.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. .46</td>
<td></td>
<td>26. -.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. .45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. .40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. .32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbering corresponds to PRI

An oblique rotational procedure was also calculated to determine if the factor 
structure would yield higher loadings, but, since the intercorrelations of the 3 
factors were close to zero (.004 to .166) and the loadings were not significantly 
different, the orthogonal solution was used. The final item communalities ranged 
from .107 to .634. The three factors accounted for 33 percent of the original 
variance. The eigenvalues and variances of the three-factor construct are shown in 
Table 2.

Table 2
EIGENVALUES AND VARIANCES OF THE THREE-FACTOR CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative % total variance</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability was determined for the resulting 11-item Religious Maturity Scale by the use of the Cronbach Coefficient Alpha (1951), an estimate of internal consistency which is a generalization of the basic Kuder-Richardson (1937) formula (Anastasi, 1968). The reliability estimate was .55. While this is only moderate, the point multiserial correlations on the individual items were all strong, ranging from .36 to .51.

The final 11 items composing the Religious Maturity Scale are listed here. Numbers 5, 7, and 11 are scored negatively; the remainder are positive.

1. My religious beliefs provide me with satisfying answers at this stage of my development, but I am prepared to alter them as new information becomes available.
2. I am happy with my present religion but wish to be open to new insights and ways of understanding the meaning of life.
3. As best as I can determine, my religion is true, but I recognize that I could be mistaken on some points.
4. Important questions about the meaning of life do not have simple or easy answers; therefore faith is a developmental process.
5. I could not commit myself to a religion unless I was certain that it is completely true.
6. I have struggled in trying to understand the problems of evil, suffering, and death that mark this world.
7. Churches should concentrate on proclaiming the gospel and not become involved in trying to change society through social or political action.
8. While we can never be quite sure that what we believe is absolutely true, it is worth acting on the probability that it may be.
9. I have found many religious questions to be difficult and complex so I am hesitant to be dogmatic or final in my assertions.
10. In my religion my relationships with other people are as fundamental as my relationship with God.
11. My religious beliefs are pretty much the same today as they were five years ago.

The lower-than-to-be-desired reliability of the scale tells us that we have set out on a rather difficult task. As noted earlier, the items require the subjects to respond to two contrasting ideas. One must balance the “master motive” role of religion, the intelligent and informed commitment to a belief system, with the openminded tentativeness of the searcher for truth. Respondents can not simply choose one or the other or both as they could if they were administered both the intrinsic and interactional scales. They must respond to the contrasting ideas within the same items.

This is no doubt very difficult to do for those who do not correspond to the psychological profile described by Allport but who are very likely in the majority in this sample. These may easily have become confused and responded in a less-than-consistent manner, thus lowering the reliability. This is a weakness in trying to operationalize a complex concept. With further studies and additional scale refinement, we anticipate an elevation in the alpha coefficient. (In a later study not reported here, correlating various measures of religiosity with attitudes toward
public issues from a national sample of over 400 people, we obtained a reliability of .68.

Finally, employing the PRI data, we correlated the total scores on the Religious Maturity Scale with those for intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest (using Batson and Venti's Interactional Scale). The matrix of intercorrelations is presented in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious maturity is positively but weakly correlated with intrinsic, not correlated with extrinsic, and positively and moderately correlated with quest. This lends empirical support to the conceptual claim that the maturity scale contains constructs from both intrinsic and quest but is different from either of them. The finding of some overlap but still a great deal of independence is exactly what would be expected if our conceptual argument is sound.

It is important to note that—following Allport—our scale seeks to measure maturity from a psychological perspective. This is in contrast to recent attempts by other scholars (Maloney, 1988; Benson, 1988) who use the content of Christianity as a part of scale construction and thus measure religious maturity, at least in part, from a theological perspective. We are not concerned (as scientists) with the "what" of faith but with how it is processed and held. Thus our mature religionist could be a committed Catholic, Baptist, Seventh-day Adventist, Jew, or even a member of a religion outside the Judeo-Christian tradition.

Some will be bothered, perhaps by our labeling our instrument a Religious Maturity Scale. Maturity is such a slippery concept. Would some other title be better? Our answer is simple. We have attempted to measure what Allport called religious maturity as differentiated from immaturity. No other label can reflect his work although, of course, whether or not his criteria are really the marks of maturity can always be questioned.

Is there a niche for the Religious Maturity Scale? Does it accomplish something above and beyond the existing Quest Scale? We think the following characteristics differentiate the two: (1) Religious maturity values clear answers to religious concerns, not merely questions, although it is open to a questioning stance. (2) Religious maturity retains the "master motive" function of religion, thus preserving its integrative role. (3) Religious maturity especially addresses the Kojetin, et al. (1987) concerns in that it emphasizes open-minded searching rather than religious conflict and personal distress. (4) With religious maturity there is not a contrast between faith and doubt but a creative tension between commitment and openmindedness. (5) Religious maturity provides for satisfying answers while still
searching for better answers. (6) Religious maturity is more faithful to Allport’s original conceptualization.

If we can study the consequences of mature religion rather than the rigid fanaticism of the “true believer” (we do not put intrinsic-end in this class) or the always-searching, never-finding rootlessness of the quest orientation, perhaps we can better answer the question as to which approach to religion is most beneficial in the areas of freedom or bondage, mental health or sickness, and brotherly love or self-concern. A broad field of empirical research stretches before us.
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APPENDIX

PERSONAL RELIGION INVENTORY

Roger L. Dudley, Ed.D. and Robert J. Cruise, Ph.D.

Here are some statements that show how some people feel about religion. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each by circling a number on a five-point scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

1. I have found many religious questions to be difficult and complex so I am hesitant to be dogmatic or final in my assertions.  
   Strongly Disagree Agree  
   1 2 3 4 5
2. My faith involves all of my life.  
   1 2 3 4 5
3. We should conduct a continuous investigation of each point of our religion to make sure that it is supportable and fits into the larger pattern of our beliefs.  
   1 2 3 4 5
4. One should seek God's guidance when making every important decision.  
   1 2 3 4 5
5. My religious beliefs provide me with satisfying answers at this stage of my development, but I am prepared to alter them as new information becomes available.  
   1 2 3 4 5
6. In my life I experience the presence of the Divine.  
   1 2 3 4 5
7. It might be said that I value my religious doubts and uncertainties.  
   1 2 3 4 5
8. In my religion my relationships with other people are as fundamental as my relationship with God.  
   1 2 3 4 5
   1 2 3 4 5
10. How I choose to behave morally is constantly informed by my religious beliefs.  
    1 2 3 4 5
11. Nothing is as important to me as serving God as best I know how.  
    1 2 3 4 5
12. I believe strongly in the tenets of my faith, but I respect the rights of others to differ from me.  
    1 2 3 4 5
13. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.  
    1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I do not expect my religious convictions to change in the next few years.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>It is best just to trust God and not try to explain the unfairness of life we see all around us.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I am happy with my present religion but wish to be open to new insights and ways of understanding the meaning of life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>What religion offers most is comfort when sorrow and misfortune strike.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>While we can never be quite sure that what we believe is absolutely true, it is worth acting on the probability that it may be.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Religion helps to keep my life balanced and steady in exactly the same way as my citizenship, friendships, and other memberships do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I have been driven to ask religious questions out of a growing awareness of the tensions in my world and in my relation to my world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Important questions about the meaning of life do not have simple or easy answers; therefore faith is a developmental process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The chief purposes of religion are to provide hope and consolation in this life and salvation in the life to come.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>My religious beliefs are pretty much the same today as they were five years ago.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>My religious development has emerged out of my growing sense of personal identity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I could not commit myself to a religion unless I was certain that it is completely true.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I see no need to struggle with interpretations of the Bible. I just take it the way it reads. That's good enough for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. There is no important question in life which my religious faith does not address. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

34. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

35. God wasn’t very important to me until I began to ask questions about the meaning of my own life. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

36. The function of religion is more to address the needs of believers and prospective believers than to speak to the conscience of the larger society. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

37. It doesn’t matter so much what I believe as long as I lead a moral life. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

38. A major purpose of religion is to fit all the various and confusing pieces of life together into one harmonious pattern. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

39. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or of the Divine Being. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

40. My religious understandings have helped me find better and fuller answers to the perplexing questions of life. 1 2 3 4 5

41. Although I am a religious person, I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs. 1 2 3 4 5

42. Questions are far more central to my religious experience than are answers. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

43. What my religion does for me is not nearly as important as how it helps me contribute to the glory of God and the good of humanity. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

44. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in life. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

45. Churches should concentrate on proclaiming the gospel and not become involved in trying to change society through social or political action. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

46. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray. 1 2 3 4 5

47. As best as I can determine, my religion is true, but I recognize that I could be mistaken on some points. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

48. If I were to join a church group, I would prefer to join a Bible study group rather than a social fellowship. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

49. If one studies the Bible carefully and prayerfully, it is possible to be absolutely certain as to what the truth is. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

50. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life. 1 2 3 4 5

51. My religion causes me to be deeply concerned with principles of justice, fairness, equality, and peace. 1 2 3 4 5

52. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity. .................. 1 2 3 4 5
53. I do not consider my religion to be a source of information on pressing public issues such as nuclear disarmament and world peace. ............ 1 2 3 4 5

54. Occasionally I find it necessary to compromise religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being. .................. 1 2 3 4 5

55. The realm of science and the realm of religion are altogether different and will have to be approached by different methods. ................. 1 2 3 4 5

56. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church. ...................... 1 2 3 4 5

57. I have struggled in trying to understand the problems of evil, suffering, and death that mark this world. ... 1 2 3 4 5

58. I read literature about my faith (or church). ....... 1 2 3 4 5
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