

Spring 2012

Societal And Spiritual Orientation: How People Interpret Ambiguous Situations

Joshua Tanguay
Fort Hays State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/theses>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tanguay, Joshua, "Societal And Spiritual Orientation: How People Interpret Ambiguous Situations" (2012). *Master's Theses*. 131.
<https://scholars.fhsu.edu/theses/131>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository.

SOCIETAL AND SPIRITUAL ORIENTATION: HOW PEOPLE INTERPRET
AMBIGUOUS SITUATIONS

being

A Thesis Presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the Fort Hays State University in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Science

by

Joshua Tanguay

B.A., University of Maine at Farmington

Date _____

Approved _____
Major Professor

Approved _____
Chair, Graduate Council

ABSTRACT

In the middle part of the twentieth century, Allport (1950) stated that the study of religion had “gone into hiding” (p.1). However, due largely to Allport’s seminal work in field, the study of religion blossomed. Batson and Ventis (1982) created a measure entitled the Religious Life Inventory based on their interpretation and critique of Allport and Ross (1967). The inventory categorized people as extrinsically, intrinsically, or quest oriented to their religion. These three orientations propose different ways that people use their religion. However, spirituality is not an inherent value system in everyone’s life (Allport, 1950). Therefore, the current study created three “societal” orientations to mirror Batson and Ventis’ (1982) spiritual orientations. The current research employed five measures to assess how people utilize their spiritual and societal values when they encounter an ambiguous scenario. These measures aimed to discriminate how people use these values in general versus situation-specific domains. Multiple regressions were conducted for the majority of data from the 235 participants. Results revealed findings that support Batson and Ventis’ (1982) conceptions of extrinsic, intrinsic, and quest orientations. Additionally, several findings support the idea that people can “cognitively contradict” themselves when asked about their values in a general way then asked to consider their values within a specific situation. This interpretation is similar to critiques of Kohlberg’s moral development theory. Additionally, it has implications for researchers and clinicians manipulating or reconstructing situations that people cognitively inhabit.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Janett Naylor for her continual patience, insight, and mentorship throughout the last year and a half. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. Leo Herrman, Dr. John Raacke, and Dr. Gene Rice for sharing their wisdom to improve my thesis.

My late mentor, Dr. Bertram Jacobs taught me the value of thinking critically, which sparked many of the ideas within my thesis. More importantly, he was a true friend and a great man.

Lastly, my parents Peter and Liz, my brother Luke, and many others are always rock-solid supports in my life. Through their love, they enable my education and quest to learn.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
LIST OF APPENDIXES.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Immature and Mature Religion.....	3
Religious Orientations.....	4
<i>Extrinsic Orientation</i>	6
<i>Intrinsic Orientation</i>	7
<i>Quest Orientation</i>	8
Lawrence Kohlberg and Morality.....	10
Indiscriminately Proreligious People.....	13
What if People are Not Religious?.....	14
Societal Orientations.....	15
Mental Health and Impulsivity.....	18
Current Study and Hypotheses.....	22
METHOD.....	32
Participants.....	32

Measures.....	32
<i>Adapted Defining Issues Test</i>	33
<i>Barratt Impulsivity Scale</i>	37
<i>Religious Life Inventory</i>	39
<i>Societal and Spiritual Adherence Scale</i>	41
<i>Demographics Questionnaire</i>	42
Procedure.....	43
PILOT STUDY RESULTS.....	44
RESULTS.....	45
DISCUSSION.....	59
Limitations.....	69
Clinical Implications.....	70
REFERENCES.....	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Variables and Method of Assessment with Applicable Subscales.....	25
2	Mean and Standard Deviation Values for All Variables.....	48
3	Beta values, F values, and Degrees of Freedom for each Regression Model.....	49

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix	Page
A	General Instructions for Data Collection.....77
B	Informed Consent Form79
C	Letter of IRB Exempt Approval.....82
D	Adapted Defining Issues Test.....84
E	Barratt Impulsivity Scale.....95
F	Religious Life Inventory.....97
G	Social and Spiritual Adherence Scale.....101
H	Demographics Questionnaire.....103
I	Pilot Study Validity Questions.....105
J	Pilot Study Categorization.....107

INTRODUCTION

In order to maneuver through the struggles of human existence, it is necessary for people to make decisions about situations in which the answers are uncertain. Solutions to dilemmas are not always clear, which lead people to draw upon their personal resources in order to formulate a justifiable answer. Among these uncertain and important dilemmas are whether to get married, move for a career, or protest for a cause. In order to make decisions about these monumental events, how do people utilize their values to come to a conclusion? Ambiguous events often produce uncertainty and speculation. People encounter difficult decisions every day that have implications for the self, other individuals, and their professional lives. The present research asserts that people can interpret ambiguous scenarios by employing their societal and spiritual values. Thus, people may use spirituality as a foundation to make uncertain and difficult decisions (Bornstein & Miller, 2009). Conversely, people may turn to societal values or standards to search or think about their response.

Religion has pervaded people's lives for centuries. However, psychologists did not focus on studying religion empirically until the last quarter of the twentieth century (Paloutzian & Park, 2005). This claim is supported by Allport (1950), who during the mid-twentieth century stated that among intellectuals the topic of religion had "gone into hiding" (p. 1). Today, approximately 95% of people report a belief in God (Bornstein & Miller, 2009) and 84% of people are affiliated with a religious denomination (Pew Forum on Religious and Public Life, 2010).

The psychological study of religion is a sensitive topic for some people (Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993; Fowler, 1971). Batson and Ventis (1982) present an analogy that captures why the psychological study of religion is sometimes difficult for people to embrace. A psychologist studying religion is similar to a botanist studying a rosebush. In order for the botanist to study the rosebush properly, he must dissect it, thus threatening its survival. In the same manner, religion often serves as a stronghold in people's lives, which enables survival. Therefore, when a psychologist closely examines people's religions, it may threaten a cornerstone in their lives. Because spirituality serves such a vital role in people's lives, it is logical to conclude that people may utilize their faith when encountering difficult decisions (Bornstein & Miller, 2009; Griffen, 1998; Idleman, 1993). Despite these various difficulties, it is essential to understand how personal beliefs, such as those that involve spirituality, may form a foundation for how people embark on the decision-making process.

Before proceeding, it is crucial that a functional definition of religion is addressed. The current study employs Batson's et al. (1993) operational definition for religion. The definition is, "whatever we as individuals do to come to grips personally with the questions that confront us because we are aware that we and others like us are alive and that we will die" (p. 7). These questions are commonly referred to as existential questions, which are concerned with issues such as the meaning of life, what happens after death, and general inquiry into human existence. Batson et al. (1993) asserts that people orient themselves in three major ways to grapple with these questions and other

sources of ambiguity in their lives. These three religious orientations, which are extrinsic, intrinsic and quest orientations, are a focal point of the current research.

Religion and spirituality have been defined in a variety of different ways throughout the past century (Zinnbauer and Pargament, 2005). Religion and spirituality are often polarized in research literature as static versus dynamic, institutionalized versus free, even as good versus bad. Zinnbauer and Pargament (2005) review the commonalities between the terms. Both religion and spirituality possess significance (they can be important in people's lives), both are a search (they are goal-directed toward significance), and both have sacred components (concepts of a God or higher power). These similar characteristics are sufficient for the current research to use the terms religion and spirituality interchangeably. Although it is important to define these terms for the field of psychology, for the purposes of this research, the terms religion and spirituality are synonymous.

Immature and Mature Religion

Batson's et al. (1993) three religious orientations were preceded by Gordon Allport's (1950) ideas of mature and immature religion. Allport (1950) normalized religion as a phenomenon that is understandable in relation to human nature. Allport (1950) suggests, "All our cognitive operations press toward coherence and unity" (p. 22). Religion is equally as natural as any other force that provides integration in people's lives. According to Allport (1950), people can possess different levels of maturity concerning religion.

Religious maturity is based on three major criteria. The first is that mature religious individuals have interests, needs, or beliefs that are beyond basic biological needs. Mature religious people can acknowledge the depth of life that surpasses shallow needs. These petty needs may include feeling socially prominent or always being part of the mainstream. The second involves self-objectification and insight into one's own religious life. Mature religious people are able to look upon their own beliefs with a critical eye and in turn are able to broaden their perspective. Lastly, mature religious people possess a unified philosophy of life that can direct their lives in a meaningful way. Although a life philosophy may be difficult to articulate and is often a work in progress, its presence allows people to integrate the idiosyncrasies of their lives.

In contrast, immature religious people possess characteristics that oppose these three criteria. People of immature religion have narrow interests and needs. Their perspective is fraught with self-justification and self-serving intent. Immature individuals are blind to different perspectives that threaten the paradigm granting them security. Consequently, there is little room for spiritual growth or exploration. Allport's (1950) ideas of mature and immature religion were seminal for future psychologists studying the once elusive topic of religion.

Religious Orientations

Building upon Allport's (1950) religious ideology, Allport and Ross (1967) developed two major styles of religious motivation. The first was extrinsic motivation, which seemed to mirror the characteristics of immature religious sentiment. The second was intrinsic motivation, which appeared to resemble mature religious sentiment. Allport

and Ross (1967) cogently summarized the difference between an intrinsically motivated and extrinsically motivated religious individual, “the extrinsically motivated individual *uses* his religion, whereas the intrinsically motivated *lives* his” (p. 434). Allport and Ross (1967) created a measure to assess people’s religious motivation entitled the Religious Orientation Scale.

Allport and Ross’s (1967) religious motivations were monumental to the psychology of religion. However, Batson and Ventis (1982) believed that the Religious Orientation Scale did not properly measure Allport’s original conception of mature religious people. The intrinsic scale seemed to assess how committed people are to religion but not how they critically evaluate or self-reflect upon their spirituality. Although Allport (1950) considered intrinsic orientation to possess “good” religion, important attributes of mature religion were mistranslated into the intrinsic scale (Batson & Prince, 1983). In order to accommodate for these missing pieces, Batson and Ventis (1982) implemented a third religious orientation, which is the quest orientation and attempted to build upon extrinsic and intrinsic orientations. The definition of religion (how people confront existential concerns) is integral to understanding each orientation.

Batson’s et al. (1993) Religious Life Inventory assesses people’s religious orientation. The quest orientation is the most unique and important addition to Allport and Ross’s (1967) religious orientations. However, Batson and Ventis (1982) attempted to create two other scales, which were meant to parallel the existing extrinsic and intrinsic orientations. These were the external scale and the internal scale. Today, there are two versions of the Religious Life Inventory. The current study uses a recommended

version by Batson et al.(1993) that does not include an external and internal scale. It employs Allport and Ross's (1967) extrinsic and intrinsic orientation scales, as well as Batson's et al. (1993) quest orientation scale. Specific reasons for the use of this particular version of the Religious Life Inventory are presented in the methodology.

Extrinsic Orientation

Extrinsic oriented religious people use their religion as an instrument to fulfill personal needs. Extrinsic religious orientation provides people with a superficial safety net for feeling secure and worthy within their spirituality. These people are not genuinely committed to their faith. Conversely, they use it as a prop to support personal needs and interests. Batson et al. (1993) further asserted that extrinsic religious people use their spirituality as a superficial guide to think about existential questions.

For instance, the topic of euthanasia contains existential questions such as the meaning and worth of human life. Extrinsic religious people may confront the topic in a different way than intrinsic or quest religious people. When asked about euthanasia, extrinsic religious people may respond in accordance with their own personal needs. If religion fills a social void in their life, siding with their fellow worshipers on the topic may be the most appealing option. Simply supporting what the church supports is a way to maintain a social connection. Alternatively, extrinsic religious people may think in a selfish way, "I don't want to think about people ending their lives, I practice my religion to make me happy." This thinking promotes personal comfort from distress. There is a lack of meaningful contemplation independent of thinking about the self. Therefore, self-reflection is limited to personal needs.

Intrinsic Orientation

Intrinsic religious people approach existential questions differently. As noted earlier, intrinsic religious people “*live*” their religion (Allport & Ross, 1967). Intrinsic oriented individuals incorporate religion into all facets of their lives and are often characterized as devoutly or fanatically religious (Allport & Ross, 1967; Batson et al., 1993). The hallmark of intrinsic religious orientation is that religion provides definitive answers to existential questions. There is safety in the certainty of knowing concrete answers to the difficult questions related to existence. From this certainty, intrinsic believers find strength and stability in their lives.

Unlike extrinsic religious orientation, intrinsic religious orientation can be compared to Fowler’s (1971) stages of faith development. Specifically, intrinsic religious orientation is similar to Fowler’s third stage of faith development. People in stage three are described as possessing a tacit meaning system. Within this system, people accept answers without questioning or reflecting on their meanings. Although intrinsic oriented religious people may have strong faith, it does not follow that they flexibly engage in existential thought.

When intrinsic oriented religious individuals contemplate existential questions, such as those posed within a discussion of euthanasia, they may strictly adhere to their religious teachings. Unlike extrinsic religious people who shape their religion to serve personal needs, intrinsic religious people internalize their spirituality and use it as an ironclad existential guide. Therefore, intrinsic religious people’s opinion about the meaning of life may be extremely pertinent to their outlook on euthanasia. Thinking like

“It states in the bible that life is sacred, therefore euthanasia is wrong” or “ I don’ think God would ever want one of his people to give up” are thought processes that demonstrate deep integration of religious thought. However, straying from these answers means betraying a creed that allows intrinsic oriented people to make sense of their world. Thinking about existential dilemmas is rigid but this inflexibility provides certainty and security in intrinsic believers’ lives.

Quest Orientation

Quest orientation is a completely original religious orientation, which directly stems from the current functional definition of religion. People who are quest oriented view spirituality as a path or a direction to encounter existential questions. Quest oriented people do not need definitive answers. They are willing to accept and work through the ambiguity of existential questions. Quest oriented people possess the attributes of mature religion that were mistranslated in Allport and Ross’s (1967) intrinsic scale (Batson & Prince, 1983). Quest oriented people demonstrate self-reflective, critical, integrative, and comprehensive religious thought. Spiritual growth is an evolving process that is rooted in thinking about difficult issues.

When encountering the topic of euthanasia, quest religious people may be more inquisitive, comprehensive, and deliberative in their thinking processes than extrinsic or intrinsic religious people. Quest religious people will not use their stance on euthanasia to gain social favor from others. Neither will they rigidly rely on a spiritual creed for answers to difficult questions. Instead, they may think, “What are the patient’s spiritual values? How do they relate to the present circumstance?” or “What are the spiritual

implications for the patient? How will this existential dilemma evolve my own spirituality?” These thoughts may cross the minds of quest oriented people. The questions reflect a tolerance for existential ambiguity and uncertainty while maintaining a genuine connection to spirituality.

Quest oriented individuals are analogous to those who have reached stages four, five, or six in Fowler’s (1971) theory of faith development. People in these stages exert a vulnerability and acceptance towards other’s truths. Fowler (1971) cites the philosopher George Santayana, “We cannot know who first discovered water. But we can be sure, that it was not the fish” (p. 199). Fowler links people of lower stages of faith to the fish that are swimming under water. Because these fish are submerged, they are not able to reflect critically on the religious system that engulfs them. Conversely, people in higher stages of faith are fish who can “leap” out of the water. This allows them to perceive and self-reflect on their spirituality. In the same way, quest oriented people are not sustained by the definitive answers that religion provides. They are accepting and continually searching for ways to understand, not to answer. The fish in the water, or the intrinsic oriented people, are consumed by the safety the water provides for them.

According to Batson and Prince (1983), people who are quest oriented possess greater cognitive complexity than intrinsic or extrinsic orientations when contemplating existential or religious conflicts. Schroeder (as cited in Batson & Prince 1983) developed the Paragraph Completion Test (PCT) in order to measure people’s levels of cognitive complexity when encountering difficult personal and interpersonal conflicts. Participants are presented with a sentence stem such as “When someone disagrees with me...” and

then are asked to write a response in paragraph form. In 1971, Batson created the Religious Paragraph Completion Test (RPCT), which is an adaptation of the PCT. The RPCT measures people's complexity of thought regarding religious and existential conflicts. Six criteria are used to evaluate the complexity of thought in response to sentence stems. These criteria according to Batson and Prince (1983) are:

- (a) tolerance of ambiguity and conflict, (b) openness to alternative points of view and to new information, (c) the ability to incorporate apparently disparate views within a larger synthetic view, (d) avoidance of compartmentalized, rigid thought, (e) recognition of the fallibility of one's own understanding, and (f) appreciation of the diverse functions served by different points of view. (pp. 45)

The RPCT scores of people who are quest oriented positively correlated with greater cognitive complexity. Whereas the scores of intrinsic or extrinsic orientated people did not positively correlate with RPCT scores. These findings further support the existence of the quest orientation. In addition, it validates that quest oriented individuals are able to think in a more self-objective, integrative, and less rigid way than people of intrinsic or extrinsic orientations.

Lawrence Kohlberg and Morality

In the later part of the twentieth century, Lawrence Kohlberg (1984) devised a developmental stage theory that encompasses how people may progress through levels of morality. Each stage represents a shift in moral reasoning. Stages constitute "structured wholes" (p.31) according to Kohlberg (1984), which are not merely attitudes of thinking about a moral dilemma, but a total cognitive framework of reasoning. According to

Kohlberg's theory, the process of deriving an answer to a moral dilemma is more important than the answer itself. Therefore, choices are not viewed as "good" or "bad". The theory focuses on the reasons behind the conclusions that people draw.

There are three major levels of moral reasoning. These levels are preconventional, conventional, and postconventional. Each level possesses two distinct stages, for a total of six stages. As people progress through the stages, they use less concrete or egocentric reasoning and use more abstract or existential reasoning. People who demonstrate preconventional morality may reason according to the avoidance of consequences or the acquisition of pleasure. People who exhibit conventional morality may utilize thinking that seeks to gain approval from groups or abides by societal laws. People who have attained postconventional morality may view society's regulations as a fluid contract, or reason according universal ethical principles. As people progress through the stages, they are able to diversify their moral understanding and better integrate different viewpoints relevant to moral conflict (Colby & Kohlberg, 1984).

Interestingly, there is considerable theoretical overlap between Kohlberg's theory of moral development and Batson's et al. (1993) spiritual orientations. A major difference between the two ideas is that Kohlberg's moral development is a stage theory, which implies a progression through stages. However, there is still similarity within the underlying cognitive thought of each moral stage and spiritual orientation.

Extrinsic orientation compares favorably with preconventional moral thinking. Both cognitive styles are concrete and limit people's self-reflective growth. Preconventional moral thinking is a response to external regulations (Duska & Whelan,

1975). As a result, moral decisions are based upon the pleasure and pain that are the consequences of these regulations. Likewise, according to Batson et al. (1993) extrinsic religious people view the world as a mean to procure personal needs. Like preconventional thinkers, extrinsic religious people are searching for ways to maximize pleasure and minimize pain. The consequences for the self are the only sincere concern. Because both preconventional thinking and extrinsic orientation are focused on maintaining primitive needs, there is little room for self-reflection that creates needs greater than the mere necessities of life.

Intrinsic oriented people and conventional thinkers share similar cognitive styles. These people feel security that derives from rigidly supporting groups. Conventional thinkers may support social groups or adhere reverently to a group of laws. Intrinsic oriented people may possess a dogmatic faith for a certain religious denomination or religious teachings. For conventional thinkers, moral value comes from maintaining the expectations of the group or laws (Duska & Whelan, 1975). Intrinsic oriented people receive comfort and safety from the answers that religion provides. Therefore, similar to conventional thinkers, intrinsic oriented people's adherence to their religious standards is critical in order to maintain their way of life. Both ways of thinking require reverence for and maintenance of a doctrine or group.

Lastly, quest orientation and postconventional thinking bear similar characteristics. The final two stages of moral development and quest orientation both contain abstract and complex thought. The hallmark of postconventional thinking is the presence of autonomous judgment (Duska & Whelan, 1975). Postconventional thinkers

can reason independent of society or laws. Through the questioning of societal laws or standards, they recognize the capacity for change. Likewise, for quest oriented people, there are not definitive answers that must remain constant. Spirituality is a pathway for personal reflection and evolution. Sapp & Jones (1986) found that quest orientation had a significant positive correlation with Kohlberg's postconventional thinking. In addition, intrinsic orientation and postconventional thinking were not closely related. This supports the corresponding cognitive dimensions of the two theories.

Some assert that Kohlberg's morality theory is independent of spirituality (Kohlberg, 1984; Wallwork, 1984). The theory provides a conceptualization for how people without a religious affiliation may utilize morality. Of course, religious people may follow the same moral trajectory, but the theory provides a possible basis of morality for those who do not.

Indiscriminately Proreligious People

When Allport and Ross (1967) found support for intrinsic and extrinsic religious motivation, there was a group of participants who were labeled as indiscriminately proreligious. These people did not fall neatly into either form of motivation. They displayed mixed characteristics from each. This has been a major criticism of the theoretical foundation of intrinsic and extrinsic religious motivation (Kirpatrick & Wood, 1990).

Perhaps another force was pulling on the indiscriminately proreligious people that complicated their religious orientation. Societal values may serve as a medium that obscures religious beliefs. For instance, participants who are intrinsically motivated may

be experiencing difficulty coping with their church's view concerning gay rights, yet agree with society's stance on the same topic. This personal struggle may complicate a person's religious orientation. It further supports the need for research on how people may relate to religion and society simultaneously in making difficult decisions. The current study seeks to tease out how people may rely on both societal and religious resources when encountering an ambiguous situation. In turn, this may shed light on how society may influence the classification of indiscriminately proreligious people.

People can certainly have personal values independent of spiritual beliefs that they draw on to make difficult decisions. The spiritual beliefs of indiscriminately proreligious people may be obscured by societal ideas and consequently these people do not neatly fit into a spiritual orientation. Additionally, Kohlberg's theory demonstrated that people might consider pleasure, laws, or utilitarian implications that are independent of religion when thinking about a moral dilemma.

What If People Are Not Religious?

The three aforementioned spiritual orientations may provide people with a base for approaching difficult situations. However, not everyone is religious. Pew Forum on Religious and Public Life (2010) reports from a U.S. Religious Landscape survey of 35,000 adult Americans, that 16% of people are religiously unaffiliated. Furthermore, the survey did not measure the strength of spirituality for the other 84%, only that they report affiliation. Therefore, considerable amounts of people may not have a spiritual orientation, or have a weak spiritual orientation toward existential questions. Allport (1950) states, "Not every mature individual forms a religious sentiment. If he does not, it

is because he has some other satisfactory philosophy of life...” (p. 54). Griffen (1998) goes further and proposes that people want trial judges to possess moral knowledge that is independent of religious values. People without spiritual affiliation or trivial affiliation, are not accounted for in Batson’s et al. (1993) spiritual orientations. In order to confront meaningful life decisions, people void of religion may utilize different personal values. They may turn to beliefs that are rooted in society.

The current study applies Batson’s et al. (1993) spiritual orientations to society. Three new constructs were developed that are considered societal orientations, which are congruent with the research of Batson et al. (1993).

Societal Orientations

The three societal orientations were developed as counterparts to Batson’s et al. (1993) spiritual orientations. The definition of religion, which is how people come to grips with existential questions, are applied to how people may orient themselves in society. The researcher of the current study has created societal constructs that parallel the three spiritual orientations. The parallel societal orientations are extrinsic societal, intrinsic societal, and quest societal. Kirkpatrick and Hood (1990) assert that the concept of intrinsic and extrinsic orientations may not be unique to religion. Intrinsic and extrinsic orientations may pertain to any entity and therefore may reflect underlying personality dimensions rather than traits that solely relate to religion. Although this is one of the major criticisms in the literature concerning intrinsic and extrinsic religion (Kirkpatrick & Hood, 1990), it supports the current research in developing three societal orientations that are independent from the spiritual orientations. These three constructs provide people

without a spiritual foundation with a way to orient themselves toward existential questions. Each societal orientation retains the same fundamental characteristics of its spiritual counterpart.

Extrinsic societal oriented people possess values that are influenced by environmental forces. Deep self-reflection in relation to societal values does not occur. Similar to Allport's (1950) idea of immaturity, there is a lack of self-expansion and self-unification. Meaning, that immature people do not hold values beyond shallow needs or they do not meaningfully integrate their life. Instead, extrinsic societal oriented people shape their values to be congruent with others in order to reinforce self-serving needs. If a need is to be socially accepted, then extrinsic societal oriented people may conform to other's beliefs about politics or laws in order to fulfill this need. As a result, existential questions are not genuinely explored because societal values only exist as means to serve personal primary needs.

Intrinsic societal oriented people bear similar tendencies to intrinsic spiritual oriented people. These people find safety in the certainty that society provides for them. When they think about existential concerns, they rely on the definitive values pronounced by society. For instance, a particular civilization may consider volunteering time a virtue. People who volunteer their time may be considered good or productive citizens. Intrinsic societal oriented people may devoutly prescribe to such a value and consequently find strength and safety in their lives because they are adhering to societal standards. Although intrinsic societal people are not using their values as means for other needs, their values are finite with little room for diversified growth. They are not developing or

expanding their personal values that are rooted in society, rather, they turn to society for definitive answers on how to “be a good person” or how to “live the good life.” This is congruent with how intrinsic spiritual oriented people turn to spirituality for explicit answers on the meaning of life or human existence.

Lastly, quest oriented societal people utilize society as a guide to a continuously evolving process of personal values. These people confront existential questions of “how to live the good life” or “how to be a good person” with flexible and open minds. Societal values may serve as a platform for developing interpretations to these questions, but they are not absolute. Personal values that spring from society are always developing and are considered indefinite. Henry Fonda in the famous film *12 Angry Men* is a juror member who deeply questions the “facts” of what is supposedly an open and shut case. His flexibility and open-mind allows him to interpret the case without jumping to conclusions. This quest orientation enabled Henry Fonda to help the other jurors arrive at the correct verdict. Quest oriented societal people approach ambiguous existential issues in a non-linear or malleable way.

The three new societal orientations are careful to retain the fundamental characteristics of each spiritual orientation as proposed by Batson et al. (1993). Each societal orientation represents how a person without a spiritual background may interpret existential questions. In using parallel spiritual and societal orientations, it is possible to gain insight on how people position themselves toward critical life decisions. People may be subject to pursuing self-interests, look for definite answers, or view the decision

process as evolving. When people encounter situations where the answer is not clear-cut, they may draw upon these foundations in order to reach a justifiable decision.

Mental Health and Impulsivity

Throughout history, psychologists have taken different stances on the worth of religion in relation to people's mental health. In the past century, some psychologists have believed that religion is a foundation for mental illness. However, others argue that religion gives meaning to people's lives and can enhance coping mechanisms. Batson et al. (1993) astutely observed that the interpretation of spirituality as a basis for mental illness is dependent on different conceptions of mental health. For instance, quest oriented people may meet criteria for mental illness if mental health is defined as acting socially appropriate. Characteristically, quest oriented people may behave in a way that seems aloof or deviant from typical social protocol. However, if mental health is defined as having an open mind and a flexible outlook on new experience, quest oriented people may be considered in good mental health. Batson et al. (1993) acknowledges seven different dimensions of mental health that apply to their three religious orientations in different ways. Using these seven lenses of mental health, each orientation can possess varying degrees of mental stability.

Impulsivity is a personality construct that can apply to several of these conceptions of mental health. Stanford et al. (2009) asserts that the concept of impulsivity is crucial in understanding personality because it relates to many domains of life including mental health, education, and criminal activity. Impulsivity is a multidimensional personality trait (Patton, Stanford, & Barratt, 1995). However, a

common definition of impulsiveness according to Moeller, Barratt, Dougherty, Schmitz, & Swann (2001) is “a predisposition toward rapid, unplanned reactions to internal or external stimuli without regard to the negative consequences of these reactions to the impulsive individuals or to others” (as cited in Stanford et al., 2009, p. 1). This broad definition of impulsiveness can apply to several of the conceptions of mental health (Batson et al., 1993) as they relate to the religious and spiritual orientations.

Impulsiveness may play a healthy or unhealthy role in both religion and society. Four of Batson’s et al. (1993) conceptions of mental health seem to have potential to relate to impulsivity as it pertains to religion and society. The first related conception of mental health is whether people demonstrate appropriate social behavior. The second conception is whether people are free from worry and guilt in their lives. These two ideas of mental health can be influenced by impulsivity. People may abide by certain religious or societal standards in an automatic and non-deliberative way in order to act socially appropriate. In addition, impulsive adherence towards a religious or societal doctrine may buffer people from worry, anxiety, or guilt in their lives. A third conception of mental health is that humans should possess personal competence and control. It emphasizes the need for people to effectively manage and have power over their environment. People who strictly adhere to religious or societal values who believe they know the answers to difficult existential questions may impulsively abide by these answers in order to create control and competence in their lives. The fourth related conception of mental health is whether people are open-minded and flexible when encountering new experiences. In this instance, not adapting to change because of the maintenance of a rigid outlook is the basis

for mental illness. Impulsive people may react to novel stimuli in an automatic way, disregarding possible negative outcomes. Therefore, impulsiveness may encourage rigid responses in situations that require greater flexibility. Again, if religious or societal doctrine is strictly adhered to, it may leave little room for open-minded inquiry. Impulsiveness can pervade mental health as it relates to religion or society through these four different conceptions of mental health.

According to Stanford et al. (2009) there is wide spread consensus in society that impulsiveness is counterproductive. Therefore, it is important to investigate how adherence to religious or societal values may be linked to impulsivity. However, it is essential that the three spiritual orientations, three societal orientations, and the different conceptions of mental health are kept in mind when measuring these variables. Batson et al. (1993) reviewed 61 studies concerning how the three spiritual orientations relate to the seven conceptions of mental health. The large amount of research reveals meaningful relationships among the three spiritual orientations and the different conceptions of mental health. However, there are no studies that investigate how impulsivity may be related to the spiritual orientations and societal orientations.

The current study seeks to examine how impulsiveness may be linked to the three spiritual orientations and the three proposed societal orientations. The Barratt Impulsivity Scale – Version 11 (BIS-11) will be used in order to accomplish this aim. The Barratt Impulsivity Scale has been developed over a span of fifty years and is one of the most widely used measures of impulsivity (Stanford et al., 2009).

The BIS-11 is composed of three second-order factors, each second-order factor possess two first-order factors. The second-order factors are Attentional Impulsiveness, Motor Impulsiveness, and Non-Planning Impulsiveness (Patton et al., 1995). The current study is particularly interested in the Planning Impulsiveness factor because of its connection with the functional definition of religion. Again, the definition of religion utilized is how people come to grips with existential questions (Batson et al., 1993). The Planning Impulsiveness factor is comprised of two first-order factors, which are self-control and cognitive complexity. Self-control involves the extent to which people plan and think carefully. Cognitive complexity involves the extent to which people enjoy challenging mental tasks. These two factors apply to how people interpret existential questions. Batson and Prince (1983) found that quest oriented religious people possessed a higher complexity of thought and a willingness to tolerate the ambiguity of existential questions. Different spiritual or societal orientations may predict impulsivity based upon how people interpret complex decisions.

Patton et al. (1995) asserts that “The subfactors are of primary value in defining impulsiveness in general and exploring more subtle relationships between impulsiveness and other clinical syndromes” (p. 6). In addition Stanford et al. (2009) states that most of the studies using the BIS only report the total score of impulsivity, however, in order to gain a better understanding of impulsivity on an individual level, it is imperative to explore how each subfactor plays a role. Although the current study recognizes the importance of the overall score of impulsivity, it also aims to investigate these “subtle relationships” as they pertain to values based on religion and society.

The Current Study: Hypotheses and Purpose

The purpose of the current study is to investigate how people interpret and draw upon spiritual or societal resources when they encounter a difficult social scenario. In life, people must make influential decisions that are not always clear-cut. The study may provide helping professionals with a better understanding of how people resolve ambiguity in difficult life decisions.

Fifteen unique hypotheses will be examined. In order to understand the variables and their measures, readers are encouraged to refer to Table 1. Twenty-one total variables are utilized within the hypotheses.

The first is religiosity, which is measured by the Religious Life Inventory (RLI) (Batson et al., 1993). The RLI classifies participants according to their religious orientation: extrinsic religious, intrinsic religious, and quest religious. These three constructs possess the operational definitions discussed in the literature review of extrinsic, intrinsic, and quest religious people.

The second variable is societal/spiritual adherence, which is measured by the Societal and Spiritual Adherence Scale (SASS). This scale reveals participants' general adherence to either societal or spiritual values when they encounter or think about difficult decisions. It is a measure of tendency to use societal or spiritual values.

The third variable is extrinsic/intrinsic/quest endorsement (EIQ Endorsement), which is examined by an adapted Defining Issues Test (DIT). The original DIT was developed by James Rest (1986) to measure participants' level of moral reasoning. It presents participants with different social dilemmas and then poses a question about the

dilemma. Participants answer the question from three choices and then rate twelve different considerations pertaining to that question on their level of importance. The adapted DIT retains the same social dilemmas and questions but uses different considerations for participants to rate on level of importance. There are twelve considerations for each social dilemma. The considerations are categorized as being extrinsic, intrinsic, or quest, there are four considerations for each orientation. EIQ Endorsement is treated as three separate variables because participants receive separate scores for each extrinsic, intrinsic, and quest endorsement, regardless of the spiritual or societal nature of the content within each statement.

In addition, the adapted DIT considerations can be categorized as societal or spiritual items. This distinction creates the fourth variable, societal/spiritual endorsement. There are six societal items and six spiritual items for each social dilemma. Therefore, for each orientation, extrinsic orientation for instance, there are two societal items and two spiritual items. This comprises the twelve considerations for each social dilemma. Societal/spiritual endorsement is treated as two separate variables because participants receive separate scores for both societal and spiritual endorsement. These scores are different from the societal and spiritual adherence scores because on the adapted DIT participants are involved in moral dilemmas from a first person perspective. Conversely, on the SASS, participants are considering their societal and spiritual adherence from a general and vague standpoint. The logic for this discrepancy is explained in the methods section.

The fifth variable is impulsivity, which is measured by the Barratt Impulsivity Scale (BIS) (Patton et al., 1995). It is a general and reliable measure of impulsivity. It possesses three subscales, which are attentional impulsiveness, motor impulsiveness, non-planning impulsiveness. The non-planning impulsiveness scale and overall measure of impulsiveness are of particular interest in the current study.

Variables fifteen through twenty-one are demographic variables, which are collected by the demographic questionnaire. The following hypotheses are grouped by sets of hypotheses for logical convenience.

Hypotheses Set One

The first set of hypotheses pertains to the three variables of religiosity (RLI), societal/spiritual adherence (SASS), and societal endorsement (adapted DIT). The first hypothesis is a main effect between religiosity and societal endorsement. Religiosity serves as the independent variable and societal endorsement as the dependent variable. People who measure as extrinsic religious will score high on societal endorsement. Whereas intrinsic religious people and quest religious people will have scattered scores on societal endorsement. This is because extrinsic religious people are loosely connected to their religion. When encountering a difficult decision, societal considerations will seem more logical or appear to have more immediate potential to fulfill personal needs than religious considerations. This is because extrinsic religious people will take the most direct path toward personal fulfillment. Societal considerations will appear to provide this more explicitly than religious considerations.

Table 1

Variables and their Method of Assessment with Applicable Subscales

Variable	Method of Assessment
Religiosity Extrinsic Religious Orientation Intrinsic Religious Orientation Quest Religious Orientation	Religious Life Inventory (Batson et al., 1993)
Societal/ Spiritual Adherence Scale Societal Adherence Group Spiritual Adherence Group Both Societal/Spiritual Adherence Group Neither Societal/Spiritual Adherence Group	Societal and Spiritual Adherence
Extrinsic/Intrinsic/Quest Endorsement Extrinsic Endorsement Intrinsic Endorsement Quest Endorsement	Adapted Defining Issues Test
Societal/Spiritual Endorsement Societal Endorsement Spiritual Endorsement	Adapted Defining Issues Test
Impulsivity Attentional Impulsiveness Motor Impulsiveness Non-planning Impulsiveness	Barratt Impulsivity Scale (Patton et al., 1995)
Intentionality	Adapted Defining Issues Test
Gender	Demographics Questionnaire
Ethnicity	Demographics Questionnaire
Age	Demographics Questionnaire
Academic Classification	Demographics Questionnaire
Academic Major	Demographics Questionnaire

The second hypothesis involves societal/spiritual adherence and societal endorsement. People of societal, spiritual, both, and no adherence will differ on societal endorsement.

Lastly, an interactional hypothesis among the three variables; religiosity as an independent variable, societal/spiritual adherence as an independent variable, and societal endorsement as the dependent variable will be examined. The hypothesized results mirror the expected results of the first hypothesis. People who are extrinsic religious and adhere to spiritual values, will score high on societal endorsement when they encounter an ambiguous situation. Extrinsic religious people may adhere to spiritual values on the SASS, but when encountering an ambiguous dilemma from a first person perspective, societal considerations may better meet their personal needs and thus they will score high on societal endorsement. Concurrently, extrinsic religious people who adhere to societal values will score high on societal endorsement.

Hypotheses Set Two

The second set of hypotheses pertains to the variables religiosity (RLI), societal/spiritual Adherence (SASS), and spiritual endorsement (adapted DIT). The first hypothesis uses religiosity and spiritual endorsement. Intrinsic religious people and quest religious people will score higher on spiritual endorsement than extrinsic religious people. This hypothesis works in conjunction with hypothesis one in the previous set. If

extrinsic religious people are expected to have high societal endorsement scores, it makes sense that intrinsic religious and quest religious people would possess higher spiritual endorsement scores.

The second hypothesis utilizes the variables societal/spiritual adherence and spiritual endorsement. People who adhere strictly to spiritual values and people who adhere to both spiritual and societal values (high on both) will score higher on spiritual endorsement than people who adhere strictly to societal values or people who adhere neither sets of values (low on both).

The third hypothesis examines the interaction of religiosity and spiritual/societal adherence group in regards to spiritual endorsement. Extrinsic religious people who adhere to spiritual values will score low on spiritual endorsement. Intrinsic religious people who adhere to spiritual values will score high on spiritual endorsement. Lastly, quest religious people who adhere to spiritual values will score high on spiritual endorsement.

Hypotheses Set Three

The third set of hypotheses has only one hypothesis, which examines religiosity (RLI) as the independent variable and societal/spiritual adherence (SASS) as the dependent variable. For this hypothesis, the spiritual orientations on the RLI are not grouped variables but left on a scale.

Logically, people who score high on extrinsic religiosity should adhere to societal values because as stated in hypothesis one, they are loosely tied to their spirituality. However, because the SASS does not entail context driven scenarios, which people can

envision themselves within, people who measure high on the extrinsic religious scale will default to adhering to spiritual values. Without an actual situation where people who measure high on extrinsic religiosity can take a first person perspective, adhering to religious values will seem the most logical because religious values have consistently granted them personal fulfillment in the past. There will be greater diversity in societal and spiritual adherence for those people who score low on the extrinsic religious scale. People who measure high on the intrinsic religious and quest religious scales will adhere to spiritual values. Conversely, people who measure low on intrinsic religious and quest religious scales will adhere to a mixture of both spiritual and societal values.

Hypotheses Set Four

This hypothesis involves the two variables, religiosity (RLI) and extrinsic/intrinsic/quest endorsement (EIQ Endorsement). The hypothesis uses religiosity as an independent variable and EIQ endorsement as a dependent variable. It is hypothesized that religious orientation and EIQ endorsement may not match when participants confront a difficult social dilemma. For instance, participants may measure as extrinsic religious but then score high on quest endorsement when they encounter an ambiguous social dilemma on the adapted DIT. This would indicate that people could orient themselves to religion one way but then think about ambiguous situations in another way.

Hypotheses Set Five

The hypothesis of set five is comprised of religiosity (RLI) as the independent variable and impulsivity (BIS) as the dependent variable. Intrinsic religious people will

measure as the most impulsive in overall score. Quest religious people will be the least impulsive in the overall score. Extrinsic religious people will differ in overall level of impulsivity from intrinsic religious and quest religious people.

Intrinsic religious people view religion as providing definitive answers or “truths” about existential questions. They stand strong by these answers in order to reaffirm their way of life, consequently, impulsivity is a trait that enables intrinsic religious people to confirm their own beliefs and disregard other possible ways of thinking. Conversely, because quest religious people are more interested in questions than answers, they will be the least impulsive. Contemplation and deliberation takes time. Lastly, extrinsic religious people will differ from intrinsic religious and quest religious people in overall impulsivity but it is uncertain how.

Hypotheses Set Six

This hypothesis involves religiosity (RLI) as the independent variable and the non-planning subscale on the Barratt Impulsivity Scale (BIS) as the dependent variable. This hypothesis mirrors the previous hypothesis. The non-planning subscale on the BIS assesses the extent to which people think carefully and their willingness to approach challenging mental tasks. These characteristics relate to the operational definition of religion, which is how people confront existential questions. It is hypothesized that intrinsic religious people will score highest on the non-planning subscale. Quest religious people will score lowest on the non-planning subscale. Extrinsic religious people will differ again from intrinsic religious and quest religious people, but it is uncertain how.

Intrinsic religious people will be less likely to approach challenging mental tasks or plan carefully because that would risk dealing with a level of uncertainty, which threatens the safety and comfort in their definitive beliefs. Quest religious people will score low on the non-planning subscale for the same reasons they will have an overall low impulsivity score.

Hypotheses Set Seven

The seventh set of hypotheses has three hypotheses. It employs the variables of religiosity (RLI), societal endorsement and spiritual endorsement (SASS), and impulsivity (overall score). Unlike previous hypotheses, societal and spiritual endorsement will be grouped instead of representing individual variables. The first hypothesis, a main effect for religiosity, parallels the hypothesis presented in the fourth set of variables.

The second hypothesis uses societal and spiritual endorsement for the independent variable and impulsivity as the dependent variable. It is hypothesized that societal and spiritual endorsers will possess equal levels of impulsivity.

The third hypothesis involves an interaction between religiosity and societal/spiritual endorsement across impulsivity as the dependent variable. People who measure as extrinsic religious and adhere to spiritual values will be less impulsive than people who extrinsic religious and adhere to societal values. People who measure as intrinsic religious and endorse either spiritual or societal values will measure as equally impulsive.

In order for people who are extrinsic religious to adhere to spiritual values, they will be less impulsive because as stated in variables set one, societal considerations have greater appeal to extrinsic religious people. Therefore, in order for extrinsic religious people to “stick to their guns” or endorse spiritual considerations, it will require greater deliberation and less impulsive thinking.

Hypotheses Set Eight

Set eight of hypotheses utilizes participants’ age (demographic questionnaire) as the independent variable and quest endorsement (DIT) as the dependent variable. The older in age participants’ are, the more likely they will be to endorse quest items. People of older age may think more consistently in a deliberative and careful way because of general life experience, thus their quest endorsement score will be high.

Hypotheses Set Nine

This hypothesis uses the two variables EIQ endorsement (DIT) as the independent variable and intentionality (DIT) as the dependent variable. Quest religious people will select “can’t decide” when answering the questions posed after each social dilemma more than intrinsic religious people or quest religious people. Quest religious people are more ambivalent and inquisitive in nature. They may conclude that there is not enough information to make a satisfactory decision about the dilemma and thus choose “can’t decide” more than intrinsic religious or extrinsic religious people.

METHOD

Participants

The majority of participants in the study included people of eighteen years and older at a small Midwestern university. Two hundred and thirty-five students were surveyed. Males and females represented 43.4% ($N = 102$) and 55.7% ($N = 131$) of the participants, respectively (two participants did not report gender). Caucasians comprised of 81.3% ($N = 191$) of the participants, followed by African Americans (6.4%; $N = 15$) and Hispanic people (6%; $N = 14$). The mean age of participants was 20.22 years with a standard deviation of 4.02. Freshman represented 52.6% ($N = 122$) of the participants, with sophomores, juniors, and seniors all at 15.7% or below. Lastly, 39.6% ($N = 93$) of participants reported they were Catholic, with “other” and “unaffiliated” as the second and third most reported religious affiliations at 23.4% ($N = 55$) and 10.6% ($N = 25$), respectively. This mixture of participants established a randomized mixture of people who theoretically drew upon spiritual and societal resources when faced with an ambiguous scenario. Lastly, participants were offered extra credit within the course for participation in the study if the instructor of the course permitted it.

Measures

Five measures were used in addressing the research questions. They were an adaptation to the Defining Issues Test (based on Rest, 1986), the Barratt Impulsivity Scale (Patton et al., 1995), the Societal and Spiritual Adherence Scale (developed for the

current study), the Religious Life Inventory (Batson et al., 1993), and a demographic questionnaire. Again, Table 1 shows all five measures and their corresponding variables.

Adaptation of the Defining Issues Test – Third Edition

The Defining Issues Test (DIT) – Third Edition was developed by James Rest (1986) in order to measure efficiently people's levels of moral reasoning based on Kohlberg's (1984) six stages of moral development. Participants were presented with six different moral dilemmas. They made a decision about the dilemma and then rate twelve different items or considerations on their level of importance, which pertain to that decision. At the end of the survey, participants ranked their four most important items.

The current study retained a similar version of the original DIT but has several differences. First, the scenarios were slightly altered. Instead of the participants being a third party observer of the dilemma, they were characters in the dilemma. For instance, in the original DIT scenario of the Escaped Prisoner, the participants were asked to decide whether Mr. Thompson's neighbor should report Mr. Thompson to the police. In the adapted DIT or the ADIT (Appendix D), used in the current study, the scenario framed participants as the neighbor who recognizes Mr. Thompson's mug shot on a television program. As Mr. Thompson's fictional neighbor, participants decided whether to report him to the police. All four adapted scenarios were fashioned to frame participants as people who play a role in the dilemma, no longer merely outsiders. These alterations were essential in order to support the theoretical foundation of the spiritual orientations, which will be explained in the following paragraph. The adapted scenarios were; the

Escaped Prisoner, the Doctor's Dilemma, Mr. Webster, and the Newspaper. Refer to Appendix D to view all four.

After participants read a dilemma, they completed two tasks. First, they made a decision pertaining to the dilemma. The Escaped Prisoner scenario asked if the participant (in the role of the neighbor) should report Mr. Thompson to the authorities. Second, the participants rated twelve different considerations in relation to this decision on their level of importance on a five – point likert scale (5 = Great importance, 3 = Some importance, 1 = No importance).

There were four ambiguous dilemmas, each with twelve considerations. The twelve considerations represented characteristics of spiritual and societal orientations. Since there were three societal orientations and three spiritual orientations, there were two items for each orientation for a total of twelve considerations. In sum, the twelve considerations for one dilemma were composed of two extrinsic spiritual, two extrinsic societal, two intrinsic spiritual, two intrinsic societal, two quest spiritual, and two quest societal.

The considerations for a particular orientation represented the elemental characteristics of that orientation. For instance, the considerations for extrinsically oriented people, whether they are spiritually or societally oriented, had components that suggested their decision was aimed at fulfilling personal needs or comfort. One of the considerations of the extrinsic societal orientation for the Escaped Prisoner dilemma was, "Whether Mr. Thompson, as a member of society, has been a helpful and kind neighbor to me through the years." The extrinsic spiritual counterpart was, "How it would affect

my reputation in the church if others found out I were living next to a criminal all these years.” The influence of securing personal needs remained constant across both extrinsic spiritual and extrinsic societal considerations.

The intrinsic orientations, whether societal or spiritual, reflected a need for definitive answers or a need for certainty. In the Escaped Prisoner dilemma, one of the intrinsic societal considerations was “Is it clear that the evidence at Mr. Thomson’s trial identified him as definitely committing the charged crime?” The intrinsic spiritual counterpart was, “Whether I can find the right answer in my spiritual teachings or sacred texts.”

Quest orientations, whether societal or spiritual, possessed components that demonstrate self-reflective, diversified, and comprehensive thought. In the Escaped Prisoner dilemma, a quest societal consideration was, “Whether certain good deeds can erase the debt that Mr. Thompson owes to society.” A quest spiritual consideration was, “Would sending Mr. Thompson back to prison make him grow as a spiritual being or complicate his possible new spiritual journey?”

The original DIT needed to be altered in order to accommodate for the extrinsic orientations. Making the participants part of the actual dilemma allowed extrinsic considerations to have the self-fulfillment that attracts extrinsic people. If participants would have been framed as being a third party observer to the dilemma as in the original DIT, extrinsic considerations could not have been as genuine as when participants were framed from a first-party perspective.

The researcher had planned on the ADIT producing two sets of scores to categorize participants. Both sets of scores would have related to the ratings of importance for the 48 total considerations across the four dilemmas. However, this scoring process was designed to be made suitable for factorial ANOVAS and ANOVAS. The current study did not attain enough participants across the multiple adherence and endorsement orientations to conduct these analyses. Because of this obstacle, scores for each of the orientations were summed and placed into multiple regressions.

Although the DIT scenarios and considerations were considerably adapted, the original DIT possessed strong reliability and good validity. The P scores (total moral judgment indicator) demonstrated test-retest reliabilities ranging from .71 to .82. In addition, Cronbach's Alpha of internal consistency measured in the high .70s for the DIT. The DIT has been supported by longitudinal validity. Three testing periods over four years revealed an upward trend in moral development through the moral stages. Because the ADIT used in the current study only used the original content of the dilemmas and part of the rating structure, the reliability and validity statistics stated above does not readily apply. Nonetheless, it is important to be cognizant that the dilemmas and the rating system have demonstrated good reliability and validity.

In addition, a pilot study was conducted using the ADIT. Participants in the pilot study filled out the ADIT and answered questions pertaining to ease of use of the test, the clarity of the scenarios and considerations, the extent to which they could take a first person perspective in the scenario, and more. In addition, participants were asked to categorize the considerations as societal or spiritual and extrinsic, intrinsic, or quest.

Forty-seven students participated in the pilot study. This helped improve the ADIT measure in terms of validity and reliability. The additional clarification questions on the ADIT are located in Appendix I. However, the actual scenarios are not included because they are identical to the scenarios in Appendix D.

Barratt Impulsivity Scale

The Barratt Impulsivity Scale-Version 11 (BIS-11) was administered to participants. The BIS-11 was considered a reliable and one of the most employed measures of impulsivity (Stanford et al., 2009). Its broad goal was to measure impulsivity within a person's personality traits (Patton et al., 1995). The instrument contains 30 items that were rated on a 4-point likert scale (1 = rarely/never, 2 = occasionally, 3 = often, 4 = almost always/always). The BIS – 11 may be viewed in Appendix E.

Patton et al. (1995) through factor analysis found support for six first-order factors and three second-order factors. The first-order factors Attention and Cognitive Instability composed the second-order factor Attentional Impulsiveness. It involved the degree to which people focused on a task and were distracted by thought insertions or racing thoughts. Motor Impulsiveness and Perseverance made up the second-order factor Motor Impulsiveness. These items measured the extent to which people acted on the spur of the moment and lived a consistent life style. Lastly, Self-Control and Cognitive Complexity comprised the second-order factor Non-Planning Impulsiveness. This dimension involved the degree to which people thought carefully and enjoyed

challenging mental tasks. The six first-order factors and the three second-order factors were both intercorrelated significantly.

The BIS-11 showed good reliability and validity (Patton et al., 1995; Stanford et al., 2009). Cronbach's alpha coefficient was strong for several populations including college graduates ($\alpha = .82$), substance-abuse patients ($\alpha = .79$), general psychiatric patients ($\alpha = .83$), and prison inmates ($\alpha = .80$). Thus, good internal consistency was present across a variety of samples. In addition, test-retest reliability at one month on an adult sample ($N = 153$), was strong for the total impulsivity score ($\rho = .83$). Test-retest reliability ranged from $\rho = .61$ to $.72$ for the three second-order subscales.

The BIS-11 demonstrated good convergent validity with other various subscales on other self-report impulsivity measures. The Zuckerman Sensation-Seeking Scale and the Eysenck Impulsiveness Scale subscales correlated with the BIS-11 total impulsivity score from $.11$ to $.63$ (Stanford et al., 2009). In addition, factor analysis revealed strong results for the BIS-11's three second-order factors and six first-order factors.

The BIS-11 was scored by summing the ratings of either the first-order or second-order factors. Stanford et al. (2009) suggested that people with a composite scores of 72 or higher should be considered highly impulsive. A total score of 52-71 was considered within a normal range of impulsivity. A total score of 52 or below was suggestive of someone who was extremely over controlled or had not honestly responded to the items. These were planned to be used as cut-off points in the current study. However, because of the issue with the factorial ANOVAS and ANOVAS, this scoring system did not need to be implemented to conduct multiple regressions.

The current study relied on the total score for a general measure of impulsivity. However, the Non-Planning second order factor was of special interest because of how it relates to the functional definition of religion. Both Patton et al. (1995) and Stanford et al. (2009) stressed the importance of focusing on the each of the subscales in order to gain a more accurate picture of the unique components of impulsivity that influence individuals.

Religious Life Inventory

Batson and Ventis (1982) originally developed the Religious Life Inventory. It measured people's spiritual orientation and had 72 total items. Six religious orientation scales comprised the inventory. Participants rated on a scale from one to nine the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with a statement. The scale ranged from: 1 = Not at all, 5 = Moderately, 9 = Extremely. The RLI is located in Appendix F.

Allport and Ross's (1967) intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity scales were two of the six scales. The Extrinsic scale (11 items) measured the extent that people use religion to serve personal needs or as an instrument to procure comfort or feeling of security. The Intrinsic scale examined the degree that people integrate religion into all areas of their life and rely on religion to provide them with definitive answers to existential questions, which they rigidly maintain as truths.

The External scale, Internal Scale, Orthodoxy scale, and Quest scale composed the rest of the inventory designed by Batson et al. (1993). The External scale (6 items) was created to correlate with Allport and Ross's (1967) Extrinsic scale, however Batson et al. (1993) found that it is associated more closely with the Intrinsic scale. The External scale measured the extent to which people's religion was influenced by environmental

factors. The Internal scale (9 items) was congruent with the ideology of the Intrinsic scale, it measured the extent to which people derived internal strength from religion, which grants certainty and unquestioned direction in their lives. The Orthodoxy scale (12 items) was associated with the Intrinsic and External scales. It measures the degree that people believed in traditional religious doctrine. Lastly, the Quest scale (12 items) measured the extent that religion is an evolving, open-ended, and self-reflecting guide for people when thinking about existential questions.

Through Principal-Components Analysis, three independent components were revealed among the six scales. The Extrinsic scale loaded onto a single component, which Batson et al. (1993) entitled the Religion as Means component. The Intrinsic, External, and Orthodoxy scales loaded onto one component named Religion as End. The Quest Scale loaded onto an independent component called Religion as Quest. Because of these loadings, Batson et al. (1993) suggested a compacted version of the RLI that demonstrated to produce parallel findings with the full version. To accomplish this, the integral scale from each component was used. Therefore, the Extrinsic, Intrinsic, and Quest scales made up the simplified RLI. The current research used this recommended version.

The RLI possessed good reliability and validity (Batson et al. 1993). For the six subscales on the extended RLI, Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged from .72 to .91, thus demonstrating strong internal consistency. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the Extrinsic Scale ($\alpha = .72$), the Intrinsic Scale ($\alpha = .83$) and the Quest Scale ($\alpha = .78$) were the three scales used in the recommended version, which the current study employed.

Discriminant validity for the Intrinsic and Quest scales was measured using a small sample of Christian and social work students (Batson et al. 1993). Students who were part of a Christian group were expected to measure high on the Religion as End component and low on the Religion as Quest component. Social work students because of the demanded flexibility and difficult dilemmas inherent in their work were expected to score high on the Religion as Quest component and low on the Religion as End component. Following expectations, the Christian group scored significantly higher on the End component than the Quest component. Conversely, the social work students scored significantly higher on the Quest component than the End Component. In addition, the validity of the Quest scale has found support through low correlations with the Extrinsic (-.10 - .10) and Intrinsic Scale (.00 - .25) (Batson et al. 1993).

Theoretically, in order to score the RLI, 235 participants rated 72 items on a nine-point likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Then, an average response (AR) for each of the three scales would have been calculated by summing the participant's responses for each scale and then dividing by the number of items on that scale. Instead, the summed scores for each of the three religious orientations were used within multiple regressions.

Societal and Spiritual Adherence Scale

The Societal and Spiritual Adherence Scale (SSAS) was designed to measure how people adhere to societal and spiritual values when they encounter a difficult or ambiguous life decision in general. It was constructed specifically for the current research. The scale consisted of ten items that participants rated using a nine - point likert

scale that ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree (1 = Not at all, 5 = Moderately, 9 = Extremely). The SSAS contained vague items in order to get an overall general adherence to spiritual or societal values. For instance, two of the spiritual items were; “In situations that are not clear-cut or black and white, my spiritual beliefs and values help me make sense of the situation”, and “Without religion, it would be difficult to maneuver through the challenges of life.” These items reflected a general adherence to religious values. Two of the societal items included; “An awareness of and respect for one’s culture allows a person to confront challenging life decisions in meaningful and comprehensive ways”, and “Societal values and ideals provide me with a framework for making difficult decisions that I encounter throughout life.” These items demonstrated a general adherence to societal values. The full SSAS can be viewed in Appendix G.

Prior to the issue with participant numbers for factorial ANOVAS and ANOVAS, to score the SASS, participants would have received a score for both spiritual and societal adherence, which is accomplished by summing the spiritual and societal items. Then median splits would have been used to categorize people as adhering to societal values, spiritual values, both sets of values, or no values. Instead, multiple regressions were implemented, in which median splits were not necessary.

Demographics Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire consisted of questions that ask for age, ethnicity, gender, academic classification, and religious denomination, and academic major. The demographic questionnaire is located in Appendix H.

Procedure

Participants were recruited from classes on the Fort Hays State University campus. Upon agreement of the professors who have classes on campus, students were given the opportunity to participate in the research study.

After listening to the recruiting script, reading, and signing the informed consent, willing participants received a packet with all four instruments and a basic demographic questionnaire. The administration of the measures were counterbalanced. With the exception of the demographic scale as being the last measure for all participants, the other four measures were a true counterbalance. The demographic questionnaire was administered last because it is a researched phenomenon that a priming effect can occur when participants receive categorical cues before doing a task (Dijksterhuis & van Knippenberg, 1998). Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg (1998) found that if participants were primed with cues alluding to intellectual accomplishment like professors versus cues indicating barbaric behavior like soccer hooligans, groups significantly differed across scores on a general knowledge test. Therefore, for the current study, if participants were to record that they were catholic before taking any of the measures, it may have primed them to adhere to spiritual values instead of societal values, thus biasing their responses. After the participants willingly completed all five instruments, they placed their own packet into a manila envelope. Lastly, participants were debriefed and dismissed.

PILOT STUDY RESULTS

A pilot study was conducted to determine the validity and reliability of the Adapted Defining Issues Test. After receiving approval from the institutional review board, forty-seven students at Fort Hays University were surveyed. To assess the reliability of the considerations for each scenario, Cronbach's Alpha was employed. Cronbach's Alpha was applied to each orientation within a single scenario. For instance, in each scenario, four extrinsic considerations exist along with four considerations for both intrinsic and quest. Therefore, Cronbach's Alpha was calculated for each individual set. The researcher used $\alpha = .60$ as an acceptable level of reliability.

To assess validity, each consideration was run through a frequency analysis on two levels. One level calculated the percentage of people who correctly categorized the consideration as either extrinsic, intrinsic, or quest orientation. The second level calculated the percentage of people who correctly categorized the consideration as either societal or spiritual orientation. The researcher used a 65% hit rate as an acceptable level of validity.

Overall, multiple questions needed alteration and clarification in order to improve validity and reliability. Here is an example of a consideration pre and post pilot study. It is consideration number two on the Doctor's Dilemma. For correct orientation categorization, only 37% of participants categorized it correctly as quest. Therefore, to increase the validity and reliability of the consideration, it needed clearer reference to quest oriented thought. Below are two examples.

Pre: What the implications are for medical care policy for people who believe there is no point in living in more.

Post: The implications for medical care policy for patients who believe that choosing not to live is a personal and relative choice.

The post version refers more clearly to quest oriented thinking as indicated by the use of language such as choosing, personal, and relative. In addition, the consideration is easier to understand because of eliminating “What” from the beginning. In general, the considerations that required alteration were changed in a similar fashion. However, it should be noted that the theme behind a consideration never changed, only the quality or quantity of language used to express it. The pilot study results improved the reliability and validity of the Adapted Defining Issues Test.

RESULTS

Analyses were conducted to test the nine sets of hypotheses previously discussed. Due to an insufficient number of participants in each cell to execute factorial ANOVAs and ANOVAs, regressions and multiple regressions were utilized to carry out the analyses. It should be noted that three regressions replaced the factorial ANOVAs. These three regressions imitated the two main effects and its interaction that a factorial ANOVA would have produced. If the overall regression was found significant, those values are reported below and if only one of the “main effect” regressions were found significant (the overall was not significant), those values are reported below. All mean and standard

deviation values are recorded in Table 2. Additionally, significant beta values for each regression model are located in Table 3.

Hypothesis Set One

Three multiple regression models (labeled 1A in Table 3) were conducted to determine whether the five predictors extrinsic, intrinsic, or quest religiosity (RLI) and spiritual and societal adherence (SSAS) predict societal endorsement (ADIT). Scatterplots indicated normal distributions with minimal bivariate outliers.

Bivariate correlations revealed one significant relationship with societal endorsement among the five predictors. Societal adherence showed a negative and significant relationship with societal endorsement, $r(233) = -.26, p < .05$. However, the remaining predictors of spiritual adherence, extrinsic religiosity, intrinsic religiosity, and quest religiosity all possessed non-significant relationships with societal endorsement. Thus, not all variables were linearly related, violating one of the assumptions of a multiple regression.

For the multiple regression equation, the Adjusted $R^2 = .07$, revealing that approximately 7% of the variance in societal endorsement can be accounted for by the five predictor variables. The overall regression was significant, $F(5, 229) = 4.54, p < .05$. Both societal adherence and spiritual adherence significantly predicted societal endorsement; $t(232) = -3.73, p < .05$ and $t(232) = -2.02, p < .05$ respectively. Therefore, for each one-point increase in societal adherence, societal endorsement decreased approximately .26 points. Additionally, for each one-point increase in spiritual adherence, societal endorsement

decreased .25 points. The findings suggest that the higher people rated societal or spiritual adherence, the less they endorsed societal values on the ADIT.

Hypotheses Set Two

For hypotheses set two, three multiple regression models were utilized. The first model (labeled 2A in Table 3) examined whether extrinsic, intrinsic, and quest religiosity (RLI) significantly predicted spiritual endorsement (ADIT). Scatterplots indicated normal distributions with minimal bivariate outliers.

Bivariate correlations revealed two significant relationships with spiritual endorsement among the five predictors. Extrinsic religiosity showed a significant negative relationship with spiritual endorsement, $r(233) = -.32, p < .05$. Additionally, intrinsic religiosity was significantly and negatively related to spiritual endorsement, $r(233) = -.44, p < .05$. Quest religiosity was not significantly related to spiritual endorsement. Thus, not all variables were linearly related, violating one of the assumptions of a multiple regression. For the first regression model, the Adjusted $R^2 = .23$, revealing that approximately 23% of the variance in spiritual endorsement can be accounted for by extrinsic, intrinsic and quest religiosity. The overall regression was significant, $F(3,231) = 24.30, p < .05$. Further, all three religious orientations significantly predicted spiritual endorsement. Extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity negatively predicted spiritual endorsement; $t(232) = -3.59, p < .05$ and $t(232) = -6.10, p < .05$ respectively. Therefore, for each one-point increase in extrinsic religiosity, spiritual endorsement decreased by .25 points.

Table 2

Mean and Standard Deviation Values for All Variables

Variable	Mean (<i>M</i>)	Standard Deviation(<i>SD</i>)
Extrinsic Religiosity	4.77*	1.20
Intrinsic Religiosity	5.25*	1.86
Quest Religiosity	4.58*	1.22
Societal Adherence	5.98*	1.18
Spiritual Adherence	5.82*	2.24
Extrinsic Endorsement	3.30*	.53
Intrinsic Endorsement	3.19*	.55
Quest Endorsement	2.98*	.61
Societal Endorsement	2.69*	.53
Spiritual Endorsement	3.62*	.69
Overall Impulsivity	2.18*	.35
Non-Planning Impulsivity	2.20*	.44
Intentionality	1.04*	.93
Age	20.22*	4.02

* *N* = 235

Table 3

Beta values, F values, and Degrees of Freedom for each Regression Model

Model	β	t	DF
1A			
Extrinsic Religiosity	.07	.87	5,229
Intrinsic Religiosity	.24	1.90	5,229
Quest Religiosity	-.04	-.58	5,229
Societal Adherence	-.26	-3.73**	5,229
Spiritual Adherence	-.25	-2.02*	5,229
2A			
Extrinsic Religiosity	-.24	-3.59**	3,231
Intrinsic Religiosity	-.37	-6.10**	3,231
Quest Religiosity	.13	1.96*	3,231
2B			
Extrinsic Religiosity	-.27	-3.85**	5,229
Intrinsic Religiosity	-.00	-.03	5,229
Quest Religiosity	.08	1.23	5,229
Societal Adherence	.11	1.81	5,229
Spiritual Adherence	-.41	-3.82**	5,229
3A			
Extrinsic Religiosity	.32	4.50**	3,231
Intrinsic Religiosity	-.20	-3.12*	3,231
Quest Religiosity	.14	2.10	3,231
3B			
Extrinsic Religiosity	.03	.84	3,231
Intrinsic Religiosity	.85	23.03**	3,231
Quest Religiosity	-.08	-2.04*	3,231
4A			
Extrinsic Religiosity	-.37	-5.10**	3,231
Intrinsic Religiosity	-.08	-1.22	3,231
Quest Religiosity	.16	2.27*	3,231

4B	Extrinsic Religiosity	-.17	-2.37*	3,231
	Intrinsic Religiosity	-.31	-4.75**	3,231
	Quest Religiosity	.07	.97	3,231
4C	Extrinsic Religiosity	-.03	.36	3,231
	Intrinsic Religiosity	-.18	-2.67**	3,231
	Quest Religiosity	-.06	-.79	3,231
5A	Extrinsic Religiosity	.07	.88	3,231
	Intrinsic Religiosity	-.12	-1.68	3,231
	Quest Religiosity	.02	.29	3,231
6A	Extrinsic Religiosity	.08	1.03	3,231
	Intrinsic Religiosity	-.13	-1.86	3,231
	Quest Religiosity	-.10	-1.38	3,231
7A	Societal Adherence	.03	.48	2,232
	Spiritual Adherence	-.08	-1.22	2,232
8A	Age	-.15	-2.30*	2,232

* = $p < .05$

** = $p < .01$

Additionally, for each one-point increase in intrinsic religiosity, spiritual endorsement decreased by .37 points. Quest religiosity positively predicted spiritual endorsement $t(232) = 1.96, p = .05$. Therefore, for each one-point increase in quest, religiosity, spiritual endorsement increased by .13 points. The findings indicate that the higher people rate themselves as extrinsically or intrinsically religious, the less spiritual they are on the situation-specific ADIT. Additionally, the higher people rate themselves as quest oriented, the more spiritual they are on the situation-specific ADIT.

The second regression model (labeled 2B in Table 3) utilized societal adherence (SSAS), spiritual adherence (SSAS), and all three religious orientations predicting spiritual endorsement. Scatterplots indicated normal distributions with minimal bivariate outliers. Bivariate correlations remained the same as model one concerning extrinsic, intrinsic and quest religiosity. Between spiritual and societal adherence, spiritual adherence possessed a negative and significant relationship with spiritual endorsement, $r(233) = -.49, p < .05$. Thus, not all variables were linearly related, violating one of the assumptions of a multiple regression.

For the second regression model, the Adjusted $R^2 = .28$, revealing that approximately 28% of the variance in spiritual endorsement can be accounted for by societal adherence, spiritual adherence, and the three spiritual orientations. The overall regression was significant, $F(5, 229) = 18.77, p < .05$. Further, both spiritual adherence and extrinsic religiosity significantly predicted spiritual endorsement, $t(232) = -3.82, p < .05$ and $t(232) = -3.85, p < .05$ respectively. Therefore, for each one-point increase in spiritual adherence, spiritual endorsement decreased by approximately .41 points. Likewise, for each one-point increase in extrinsic religiosity, spiritual endorsement decreased by .27 points. It should be noted that in the second multiple regression model, both intrinsic religiosity and quest religiosity became non-significant. These findings, similar to model one, indicate that the higher people rate themselves as adhering to spiritual values or as extrinsically religious, the less they endorsed spiritual items on the ADIT.

Hypotheses Set Three

Two multiple regressions were conducted for the third set of hypotheses. The first regression (labeled 3A in Table 3) determined whether extrinsic, intrinsic and quest religiosity (RLI) significantly predicted societal adherence (SSAS). Scatterplots indicated normal distributions with minimal bivariate outliers.

Bivariate correlations revealed two significant relationships with societal adherence among the three predictors. Quest religiosity possessed a significant relationship with societal adherence, $r(233) = .27, p < .05$. Additionally, extrinsic religiosity possessed a significant relationship with societal adherence, $r(233) = .36, p < .05$. Intrinsic religiosity was not significantly correlated with societal adherence. Thus, not all variables were linearly related, violating one of the assumptions of a multiple regression.

For the first model, the Adjusted $R^2 = .14$, revealing that approximately 14% of the variance in societal adherence can be accounted by the three religious orientations. The overall regression was significant, $F(3,231) = 14.04, p < .05$. All three religious orientations were significant predictors of societal adherence. Extrinsic religiosity positively predicted societal adherence, $t(232) = 4.50, p < .05$. Therefore, for each one-point increase in extrinsic religiosity, societal adherence increased by .32 points. Intrinsic religiosity negatively predicted societal adherence, $t(232) = -3.12, p < .05$. Therefore, for each one-point increase in intrinsic religiosity, societal adherence decreased by .20 points. Lastly, quest religiosity positively predicted societal adherence, $t(232) = 2.10, p < .05$. Therefore, for each one-point increase in quest religiosity, societal adherence

increased by .14 points. The findings indicate that the higher people rated extrinsic or quest religious items, the more they adhered to societal values. Conversely, the higher people rated intrinsic religious items, the less they adhered to societal values.

The second model (labeled 3B in Table 3) utilized the three religious orientations (RLI) as predictors of spiritual adherence (SSAS). Scatterplots indicated normal distributions with minimal bivariate outliers. Bivariate correlations revealed two significant relationships. Extrinsic religiosity possessed a significant relationship with spiritual adherence, $r(233) = .29, p < .05$. Additionally, intrinsic religiosity possessed a significant relationship with spiritual adherence, $r(233) = .85, p < .05$. Quest religiosity was not significantly correlated with spiritual adherence. Thus, not all variables were linearly related, violating one of the assumptions of a multiple regression

For the second model, the Adjusted $R^2 = .72$, revealing that approximately 72% of the variance in spiritual adherence can be accounted by the three religious orientations. The overall regression was significant, $F(3, 231) = 204.42, p < .05$. Further, two significant predictors were identified. Intrinsic religiosity positively predicted spiritual adherence, $t(232) = 23.03, p < .05$. Therefore, for each one-point increase in intrinsic religiosity, spiritual adherence increased by .85 points. Additionally, quest religiosity negatively predicted spiritual adherence, $t(232) = -2.04, p < .05$. Therefore, for each one-point increase in quest religiosity, spiritual adherence decreased by .08 points. The findings indicate that the higher people rated intrinsic religious items, the more they adhered to spiritual values. Conversely, the higher people rated quest religious items, the less they adhered to spiritual values.

Hypotheses Set Four

Hypotheses set four involves three multiple regressions. Extrinsic, intrinsic, and quest religiosity (RLI) were used as predictor variables for the three separate criterion variables of extrinsic, intrinsic, and quest endorsement (ADIT). For all three regressions, scatterplots indicated normal distributions with minimal bivariate outliers.

The first model (labeled 4A in Table 3) utilized extrinsic endorsement as the criterion variable. Bivariate correlations revealed two significant relationships with extrinsic endorsement among the three predictors. Both extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity were significantly correlated with extrinsic endorsement; $r(233) = -.33, p < .05$ and $r(233) = -.19, p < .05$, respectively. However, quest religiosity was not significantly correlated with extrinsic endorsement. Thus, not all variables were linearly related, violating one of the assumptions of a multiple regression.

The Adjusted $R^2 = .12$, indicating that approximately 12% of variance in the extrinsic endorsement can be accounted for by the three religious orientations. The overall regression was significant, $F(3,231) = 11.93, p < .05$. Further, both extrinsic and quest religiosity were significant predictors. Extrinsic religiosity negatively predicted extrinsic endorsement, $t(232) = -5.10, p < .05$. Therefore, for each one-point increase in extrinsic religiosity, extrinsic endorsement decreased by .37 points. Quest religiosity positively predicted extrinsic endorsement, $t(232) = 2.27, p < .05$. Therefore, for each one point in increase in quest religiosity, extrinsic endorsement increased by .16 points. The findings suggest that the higher people rated themselves as extrinsic religious, the

less they endorsed extrinsic items. Additionally, the findings suggest that the higher rated themselves as quest religious, the more they endorsed extrinsic items.

The second model (labeled 4B in Table 3) utilized the intrinsic endorsement as the criterion variable. Bivariate correlations revealed two significant relationships with intrinsic endorsement among the three predictors. Both extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity were significantly correlated with intrinsic endorsement; $r(233) = -.25, p < .05$ and $r(233) = -.36, p < .05$ respectively. However, quest religiosity was not significantly correlated with intrinsic endorsement. Thus, not all variables were linearly related, violating one of the assumptions of a multiple regression.

The Adjusted $R^2 = .14$, indicating that approximately 14% of variance in the intrinsic endorsement can be accounted for by the three religious orientations. The overall regression was significant, $F(3,231) = 13.57, p < .05$. Further, both extrinsic and intrinsic religiosities were significant predictors. Extrinsic religiosity negatively predicted intrinsic endorsement, $t(232) = -2.37, p < .05$. Therefore, for each one-point increase in extrinsic religiosity, intrinsic endorsement decreased by .17 points. Intrinsic religiosity negatively predicted intrinsic endorsement, $t(232) = -4.75, p < .05$. Therefore, for each one-point increase in quest religiosity, intrinsic endorsement decreased by .31 points. The findings suggest that the higher people rated extrinsic religious items, the less they endorsed intrinsic items on the ADIT. Additionally the findings suggest that the higher people rated intrinsic religious items, the less they endorsed intrinsic items on the ADIT.

The third model (labeled 4C in Table 3) employed quest endorsement (ADIT) as the dependent variable. Bivariate correlations revealed one significant relationship with

quest endorsement among the three predictors. Intrinsic religiosity significantly correlated with quest endorsement; $r(233) = -.18, p < .05$. However, neither extrinsic or quest religiosity held a significant relationship with quest endorsement. Thus, not all variables were linearly related, violating one of the assumptions of a multiple regression.

The Adjusted $R^2 = .02$, indicating that approximately 2% of variance in quest endorsement can be accounted for by the three religious orientations. The overall regression was significant, $F(3, 231) = 2.81, p < .05$. Further, intrinsic religiosity was a significant predictor. Intrinsic religiosity negatively predicted quest endorsement, $t(232) = -2.67, p < .05$. Therefore, for each one-point increase in intrinsic religiosity, quest endorsement decreased by .18 points. The findings suggest that the higher people rated intrinsic religious items, the less they endorsed quest items on the ADIT.

Hypotheses Set Five

Hypotheses set five consists of one multiple regression (labeled 5A in Table 3) involving extrinsic, intrinsic, quest religiosity as predictors and overall impulsivity (BIS-11) as the criterion variable. A scatter plot revealed normal distributions with minimal bivariate outliers.

Bivariate correlations revealed no significant relationships with overall impulsivity among the three predictors. Thus, not all variables were linearly related, violating one of the assumptions of a multiple regression.

The Adjusted $R^2 = .00$, indicating that approximately 0% of variance in the overall impulsivity can be accounted for by the three religious orientations. The overall regression was not significant, $F(3, 231) = 1.10, p > .05$. Further, no significant

predictors were identified. The findings suggest that extrinsic, intrinsic, and quest religiosity do not significantly predict peoples' level of overall impulsivity.

Hypotheses Set Six

Hypotheses set six consists of one multiple regression (labeled 6A in Table 3) involving extrinsic, intrinsic, and quest religiosity (RLI) as predictors and non-planning impulsivity (BIS-11) as the criterion variable. A scatter plot revealed normal distributions and minimal bivariate outliers.

Bivariate correlations revealed no significant relationships with non-planning impulsivity among the three predictors. Thus, not all variables were linearly related, violating one of the assumptions of a multiple regression.

The Adjusted $R^2 = .01$, indicating that approximately 1% of variance in the overall impulsivity can be accounted for by the three religious orientations. The overall regression was not significant, $F(3,231) = 1.70, p > .05$. Further, no significant predictors were identified. The findings suggest that extrinsic, intrinsic, and quest religiosity do not significantly predict peoples' level of non-planning impulsivity.

Hypotheses Set Seven

Hypotheses set six consists of one multiple regression (labeled 7A in Table 3) involving societal and spiritual adherence (SSAS) as predictors and overall impulsivity (BIS-11) as the criterion variable. A scatter plot revealed normal distributions and minimal bivariate outliers.

Bivariate correlations revealed no significant relationships with overall impulsivity among the two predictors. Thus, not all variables were linearly related, violating one of the assumptions of a multiple regression.

The Adjusted $R^2 = -.00$, indicating that approximately 0% of variance in the overall impulsivity can be accounted for by societal and spiritual adherence. The overall regression was not significant, $F(2,232) = .87, p > .05$. Further, no significant predictors were identified. The findings suggest that societal and spiritual adherence do not significantly predict peoples' level of overall impulsivity.

Hypotheses Set Eight

Hypotheses set eight consists of one bivariate regression (labeled 8A in Table 3) involving participants' age as the predictor and quest endorsement (ADIT) as the dependent variable. A scatterplot revealed that a normal distribution with minimal bivariate outliers.

The bivariate correlation between quest endorsement and age was significant, $r(233) = -.15, p < .05$. Therefore, all assumptions were met to conduct a bivariate regression.

The Adjusted $R^2 = .02$, indicating that approximately 2% of variance in the quest endorsement can be accounted for by participants' age. The overall regression was significant, $F(1,231) = 5.29, p < .05$. Further, participants' age was a significant predictor. Participants' age negatively predicted quest endorsement, $t(232) = -2.30, p < .05$. Therefore, for each one-year increase in participants' age, quest endorsement

decreased by .15 points. The findings suggest that the older people were, the less they endorsed quest items on the ADIT.

Hypotheses Set Nine

Hypothesis set nine consists of one bivariate correlation between quest endorsement (ADIT) and indecision (ADIT). Indecision was a variable representing the number of times “Can’t Decide” was selected as an answer to each of the four ambiguous dilemmas. The correlation was not significant, $r(233) = -.05, p > .05$. Therefore, no significant relationship exists between peoples’ level of selecting “Can’t Decide” for the decision on each ADIT story and peoples’ level of quest endorsement on the ADIT. It should be noted that in the Escaped Prisoner, 40.4% of participants selected “Can’t Decide” as their response to the decision. In the Doctor’s Dilemma, 20.4% of participants selected “Can’t Decide” as their response to the decision. In Webster, only 6.4% of participants selected “Can’t Decide” as their response to the decision. Lastly, in Newspaper, only .9% of participants selected “Can’t Decide” as their response to the decision.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to investigate how people interpret and draw upon spiritual or societal resources when they encounter a difficult social scenario. In life, people must make influential decisions that are not always clear-cut. Five different measures were utilized to examine how people assess ambiguous situations. Many of the findings were not congruent with the researcher’s original hypotheses. However, several interesting results were identified and their interpretations are discussed below. Lastly, it

should be noted again that because factorial ANOVAs and ANOVAs could not be conducted, the statistical interpretations based on the original hypotheses are made through the scope of multiple regressions and bivariate regressions.

Within hypotheses set one, it was expected that extrinsic religiosity would have significantly predicted societal endorsement in the positive direction on the ADIT. Because extrinsic religious people use their religion as a means to an end, they are loosely connected to their religion (Batson et al., 1993). Therefore, societal considerations on the ADIT may have looked more appealing. This, however, was not the case. Perhaps on the situation-specific ADIT, societal considerations appeared to possess little importance or were considered “taboo” to people who rated extrinsic religious items highly. It is possible these people have learned to refrain from endorsing ideals that may impede their ability to procure the personal needs that religion provides. Nonetheless, a major piece of hypotheses set one was not confirmed.

Rather, within hypotheses set one, both societal adherence and spiritual adherence significantly predicted societal endorsement in the negative direction on the ADIT. Intuitively, spiritual adherence should possess a significant and negative relationship with societal endorsement. If people adhered to spiritual values on the SSAS, they should endorse spiritual items on the ADIT, thus not endorsing societal items. However, it is counter-intuitive that the more people adhered to societal values on the SSAS, the less they actually endorsed societal values on the ADIT. Although counter intuitive, this finding revealed a theme, which the current research will call cognitive contradiction.

Cognitive contradiction was repeatedly identified within the significant findings of this study.

To help illustrate these cognitive contradictions, the idea can be compared to a critique of Kohlberg's moral development theory. Bruggerman and Hart (1996) propose that the relationship between peoples' moral reasoning stage and actual behavior is weak. For example, some people may have postconventional moral reasoning and may view societal rules as a fluid contract subject to change. However, when postconventional thinkers are placed in a live situation and must make decisions, their behavior may contradict their cognitive level of moral development. Likewise, the current research identified several significant findings that support a similar contradiction. The current research found that people who subscribed to certain values when asked in a general or vague way like on the SSAS then subscribed to a different set of values or no longer endorsed those values when cognitively placed in situation-specific scenarios like on the ADIT.

Through this lens, the contradiction of societal adherence on the SSAS negatively predicting societal endorsement on the ADIT in hypotheses set one makes sense. However, it should be noted that critiques on Kohlberg's theory have focused on the contradiction between thought and behavior, whereas the current research implicates a contradiction between general thought and situation-specific thought. Therefore, a cognitive contradiction exists instead of a contradiction between only behavior and thought.

The idea of cognitive contradiction resonates with the extensively researched conundrum of judgment versus choice (Sood & Forehand, 2003). Research has demonstrated that judgment involves more holistic or comprehensive thinking, whereas choice comprises a narrower frame of reference that often relies on heuristics (Sood & Forehand, 2003; Wedell & Center, 1997). Similarly, the general and overall adherence on the SSAS contrasts with judgment and choice contrasts with the situation-specific ADIT. In the current study, participants may have thought more comprehensively when “judging” their values form a general point of view. Then, the ambiguous moral dilemmas on the ADIT may have made choosing that aligned with their overall judgment of their values difficult.

Furthermore, Sood & Forehand (2003) found support that choice involves greater self-referent thinking than judgment. Meaning, people envisioned themselves as carrying out their choices in specific situations. This follow through with the self in mind occurred significantly less with judgment. The current study would assert that because spiritual and societal values likely play vital roles in meaning that people ascribe to their lives, that choice within the situation specific ADIT may have produced more self-referent thought than the general SSAS, thus creating a cognitive contradiction. The idea of cognitive contradiction can be interpreted for several other significant findings and will be identified when it arose.

As expected, in regression model 2C, extrinsic religiosity (RLI) significantly and negatively predicted spiritual endorsement on the ADIT. The higher people rated extrinsic religious items, the less spiritual considerations they endorsed in a situation-

specific decision. Extrinsic religious people are loosely connected to their religion because they use religion to gain social prominence or other needs secondary to spirituality (Batson et al., 1993). Therefore, it makes sense that people who rate highly extrinsic religious items would be inconsistent in endorsing spiritual items when other considerations may appear more appealing. It would be easy to state that societal considerations on the ADIT may have appeared to grant more immediate gratification for people who rated highly extrinsic religious items. However, as demonstrated in hypotheses set one, extrinsic religiosity did not significantly predict societal endorsement. Therefore, extrinsic religiosity did not significantly predict societal or spiritual endorsement on the situation-specific ADIT. However, the results did demonstrate that these people significantly refrained from endorsing spiritual items, which would be consistent with their superficial use of spirituality.

Additionally, regression model 2B and 2C revealed that spiritual adherence negatively and significantly predicted spiritual endorsement. This finding mirrors the idea that people can cognitively subscribe to one set of values in a general manner and then endorse a different set of values within situation-specific decisions. Endorsing spiritual values in a general way, such as “Without religion, it would be difficult to maneuver through the challenges of life” may seem natural to some people whose spirituality have been indoctrinated upon them. However, when these people have the opportunity to endorse similar values within a specific situation, their spiritual resolve may diminish. Therefore, people may be able to reason at a higher level regarding their values in a general way but reasoning ability may decrease on a day-to-day or situational basis.

In regression model 2A, quest religiosity significantly predicted spiritual endorsement in the positive direction. This was expected because quest religiosity involves mature religious thinking (Batson et al., 1993) that would be less likely to waver in comparison to extrinsic religiosity. The spirituality of quest religious people may be pervasive and fully integrated into their lives and therefore remain consistent across general and situation-specific decisions. This is congruent with Batson's et al. (1993) assertion that quest oriented people are more deliberate and comprehensive in their thought process.

Regression models 3A and 3B findings were as expected. Extrinsic religiosity (RLI) significantly predicted societal adherence (SSAS) in the positive direction and was non-significant in predicting spiritual adherence (SSAS). Extrinsic religious people are not genuinely committed to their faith (Batson et al., 1993). They use it as a platform to help attain their personal needs. It follows that rating highly extrinsic religious items significantly predicted societal adherence in a positive direction because general societal items on the SSAS may have made more sense than values relating to spirituality to which they hold a loose commitment. This finding supports the interpretation of regression 2C where extrinsic religiosity negatively predicted spiritual endorsement on the ADIT. People who rated highly extrinsic religious items in both regressions did not endorse spiritual values.

Additionally, regression models 3A and 3B revealed that intrinsic religiosity significantly predicted societal adherence in a negative direction and significantly predicted spiritual adherence in the positive direction. These results were expected. It

makes sense that people who dogmatically follow their religion would adhere to spiritual values, especially when presented in a matter-of-fact way like on the SSAS.

Consequently, it makes sense that they would be averse to adhering to societal values, which would explicitly insult the security they derive from their faith. When presented with the general statements on the SSAS, it logically follows that people who subscribe to intrinsic values would significantly adhere to spiritual values and abstain from adhering to societal values.

Several interesting interpretations can be deduced from the regression models 4A, 4B, and 4C. First, models 4A and 4B grant further validity to the idea that cognitive contradiction can occur between general adherence and situation-specific decisions. Extrinsic religiosity (RLI) significantly and negatively predicted extrinsic endorsement (ADIT). Further, intrinsic religiosity significantly and negatively predicted intrinsic endorsement. These findings support cognitive contradiction. People can cognitively endorse certain values on a general measure, then think in a differing way on a task that is situation bound. Identifying whether contradictions in thought orientation could occur was the purpose of hypotheses set four.

Two findings within hypotheses set four were not expected but yield interesting interpretations. First, extrinsic religiosity significantly and negatively predicted intrinsic endorsement. Secondly, intrinsic religiosity significantly and negatively predicted quest endorsement. Both findings lend an interpretation that both extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity identified something “off” or “wrong” with the intrinsic and quest items on the ADIT, respectively. For instance, perhaps people who rated intrinsic religious items

highly identified quest considerations on the ADIT as too open-ended or indecisive. This would be consistent with intrinsically oriented religious people who derive security from definitive answers or creeds. Similarly, perhaps people who rated extrinsic religious items highly found intrinsic considerations on the ADIT to be overly dogmatic or rigid. This would support extrinsic religious peoples' stance of remaining detached from entities and using them as platforms for personal needs. It is possible that people who rated extrinsic and intrinsic items highly on the RLI found differing orientations on the ADIT to be distasteful.

Meanwhile, other findings within hypotheses set four are less understandable. Quest religiosity significantly and positively predicted extrinsic endorsement. Such a finding leads to an interpretation that questions the validity of the quest orientation. However, this interpretation is not unique (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991). Hypothetically, quest religiosity should have endorsed quest items. When quest religious people confront ambiguous scenarios, they are theoretically supposed to relish the opportunity to learn from the ambiguity. Rather, people who rated quest items highly on the RLI significantly identified with extrinsic values, which is a direct opposition to how quest oriented people allegedly think. However, it may be that quest oriented people think in more complex way and holistic way (Batson & Prince, 1983) but when they enter specific situations powerful emotions such as pride or guilt may trump rational thinking. Hart and Chmiel (1992) revealed a similar critique of Kohlberg's theory. Nevertheless, quest religiosity did not predict quest endorsement, chipping at the foundation of the quest orientation.

To much disappointment, the Barratt Impulsivity Scale – 11 (BIS-11) did not yield any significant results within any of the regression models (5A, 6A, 7A). None of the three religious orientations (RLI) or spiritual and societal adherence (SSAS) significantly predicted overall impulsivity. Further, none of the religious orientations significantly predicted non-planning impulsivity, a second-order factor on the BIS-11. Therefore, it appears that people's overall or non-planning level of impulsivity does not depend on religious orientation or whether they adhere to spiritual or societal values. It was hypothesized that the more people subscribe to intrinsic values on the RLI, the more impulsive they would measure on the BIS-11. However, intrinsic religiosity was not related in any way to overall or non-planning impulsivity. Impulsivity may have been the wrong construct to compare with intrinsic religiosity. Perhaps, if intrinsic religious people learn to “live” their faith (Batson et al., 1993), they are deliberate in their thought because they must choose the “right” answer. This process may actually require more significant and deeper thought than expected. Nevertheless, impulsivity was revealed to be a futile construct in relation to religious orientation and adherence styles.

Contrary to expectations, the last regression model (8A) demonstrated that quest endorsement (ADIT) significantly and negatively predicted age. The more people endorsed quest considerations, the younger they tended to be in age. Previous research indicates that the level of moral reasoning tends to increase with age (Colby et al., 1983). Because, Batson's et al. (1993) orientations are based on Kohlberg and Piaget's theories of development (Batson et al., 1993), it would be fair to predict that people who are quest oriented are older. However, the contradictory findings of the current study may be due to

young college students experiencing a “shock” stage of learning where many of their previous values are being challenged inside and outside of the classroom. This possible “shock” stage may also be sparked by the discrepancy between liberalism at the college scene and conservatism in the home. Kansas is traditionally a conservative state within the “bible belt” of the Midwest United States. When high school graduates transition to college from a strong conservative background, there may be a tendency to digress or rebel from conservative values and embrace less restrictive ideals. Therefore, they may be more open to ambiguous and open-ended interpretations than the quest items offered.

Similar findings have been identified in research with Kohlberg’s moral development theory. Thoma and Rest (1999) found that situational factors can have a strong influence on existing moral principles. Perhaps the transition to the college environment creates confusion that may lead to people being unsure of their convictions.. By definition, quest thinking is content with uncertainty (Batson et al., 1993) and thus younger participants who were new to college may have identified more with the ambiguity that the quest items exhibited.

Hypothesis set nine did not reveal any significant findings. It was expected that quest endorsement would possess a positive correlation with the indecision variable. Because people who endorse quest items are allegedly better able to tolerate ambiguity (Batson & Prince, 1983), it was expected that quest endorsement would significantly relate to the frequency that “can’t decide” was selected as an answer to the questions after each of the scenarios on the ADIT. However, no significant relationship existed. It might have been illogical to hypothesize that people who rated quest items highly “cannot

decide” more often than extrinsic or intrinsic oriented people. A more rational explanation may be that quest thinkers can make definitive decisions as easily as other orientations but they have more sophisticated reasons for selecting their decision. Batson and Prince’s (1983) research demonstrates this idea by revealing that quest oriented people think in a more complex and comprehensive way than the other orientations.

Overall, many conclusions can be drawn from the current research. Perhaps the most important interpretation involves the idea that people can cognitively contradict themselves when asked to consider their values in a general manner and in a situation-specific manner. This research is comparable to Bruggerman and Hart’s (1996) critique of Kohlberg’s moral development theory where peoples’ cognitions and behavior appear to contradict each other.

Additionally, the current study demonstrates that people who endorse extrinsic religiosity consistently shy away from spiritual considerations when cognitively placed in a specific situation. This further supports the idea that extrinsic religious people are loosely connected to their religion (Batson et al., 1993). People who endorsed intrinsic religiosity, as expected, adhered to spiritual values and refrained from adhering to societal values when asked to consider their beliefs in a general way. However, cognitive contradiction did occur with people who endorsed intrinsic religiosity when asked to consider their values within a situation-specific domain. Lastly, people who endorsed quest oriented items did significantly endorse spiritual items within situation-specific scenarios, which supports their ability to think in a comprehensive and deliberate way. However, other findings relating to the quest orientation were less understandable and

contribute to the debate concerning its authenticity. Several of the findings of the current study can help further inform the foundations of the religious orientations.

Limitations

There are several limitations to current study. First, the study utilized eight regressions and in all but one regression, an assumption to conduct the regression was violated. Not all independent variables were linearly related to the dependent variable, thus violating one of the assumptions of a regression. Therefore, interpretations from these analyses should be made with caution.

A second limitation involves the small Adjusted R^2 values present in some of the analyses. The Adjusted R^2 s ranged from 2% to 72% within the significant findings. The effect sizes in several of the significant findings were small enough to question the generalizability of the findings.

A third limitation of the study was the lack of diversity within the sample. The constructs of spiritual orientations apply to people of all ages, ethnicities, and religions but the current study only sampled a population consisting of mostly 18-24 year olds who were predominantly Caucasian. Future research should consider seeking a more diverse sample of participants in hope to identify findings that are more generalizable.

Lastly, it should be noted the Adapted Defining Issues Test and the Societal and Spiritual Adherence Scale were created by the researcher for the purposes of this research. Although the ADIT did go through a pilot study, neither measure can be definitely pronounced as a valid measure because of lack of research and revision on validity and reliability.

Clinical Implications

The current study revealed that people can contradict their thoughts depending on whether they were asked to think about their values in a general way versus a situation-specific way. This cognitive contradiction idea may be of use for those who conduct psychotherapy and rely on people to change their cognitions in order to change their symptomology. Several cognitive therapy modalities of treating posttraumatic stress disorder patients involve systematically re-experiencing the trauma and replacing maladaptive thoughts with more adaptive thoughts to alleviate symptomology.

One such therapeutic modality prolonged exposure. In treating patients with PTSD, one of the central facets of prolonged exposure is imaginal exposure to traumatic memories (Resick et al., 2010). Instead of avoiding traumatic reminders of the event, patients vividly work through their trauma and practice coping skills to decrease their anxiety. Additionally, (Resick et al., 2010) found prolonged exposure to be a very effective treatment for female rape victims.

The current research would support therapeutic modalities such as prolonged exposure therapy in that being cognitively placed in a specific situation is significantly different from speaking about cognitions in vague or general terms. Imaginal exposure to trauma may be significantly more effective in treating traumatic stress symptoms than only talking about traumatic events in a generalized way. Future research on the idea of cognitive contradiction can lend better support to therapies that aim to help patients overcome symptomology rooted in a specific situation.

References

- Allport, G. (1950). *The individual and his religion*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Allport, G., & Ross, J. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5(4), 432-445.
- Batson, D., & Raynor-Prince, L. (1983). Religious orientation and the complexity of thought about existential concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 38-50.
- Batson, D., & Schoenrade, P. (1991). Measuring religion as quest: Reliability concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30(4), 430-447.
- Batson, D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, L. (1993). *Religion and the individual*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Batson, D., & Ventis, L. (1982). *The religious experience*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bornstein, B., & Miller, K. (2009). *God in the courtroom*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bruggerman, E. L., & Hart, K.J. (1996). Cheating, lying, and moral reasoning by religious and secular students. *Journal of Educational Research*, 89, 340-344.

- Colby, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1984). Invariant sequence and internal consistency in moral judgment and stages. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, Moral Behavior, and Moral Development* (pp. 41-52). Canada: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., Gibbs, J., & Lieberman, M. (1983). A longitudinal study of moral judgment. *Monographs of the society for Research in Child Development*, 48,(21, Serial No. 201).
- Dijksterhuis, A., & van Knippenberg, A. (1998). The relation between perception and behavior, or how to win a game of Trivial Pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 865-877.
- Duska, R., & Whelan, M. (1975). *Moral Development: A guide to Piaget and Kohlberg*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Fowler, J.W. (1981). *Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Griffen, W. L. (1998). The case for religious values in judicial decision-making. *Marquette Law Review*, 81, 513-519.
- Hart, D., & Chmiel, S. (1992). Influence of defense mechanisms on moral judgment development: A longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(4), 722-730.
- Idleman, S.C. (1993). The role of religious values in judicial decision-making. *Indiana Law Journal*, 68, 433-487.

- Kiripatirck, L., & Hood, R. (1990). Intrinsic-extrinsic religious orientation: The boon or bane of contemporary psychology of religion? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29, 442-462.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). Stages of moral development as a basis for education. In B. Munsey (Ed.), *Moral development, moral education, and Kohlberg* (pp. 15-98). Alabama: Religious Education Press.
- Patton, J., & Barratt, E. (1995). Factor structure of the Barratt impulsiveness scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 51(6), 768- 774.
- Pew Research Center. (2010). *The pew forum on religion and public life: U.S. religious landscape survey*. Retrieved December 2, 2010, from <http://religions.pewforum.org/reports>
- Paloutzian, R., & Park, C. (2005). Integrative themes in the current science of the psychology of religion. In R. Paloutzian & C. Park (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (pp. 3-21). New York: Guilford Press.
- Resick, P., Nishith, P., Weaver, T., Astin, M., & Feuer, C. (2002). A comparison of cognitive processing therapy with prolonged exposure and a waiting condition for the treatment of chronic posttraumatic stress disorder in female rape victims. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 70(4), 867-869.

- Rest, J. (1986). *Manuel for defining issues test*. Minneapolis, MN. University of Minnesota.
- Sapp, G., & Jones, L. (1986). Religious orientation and moral judgment. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 24, 208-214.
- Stanford, M., Mathias, C., Dougherty, D., Lake, S., Anderson, N., & Patton, J. (2009). Fifty years of the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale: An update and review. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 385-395.
- Sood, S., & Forehand, M. (2003). On self-referencing differences in judgment and choice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 98, 144-154.
- Thoma, J. S., & Rest, R. J. (1999). The relationship between moral decision making and patterns of consolidation and transition in moral judgment development. *Developmental Psychology*, 35(2), 323-334.
- Wallwork, E. (1984). Morality religion, and Kohlberg's theory. In B. Munsey (Ed.), *Moral development, moral education, and Kohlberg* (pp. 269-298). Alabama: Religious Education Press.
- Wedell, D., & Senter, Stuart. (1997). Looking and weighting in judgment and choice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 70(1), 41-64.

Zinnbauer, B., & Pargament, K. (2005) Religiousness and spirituality. In R. Paloutzian & C. Park (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (pp. 21-42). New York: Guilford Press.

Appendix A
General Instructions for Participants

General Instructions
(After informed consent is signed and collected)

Thank you for being willing to participate in this research study. Now, a questionnaire will be distributed. The questionnaire has instructions for each section. If you should have any questions about how to fill out the questionnaire, please feel free to approach me and ask. I will do my best to clarify. When you have finished taking the questionnaire, please come up here (wherever I am) and place it in this manila envelope. I will then give you a debriefing statement on your way out and you are free to leave. As stated in the informed consent, you are free to leave at any time if you no longer wish to complete the questionnaire. If you decide to leave before you finish, please still place the questionnaire in the manila envelope and I will give you the debriefing statement.

Thank you.

Appendix B
Informed Consent Form

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Department of Psychology Fort Hays State University
 The Adapted Defining Issues Test: Evaluation and Validation

Researcher: Joshua Tanguay
 207-776-5445

jptanguay@scatcat.fhsu.edu

Project Advisor: Dr. Janett Naylor
 785-628-5857

jmnaylor@fhsu.edu

You are being asked to participate in a research study. It is your choice whether or not to participate. Your decision whether or not to participate will have no effect on benefits of the research, the quality of your care, or academic standing to which you are otherwise entitled. Please ask questions if there is anything you do not understand.

What is the purpose of this study ?

The purpose of the study is to explore how participants interpret and make decisions about scenarios involving difficult moral dilemmas. You will be asked to think about your personal values and beliefs when making your decisions.

What does this study involve?

The study involves filling out five surveys. If you decide to participate and sign this form, you will be given the questionnaires with adequate instructions. Instructions for each questionnaire are explained at the beginning of each. The surveys are not experimental in nature. The only experimental aspect of this study is the gathering of information for analysis. If you have any questions, feel free to approach the researcher and ask. General instructions for completing the surveys and handing them in after completion will be read aloud prior to distribution. If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to sign this consent form after you have had all your questions answered and understand what will happen to you. The length of time of your participation in this study is approximately thirty minutes. Approximately 200 participants will take part in this study.

Are there any benefits from participating in this study ?

Your participation will help us learn more about how people interpret scenarios that involve difficult moral dilemmas. It is important to learn about how people's values relate to how they make decisions. In participating in this study, you are helping this cause.

Will you be paid or receive anything to participate in this study ?

Yes, compensation is offered in the form of extra credit, if the professor of one of your classes allows extra credit for participation.

What about the costs of this study ?

There are no costs for participating in this study other than the time you will spend completing the surveys.

What are the risks involved with being enrolled in this study ?

It is unlikely that participation in this project will result in any harm. However, sometimes thinking about these subjects cause people to be upset. Therefore, there is a slight psychological risk. You do not have to respond to any question that you feel uncomfortable responding to, and you may stop participating at any time. If you feel distressed or become upset by participating, you may seek help at the Kelly Center on campus, which provides support services for students. They are located on the bottom floor of Picken Hall and their number is 785-628-4401.

As with every study, there is a risk with confidentiality. However, every step will be taken to ensure the confidentiality of your data. Once you place the surveys in the manila envelope, they will be kept secure and eventually entered electronically into computer. This data will be de-identified and remain securely in a password-protected folder. Also, the only people who know you participated in this study are myself, thesis chair and any professors who you receive extra credit from for participation.

How will your privacy be protected?

Data is collected only for research purposes. Your data will be identified by ID number, not name, and will be stored separately in a locked file cabinet. The data will be entered electronically into password-protected computer files and will remain de-identified. All personal identifying information such as compensation forms or reminder emails will be deleted immediately after you have been reminded or compensated. Access to all data will be limited to my thesis advisor and myself. All of the data will be destroyed after five years by shredding files or deleting computer files. The information collected for this study will be used only for the purposes of conducting this study. What we find from this study may be presented at meetings or published in papers but your name will not ever be used in these presentations or papers.

Other important items you should know:

• **Withdrawal from the study:** You may choose to stop your participation in this study at any time. Your decision to stop your participation will have no effect on your academic standing or possible compensation.

• **Funding:** There is no outside funding for this research project.

Whom should you call with questions about this study ?

Questions about this study may be directed to the researcher in charge of this study: Joshua Tanguay at jptanguay@scatcat.fhsu.edu or 207-776-5445. You may also contact Dr. Janett Naylor as jmnaylor@fhsu.edu. If you have questions, concerns, or suggestions about human research at FHSU, you may call the Office of Scholarship and Sponsored Projects at FHSU (785) 628-4349 during normal business hours.

CONSENT

I have read the above information about the current study and have been given an opportunity to ask questions. By signing this I agree to participate in this study and I have been given a copy of this signed consent document for my own records. I understand that I can change my mind and withdraw my consent at any time. By signing this consent form I understand that I am not giving up any legal rights. I am 18 years or older.

Participant's Signature and Date

Appendix C
Letter of IRB Exempt Approval

OFFICE OF SCHOLARSHIP AND SPONSORED PROJECTS

DATE: September 27, 2011

TO: Josh Tanguay

FROM: Fort Hays State University IRB

STUDY TITLE: [270540-1] SOCIETAL AND SPIRITUAL ORIENTATION: HOW
PEOPLE
INTERPRET AMBIGUOUS SITUATIONS

IRB REFERENCE #: 12-018

SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS

DECISION DATE: September 27, 2011

REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category # 2

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this research study. The departmental human subjects research committee and/or the Fort Hays State University IRB/IRB Administrator has determined that this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulations.

Please note that any changes to this study may result in a change in exempt status. Any changes must be submitted to the IRB for review prior to implementation. In the event of a change, please follow the Instructions for Revisions at <http://www.fhsu.edu/academic/gradschl/irb/>.

The IRB administrator should be notified of adverse events or circumstances that meet the definition of unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects. See <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/policy/AdvEvtGuid.htm>.

We will put a copy of this correspondence on file in our office. Exempt studies are not subject to continuing review.

If you have any questions, please contact Leslie Paige at lpaige@fhsu.edu or 785-628-4349. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

Appendix D
Adapted Defining Issues Test

OPINIONS ABOUT SOCIAL PROBLEMS

This questionnaire is aimed at understanding how people think about social problems. Different people often have different opinions about questions of right and wrong. There are no “right” answers in the way that there are right answers to math problems. We would like you to tell us what you think about several problem stories. In this questionnaire you will be asked to give your opinions about several stories. Here is a story as an example.

Frank Jones has been thinking about buying a car. He is married, has two small children and earns an average income. The he buys will be his family’s only car. It will be used mostly to get to work and drive around town, but sometimes for vacation trips also. In trying to decide what car to buy, Frank Jones realized there were a lot of questions to consider below is a list of some of these questions.

If you were Frank Jones, how important would each of these questions be in deciding what car to buy?

Instructions:

On the left hand side check one of the spaces by each statement of a consideration. (For instance, if you think that statement #1 is not important in making a decision about buying a car, check the space on the right.)

IMPORTANCE:

Great Much Some Little No

Great	Much	Some	Little	No	
				X	1. Whether the car dealer was in the same block as where Frank lives. (Note that in this sample, the person taking the questionnaire did not think this was important in making a decision.)
X					2. Would a used car be more economical in the long run than a new car. (Note that a check was put in the far left space to indicate the opinion that this is an important issue in making a decision about buying a car.)
		X			3. Whether the color was green, Frank's favorite color.
				X	4. Whether the cubic inch displacement was at least 200. (Note that if you are unsure about what "cubic inch displacement" means, then mark it "no importance.")
X					Would a large, roomy car be better than compact car.
				X	Whether the front connibilies were differential. (Note that if a statement sounds like gibberish or nonsense to you, mark it "no importance.")

Escaped Prisoner

A man had been sentenced to prison for 10 years. After one year, however, he escaped from prison, moved to a new area of the country, and took on the name of Thompson. For 8 years, he worked hard, and gradually he saved enough money to buy his own business. He was fair to his customers, gave his employees top wages, and gave most of his own profits to charity. Mr. Thompson has been living in your neighborhood for these last 8 years. Then one day, you recognize him as the man who had escaped from prison 8 years before, and whom the police has been looking for.

Would you report Mr. Thompson to the police and have him sent back to prison? (Check one)

Should report him Can't decide Should not report him

IMPORTANCE:

Great Much Some Little No

					1. How it would affect my reputation in the church if others found out I were living next to a criminal all these years.
					2. What the law states or local authorities state is the best way to deal with an escaped criminal
					3. Would going to prison do any good for Mr. Thompson or protect anybody?
					4. Whether Mr. Thompson has been a helpful and kind neighbor to me through the years.
					5. The likelihood that I would get in trouble from the police if they discovered I was withholding information about an escaped convict.
					6. Whether I can find the right answer in my spiritual teachings or sacred texts.
					7. Would sending Mr. Thompson back to prison make him grow as a spiritual being or complicate his possible new spiritual journey?
					8. Is it clear that the evidence at Mr. Thomson's trial identified him as definitely committing the charged crime?
					9. Whether certain good deeds can erase the debt that Mr. Thompson owes to society.
					10. How the leader of my religion/church would advise me to make the decision.
					11. How Mr. Thompson's spiritual values has evolved since he escaped from prison and how these values will enable him to enrich the lives of others.
					12. Whether turning in Mr. Thompson to the police would make me look like a good person to others that practice my religion/ go to my church.

The Doctor's Dilemma

A lady was dying of cancer which could not be cured and she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a good dose of pain-killer like morphine would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, and in her calm periods, she would ask the doctor to give her enough morphine to kill her. She said she couldn't stand the pain and that she was going to die in a few months anyway. You are a nurse cares to the dying woman's medical needs every day, under the supervision of the doctor.

What should the doctor do? (Check one)

- The doctor should give the lady an overdose that will make her die Can't decide Should not give the overdose

IMPORTANCE:

Great Much Some Little No

Great	Much	Some	Little	No	
					1. Are there ethics codes or laws that explain what the proper course of action is if a patient is making such wishes?
					2. What the implications are for medical care policy for people who believe there is no point in living anymore.
					3. Whether I could somehow use my decision to appear wise or praiseworthy in the eyes of my fellow church members.
					4. Would knowing that the doctor gave her an extra dose of morphine make me feel guilty and emotionally distressed?
					5. Can religious values be interpreted in different ways to allow people to make both spiritually sound yet independent decisions?
					6. Whether other people who share my spiritual values such as fellow church members or religious leaders would support the woman's wish.
					7. Whether I could lose my job if the doctor gave her an extra dose of morphine to make her die sooner.
					8. Whether the woman has thoroughly thought about how her spiritual values relate to her condition and how they affect her future.
					9. Whether the woman would still be able to live a peaceful afterlife according to her religious beliefs.
					10. Whether the doctor and the woman share similar religious beliefs as I do, that would make me feel more at ease with the decision made.
					11. Whether other doctors at the hospital have done the same for their patients who are experiencing such a condition.
					12. Does society have the right to force the woman's continued existence if she does not want to live?

Webster

You are a mechanic at a gas station that is owned and managed by Mr. Webster. He wants to hire another mechanic to help him, but good mechanics are hard to find. The only person he found who seemed to be a good mechanic was Mr. Parker, but he is Hispanic. While Mr. Webster himself does not have anything against Hispanic people, he is afraid to hire Mr. Parker because many of his customers do not like Hispanic people. His customers might take their business elsewhere if Mr. Parker is working at the gas station.

When Mr. Parker asks Mr. Webster if he could have the job, Mr. Webster said that he has already hired somebody else. But Mr. Webster really had not hired anybody, because he could not find anybody who was a good mechanic besides Mr. Parker.

What should Mr. Webster have done? (Check one)

Should have hired Mr. Parker Can't decide Should not have hired him

IMPORTANCE:

Great Much Some Little No

					1. Whether other businesses in the community are supporting diversity in the workplace.
					2. Whether Mr. Parker practices a different religion than I do, I would prefer not to work with someone who might challenge my beliefs.
					3. Whether hiring people of a different culture/race encourages a new perspective about the possible strengths of a diverse workplace.
					4. Would hiring Mr. Parker encourage exploration of people's religious faith in the community, which may help everyone grow as spiritual people?
					5. Would hiring Mr. Parker bring in a different demographic of customers and give us more business?
					6. Would working with Mr. Parker make me look like a more accepting and loving person in the eyes of my fellow church members?
					7. Does the auto repair shop support affirmative action laws that might require that we hire Mr. Parker?
					8. Whether the decision that Mr. Webster made is consistent with his religious values and he can acknowledge the issue as spiritually complex.
					9. What standard or model does Mr. Webster's decision create for businesses looking to hire new employees?
					10. What my fellow church members or leaders from my religion think about the issue.
					11. Whether Mr. Parker would have been a good worker and could have helped me with my workload.
					12. Does Mr. Parker share similar religious values as I? Because if so, that would make me feel more secure at work.

Newspaper

Fred, a senior at a University, wanted to publish a mimeographed newspaper for students so that he could express many of his opinions. He wanted to speak out against America “pushing democracy” onto other nations and wanted to speak out against some of the school’s rules, like the rule forbidding the existence of politically charged clubs.

You are a student at the same University where Fred wants to start his newspaper. He asks the student affairs director for permission and he says it will be all right if before every publication Fred turns in all his articles for approval. Fred agreed and turned in several articles for approval. The student affairs director approved all of them and Fred published two issues of the paper in the next two weeks

But the student affairs director had not expected that Fred’s newspaper would receive so much attention. Students were so excited by the paper that they began to organize protests supporting the freedom to assemble political clubs and against other school rules. Angry parents objected to Fred’s opinions. They phoned the University claiming that the newspaper was unpatriotic and should not be published. As a result of the rising excitement, the student affairs director ordered Fred to stop publishing. He gave as a reason that Fred’s activities were disruptive to the operation of school

Should the University stop the newspaper? (Check one)

Should stop it Can’t decide Should not stop it

IMPORTANCE:

Great Much Some Little No

					1. What the limits are to freedom of speech, especially in an educational setting.
					2. Whether the controversy is bringing up important spiritual questions such as “Is doubting authority a good thing?”
					3. How other students that attend the school who share similar religious beliefs are reacting to the controversy.
					4. How I am coping with the controversy. The amount of turmoil or distress it is causing me from thinking about it.
					5. What effect would stopping the newspaper have on the student’s critical thinking skills, which are necessary to be a productive member of society.
					6. If some of the newspaper supporters share my religious faith, I would not want to upset anyone by going against them.
					7. The only true and absolute answer to this dilemma lies with God. I will need to seek his unquestionable guidance.
					8. Would stopping the publication of the newspaper be discouraging the diversity of thought in a college setting?
					9. Whether I have friends who strongly support the newspaper, if they were kicked out of school, it would not be good for my social life.
					10. Doesn’t thinking critically and raising questions encourage healthy spiritual development for students?
					11. Would my decision cause my religious peers or fellow church members to look at me more or less favorably?
					12. What the local law enforcement agency believes is the most appropriate decision.

Appendix E
Barratt Impulsivity Scale

DIRECTIONS: People differ in the ways they act and think in different situations. This is a test to measure some of the ways in which you act and think. Read each statement and put an X on the appropriate circle on the right side of this page. Do not spend too much time on any statement. Answer quickly and honestly.

	○ Rarely/Never Always/Always	○ Occasionally	○ Often	○ Almost
1 I plan tasks carefully.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2 I do things without thinking.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3 I make-up my mind quickly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4 I am happy-go-lucky.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5 I don't "pay attention."	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6 I have "racing" thoughts.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7 I plan trips well ahead of time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8 I am self controlled.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9 I concentrate easily.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10 I save regularly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11 I "squirm" at plays or lectures.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12 I am a careful thinker.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13 I plan for job security.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14 I say things without thinking.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15 I like to think about complex problems.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16 I change jobs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17 I act "on impulse."	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18 I get easily bored when solving thought problems.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19 I act on the spur of the moment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20 I am a steady thinker.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21 I change residences.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22 I buy things on impulse.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23 I can only think about one thing at a time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24 I change hobbies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25 I spend or charge more than I earn.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26 I often have extraneous thoughts when thinking.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27 I am more interested in the present than the future.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28 I am restless at the theater or lectures.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29 I like puzzles.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
30 I am future oriented.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix F
Religious Life Inventory

This questionnaire includes some commonly heard statements about one's religious life. They are very diverse. Your task in each of the three parts of the questionnaire is to rate your agreement or disagreement with each statement. For each statement there is a scale on which to make your judgment. The scale ranges from strongly disagree (SD) through disagree (D) and agree (A) to strongly agree (SA); it is numbered from 1-9. Simply circle the number you feel best represents your own agreement or disagreement with the statement. Try to rate each of the statements, not leaving any blank, unless it does not apply to someone from your religious background. Work fairly rapidly, not brooding over any one statement too long

The statements concern your experience with religion, religious ideas and religious practices. There is no consensus about right or wrong answers; some people will agree and others will disagree with each of the statements. Some statements refer to "church" or "the Bible"; if your religious background is other than Christianity, please substitute the religious institution or scripture appropriate to your background. Again, there is no consensus about right or wrong answers; some people will agree and others will disagree with each of the statements.

SD D A SA

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2. I am constantly questioning my religious beliefs.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

3. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

5. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

6. For me doubting is an important part of what it means to be religious

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

7. I was not very interested in religion until I began to ask questions about the meaning of life

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

SD D A SA

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

SD D A SA

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

9. My life experiences have led me to rethink my religious convictions.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

13. What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortunes strike.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

14. I read literature about my faith (or church).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

15. It might be said that I value my religious doubts and uncertainties.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

17. There are many religious issues on which my views are still changing.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

21. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

23. As I grow and change, I expect my religion also to grow and change.

SD D A SA

SD D A SA

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 24. Questions are far more central to religious experience than are answers.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 25. If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join a Bible study group rather than a social fellowship.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 26. I find religious doubts upsetting.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 27. Occasionally I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 28. One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 29. God wasn't very important for me until I began to ask questions about the meaning of my own life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 30. I do not expect my religious convictions to change in the next few years.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 31. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 32. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.

SD D A SA

Appendix G
Societal and Spiritual Adherence Scale

Please rate the extent to which you strongly agree or strongly disagree with the following statements concerning the story of the Newspaper a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree).

SD D A SA

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

1. Without religion, it would be difficult to maneuver through the challenges of life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2. Societal values are healthy to incorporate into life. When people strive to live by societal ideals, they can live a good and happy life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

3. An awareness and respect for one's culture allows a person to confront challenging life decisions in meaningful ways.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

4. When making important life decisions, I draw on my spiritual beliefs or values as a resource to make the decisions.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

5. In order for people to develop moral values, spirituality should have a presence in people's lives.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

6. Societal values provide me with a framework for making difficult decisions that I encounter throughout life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

7. In situations that are not clear-cut or black and white, my spiritual beliefs and values help me make sense of the situation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

8. Society is capable of teaching people moral values that enable people to exercise sound judgment.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

9. The reason why some people are "heading down the wrong path" in life is a lack of spiritual faith.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

SD D A SA

10. Religion cannot provide people with all the necessary ideas or values to make important decisions that entail difficult or unclear circumstances.

Appendix H
Demographic Survey

Please answer the following questions:

1. Age _____

2. Circle the gender that best describes you

MALE

FEMALE

3. Academic Major _____

4. Academic Classification

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

5. Please circle your religious denomination

Catholic

Muslim

Buddhist

Protestant

Mormon

Agnostic

Baptist

Greek Orthodox

Unaffiliated

Jewish

Hindu

Other:

6. Please circle your ethnicity:

White

Hispanic

Other:

African American

Pacific Islander

Asian

American Indian

Appendix I
Pilot Study Validity Questions

Following each dilemma (Escaped Prisoner, Doctor's Dilemma, Webster, and the Newspaper) for the pilot study, participants were asked to respond to the following questions.

Please rate the extent to which you strongly agree or strongly disagree with the following statements concerning the story of the Escaped Prisoner on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree).

1. The story of the Escaped Prisoner was believable.

SD				D		A		SA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

2. I could understand the story, the contents of the story were clear.

SD				D		A		SA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

3. I was able to envision myself as the neighbor of Mr. Thompson.

SD				D		A		SA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

4. The twelve items following the story were easy to understand.

SD				D		A		SA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Please list the number of any item you did not understand, why?

Appendix J
Pilot Study Categorization

Please classify the items from each story according the directions and definitions below.

To the LEFT of the items please classify the item as either societal or spiritual oriented:

Societal (SO): An item that identifies with society's values or ideas.

Spiritual (SP): An item that identifies with religious or spiritual values or ideas.

To the RIGHT of the items please classify the items as Extrinsic, Intrinsic, or Quest oriented:

Extrinsic (E): An item that when selected reflects self-serving needs or an instrument to secure personal safety or comfort.

Intrinsic (I): An item that when selected reflects a need for definitive or clear-cut answers and a rigid adherence to a set of values.

Quest (Q): An item that when selected reflects inquisitive, critical, and evolving thought processes that may raise more questions than find answers.

SO	SP	Escaped Prisoner	E	I	Q
		1. How it would affect my reputation in the church if others found out I were living next to a criminal all these years.			
		2. What the law states or local authorities state is the best way to deal with an escaped criminal			
		3. Would going to prison do any good for Mr. Thompson or protect anybody?			
		4. Whether Mr. Thompson has been a helpful and kind neighbor to me through the years.			
		5. The likelihood that I would get in trouble from the police if they discovered I was withholding information about an escaped convict.			
		6. Whether I can find the right answer in my spiritual teachings or sacred texts.			
		7. Would sending Mr. Thompson back to prison make him grow as a spiritual being or complicate his possible new spiritual journey?			
		8. Is it clear that the evidence at Mr. Thomson's trial identified him as definitely committing the charged crime?			
		9. Whether certain good deeds can erase the debt that Mr. Thompson owes to society.			
		10. How the leader of my religion/church would advise me to make the decision.			
		11. How Mr. Thompson's spiritual values has evolved since he escaped from prison and how these values will enable him to enrich the lives of others.			
		12. Whether turning in Mr. Thompson to the police would make me look like a good person to others that practice my religion/ go to my church.			

