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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an attempt to examine an operational definition (or measure) of nondoctrinal religion proposed by J. Milton Yinger in 1969. Yinger, in his 1969 publication, suggests that the majority of scientific studies of religion have been pursuing a less valuable course by assuming definitions of "religion" which restrict the concept to more traditional forms of religion. Such definitions tend to prevent researchers from examining important and abundant structures which serve religious functions but do not resemble traditional institutionalized religion in form. Such structures serve the function of dealing with chaos, the human situation, and ultimate concern.

There is a need, says Yinger, for a more comprehensive definition of religion, one which suggests that religion is theoretically most important for what it does rather than for what form it takes. The thesis of Yinger's paper consists of preliminary development of such a comprehensive definition, along with the caution that his findings should be taken lightly and simply as an illustration of problems of measurement and a direction for further research.

It is the purpose of this thesis to ask whether Yinger's assessment is as comprehensive as he would have the readers believe and
whether efforts to refine Yinger's idea of a functional definition should not be redirected.

Yinger (1969:87) implies that he is measuring "what is intrinsic to religion." He operationalizes his definition (p. 91) and develops a scale employing nondoctrinal statements of ultimate concern for assessment of religion in college students.

A concept of "intrinsic religion" was developed by Allport (1959) as a component of what has become known in the study of religious values as the intrinsic-extrinsic dimension. Since 1959 research has examined and refined this dimension of religiosity and found correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic religious values in other areas of the individual's attitudes, beliefs, and ideologies. Since the concept of intrinsic religion in this dimension has implications similar to those in Yinger's operational definition of religion, the writer of this thesis believes that assessment of Yinger's concept by use of the intrinsic-extrinsic concept would prove useful in helping determine the social and motivational sources of the religious orientation measured by the Yinger index. Therefore, the question of greatest interest to the author of this thesis concerns what the Yinger index really measures.

Chapter II of this thesis will discuss some of the previous research citing problems of defining religion, the development of the intrinsic-extrinsic concept, and the implications of the "pro-religion" factor (Allport and Ross, 1967). The possibility that social class is a correlate of the Yinger scale and the intrinsic-extrinsic variable is also discussed. Chapter III sets forth the
intentions of this writer to test the Yinger variable against social class, religious socialization, and the intrinsic-extrinsic concept. Reliability of the scales is discussed, and the sample and methods for this research are described. Findings which are of importance to this discussion are reported in tables. Chapter IV describes the findings in detail, and the implications of the findings of this research are discussed in Chapter V.
Defining religion and assessing religiosity is problematic to the scientist who insists on a valid definition. Demerath and Hammond (1969:3-22) suggest that the concept "religion" is ambiguous, for by its very nature it cuts across many aspects of the individual's life and defies compartmentalization. They point out the inadequacy of various things and do not specify relative degrees of church participation, while questions concerning belief in God are answered under the influence of the cultural context in which atheism is undesirable, and often these questions do not explore various concepts of God.

Recently there has been a trend toward the breaking down of religiosity into basic dimensions. Yinger recognizes that those who have followed this trend have pioneered the structural examination of religion in significant ways, yet he (p. 91) suggests that it is time to take a further step "involving the search for more analytic categories that are less closely identified with the major institutional systems we have labelled religious." Yinger, himself, uses a commonly referred to dimension of religiosity as his point of departure. Demerath and Hammond (1969) describe this dimension as a distinction between religion defined according to "what it does" as opposed to "what it is." Yinger (1957:5-17) differentiates between valuative
definitions of religion which view religion in the particular writer's judgment of what ought to be, descriptive or substantive definitions which designate types of beliefs and practices according to specific characteristics, and functional definitions which view religion according to its consequences or functions.

Yinger suggests that once we realize that religion is theoretically most valuable for its function, our research is less likely to miss certain important and abundant structures which are not likely to be defined as "religion" in the more traditional sense, yet serve the same indispensable function for society. In the past, this problem has often led to the misrepresentation of religious change, or movements toward "the more ephemeral, the emergent, the poorly institutionalized expressions of ultimate concern," as decline of religion (Yinger, 1969:90).

Because it serves the vital function of dealing with chaos, life's predicaments, and one's ultimate concerns, Yinger asserts that religion should be defined as any structure with the manifest aim of serving these functions. Yinger contends that almost all humans are religious to an extent. He writes (1969:90) that:

Rather than asking if a person is religious, we ask how he is religious. How does he define "chaos?" What concerns him most fundamentally? What actions follow as a result of these definitions and concerns? How widely shared are they? What groups form around them?

Yinger contends that such an assessment of religion would help research escape the problem of incorporating the researchers' values into a definition. Moreover, it would allow the study of "invisible" forms of religion which fulfill the religious functions in society.
once traditional forms lose their influence. A prime example of a social system where traditional religion has lost its influence is the university: it is in that setting where Yinger chooses to search for an "invisible religion." (The concept "invisible religion" was credited to Thomas Luckmann in Yinger's paper. See Luckmann, The Invisible Religion, The MacMillan Company, 1967.)

Yinger suggests that college students are often identified as irreligious. Hastings and Hoge (1970) point out that research in this area has led to many conclusions. In the literature reviewed by Hastings and Hoge it was reported in certain studies that there was a decrease in religious interest (Argyle, 1958; Leuba, 1934; and Young, 1965). In one study (Dudycha, 1950) few changes in religious belief were found. Careful examination of these studies indicate that in research which assessed traditional religious beliefs and practices, a decrease was found, while in studies which assessed nontraditional values, or interest in problems of a religious concern, an increase was found. There were two exceptions: Gilliland, who found an increase in traditional beliefs, and Dudycha, who found few changes in religious beliefs. Both of these studies concerned the period of the 1930's and 40's.

The research by Hastings and Hoge (1970) led to the conclusion that between 1948 and 1967 significant changes occurred in the nature of religious beliefs and practices of college students. In 1967 students were less likely to identify with the religious tradition in which they were reared. The "holding power" of the religious background varied directly with the degree of liberalism of the
background. The 1967 sample reported more frequent and earlier questioning of traditional beliefs and diminished religious involvements and practices. The 1967 questionnaire contained an item concerning religious interest; positive response on this item was relatively high, and religious interest was only weakly associated with items indicating religious orthodoxy.

Yinger developed an instrument for measuring "invisible religion" among college students. The index employed seven items representing abstract philosophical statements indicating ultimate concern, questions concerning where one might look for answers to the "basic human condition," whether pain and sorrow are negative or enlightening experiences, and whether there is order and pattern to existence. Such questions Yinger would term as "religious," because they indicate ultimate concern. Yinger tabulated responses of two samples of college students, a test sample as well as a larger sample drawn from ten liberal arts colleges, and calculated "percent religious" response rates (69 percent in the former sample and 70 percent in the latter sample) which he evaluated as high rates. This suggests that religion (if what is being measured is to be called religious concern) is not on the decline, after all, among college students.

Yinger's intention was the development of a value-free definition of religion, but careful examination of his operational definition shows that the problem with which Yinger was dealing was theological. The concept of "ultimate concern" was first championed by the late theologian Paul Tillich, and Tillich's assumption that modern man is "ultimately concerned" has been challenged by modern secular theologians.
Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a forerunner of the secular theology trend, says of Tillich:

Tillich set out to interpret the evolution of the world (against its will) in a religious sense—to give it its shape through religion. That was very brave of him, but the world unseated him and went on by itself; he too sought to understand the world better than it understood itself; but it felt that it was completely misunderstood, and rejected the imputation (Bonhoeffer, 1967:170).

Similar accusations have been directed toward Neo-Orthodox orientations in more recent years. These criticisms question the assumption that modern secular man really attempts to understand himself "religiously."

Yinger fashions a theologically derived operational definition of religion out of the concept "ultimate concern:"

Where one finds awareness of and interest in the continuing recurrent, "permanent" problems of human existence—the human condition itself, as contrasted with specific problems: where one finds rites and shared beliefs relevant to that awareness which define the strategy of ultimate victory: and where one has groups organized to heighten that awareness and to teach and maintain those rites and beliefs--there you have religion (Yinger, 1969:91).

The above operational definition is Yinger's attempt to operationalize that which he feels is "intrinsic" to religion. Yinger cites similar definitions by Langer and Luckmann (Langer, 1957; Luckmann, 1967). Of Langer's definition he writes (1969:89):

This kind of a definition, as contrasted with the kind that points to specific social and cultural systems generally called religion, requires that one try to distinguish between what is intrinsic to religion and what is part of specific forms for expressing that intrinsicality.

There is some doubt whether it can be scientifically justified that Yinger's definition concerns what is "intrinsic" to religion, or that it can be applied universally to all forms of religion. The
principal problem of this research is to explore the actual social factors which foster an individual "religious" orientation which a high rate of endorsement of the Yinger items would indicate. For such individuals, the writer expects to find (1) a "yeasaying" or indiscriminately proreligious orientation, (2) upper or middle class status, and (3) high religious background or training. The author's reason for expecting that Yinger is measuring religious "yeasaying" instead of intrinsic religion is that the concept "intrinsic religion" is ambiguous and has never been adequately operationalized; moreover, an indiscriminate yeasaying attitude toward anything sounding abstract, ideological, philosophical, or religious, might be reinforced by certain college reference groups. Later in this chapter, some literature which suggests that middle or upper social status and religious socialization might explain such an orientation will be discussed.

The concept of "intrinsic religion" is a component of the intrinsic-extrinsic religion concept first described by Gordon Allport (1959). In 1960 Allport operationally defined the two components in this new dimension:

Extrinsic religion is a self-serving utilitarian, self-protective form of religious outlook, which provides the believer with comfort and salvation at the expense of outgroups. Intrinsic religion marks the life that has interiorized the total creed of his faith without reservation, including the commandment to love one's neighbor. A person of this sort is more intent on serving his religion than making it serve him (p. 257).

This dichotomy represents an attempt to break religion down into a dimension defined by individual motives associated with religion. Hunt and King (1971) re-evaluated the concept and found that intrinsic religion has not been adequately operationalized, has many dimensions,
and has many components. Because of this conceptual complexity Hunt and King recommend that the concept of intrinsic religion be discarded. It seems likely that Yinger is measuring something other than what is simply intrinsic to religion; from an exploration of the literature on the intrinsic-extrinsic concept, perhaps some hypothetical explanation might be found.

Various writers have found that an orientation toward extrinsic religion is associated with prejudice and authoritarianism in the individual. Wilson (1960) developed a scale of items indicating extrinsic religious values and found that his extrinsic values scale correlated positively with the California Anti-Semitism Scale more strongly than with religious conservatism (only a slight correlation existed between extrinsic religion and religious conservatism). Allen and Spilka (1967) describe a dimension similar to intrinsic-extrinsic religion which they call "committed faith," or intrinsic, and "consensual religion," or extrinsic. They found a strong correspondence between prejudice and consensual religion and a negative relationship between prejudice and committed faith.

In 1957 Yinger (p. 82) wrote that traditional religious orientations have been shown by previous research to be associated with prejudice. He suggested that this might indicate that the neurotic, self-doubting person may grasp at both prejudice and religion in search of some justification or defense mechanism for his disposition. In 1970, he (pp. 192-193) suggested that there is a need for the examination of the previous conclusion to see if religious orientation is really a cause of prejudice.
Allport and Ross (1970) related extrinsic and intrinsic religion to prejudice and drew a very interesting conclusion. Their scale consisted of a set of items representing extrinsic religious values, along with a set of items representing intrinsic values. They found four factors in their final analysis—a category which endorsed the intrinsic items, a category which endorsed the extrinsic items, a category which tended to endorse both sets of items, and a category which endorsed none of the items. It was found that endorsement of both sets of items, the intrinsic as well as extrinsic, was far more associated with prejudice than any of the other three factors. Allport and Ross called this category the "indiscriminately proreligious," and in attempting to discover some functional tie between this category and prejudice, they suggested that individuals in this category have a tendency toward yeasaying and indiscriminate thinking, and they lack the ability to perceive differences. Such individuals, if they tended to be oriented toward traditional religion, might tend to indiscriminately agree with anything sounding religious. Couch and Keniston (1960) describe yeasayers as generally tending to be impulsive and low in ego strength; therefore, they might lack the ability to discriminate in other areas of life.

The writer feels that a tendency to agree with statements of an abstract ideological nature (such as the items of Yinger's scale) has similar social-psychological roots as a proreligious orientation. A yeasaying tendency represents any susceptibility to endorsement of statements or ideologies which sound good to the individual and do not necessarily give a true assessment of his position. The nature
or type of statements to which such an individual might tend to cling should be determined by that individual's particular position in social life.

Social class (assessed by parental education and occupation) is probably a strong determining factor for whether an individual tends to be proreligious or pro-Yinger. Hastings and Hoge report that higher parental educational levels are associated with a more liberal religious orientation. The author of this research expects social class to be related to Yinger's liberal non-doctrinal religion.

Upper or middle class individuals, especially those with considerable religious socialization, are likely to endorse abstract, ideological sounding statements because they sound pleasing, being congruent with the style of expression reinforced by their background. Literature suggests that such a style is probably reinforced by middle and upper class settings. Feldman (1969:277) states that research findings indicate significant differences in the orientations of entering students of the lower class from the middle and upper class. Working-class, entering students are (1) less culturally sophisticated, (2) more restricted in their range of experiences, and (3) more likely to be oriented to college in terms of professional training as opposed to intellectual growth.

The writer expects that an abstract, non-doctrinal religious orientation, which might be reflected by endorsement of the Yinger scale, might be manifested as a conscious or unconscious need to fit in with the style of one's social class and college reference groups. If this is indeed the function of a yeasaying orientation toward
things of an ultimate, abstract nature, it may be more correct to label a pro-finger orientation as an ideology rather than a religion. An examination of some operational definitions of ideology will justify this conclusion and explain what this writer means by the concept of "ideology."

Geertz (1963:58-50) defines ideology as a perspective or subjective interpretation of reality according to the context of one's own experience with reality, a form of consciousness of reality which expresses itself symbolically. This symbolic expression of reality sometimes manifests itself in abstract conceptualizations of the universe. One theory of ideology, according to Geertz, is that it may be used as a weapon to propagate particular interests.

Converse (1964:207) argues that the term "belief system" is preferable to "ideology." One's belief system fulfills the function of serving as functionally interconnecting, reinforcing links which help to integrate interests, values, and intellectual discontinuities of the individual's perception of reality.

Rokeach (1963:5-6) makes the generalization that the importance of a belief can be defined in terms of its interconnectedness with other beliefs. It is this writer's speculation that upper and middle class students, especially those with a high religious socialization index, will participate in settings where an intellectual approach to religious and ideological questions is functionally interconnected with the general life style of that individual.

In conclusion, this writer feels that literature suggests that an individual's endorsement or agreement with an ideological or
religious sounding statement does not necessarily indicate what his personal orientation to life really is. In the next chapter some hypotheses are formulated which follow from the application of this statement to the index developed by Yinger.
CHAPTER III
SAMPLE AND METHOD

The data were collected in a survey of a random sample of students at Western Kentucky University, a state university with an enrollment of 11,000. Of 387 questionnaires mailed, 217 were returned, and 26 were ineligible. The questionnaire included Yinger’s items, items for an intrinsic-extrinsic scale similar to that used by Allport and Ross, questions determining a religious socialization score (Kader, 1972), Hollingshead’s two-factor index of social position (Hollingshead, 1957), questions determining a religious saliency score (Kader, 1972), and Lenski’s (1963) three dimensions of religiosity (doctrinal orthodoxy, associational involvement, and devotionalism).

The Yinger non-doctrinal religion scale was crosstabulated with the intrinsic-extrinsic scale. The latter scale was broken down into the four combinations of intrinsic and extrinsic values (Allport and Ross, 1959). The Yinger scale was dichotomized into low and high, with approximately fifty percent in each category. Endorsement of zero to five items represented a low response, and endorsement of six to seven items represented a high response. The intrinsic-extrinsic scale was collapsed in a similar manner. Endorsement of all three intrinsic items represented high intrinsic religion, and endorsement of two to three extrinsic items represented high extrinsic religion.
The proreligion category is represented by endorsement of two to three extrinsic items and all three intrinsic items. The antireligion category is represented by endorsement of less than three intrinsic items and less than two extrinsic items. Chi-square (Siegal, 1956:42-43) was used as a test of significance for this table, and a contingency coefficient (Siegal, 1956:196-199) was computed as a measure of association.

Each Yinger item, dichotomized into low and high (disagree versus agree), was crosstabulated with the proreligion category, dichotomized into low and high (with low representing other orientations). Chi-square was used as a test of significance.

Using Hollingshead's index, individuals were placed in three social class categories (classes I and II or upper, class III or middle, and classes IV and V or lower). The Yinger scale was crosstabulated and each Yinger item, dichotomized into low and high, was also crosstabulated with social position. Chi-square was used as a test of significance; gamma was computed as a measure of association.

A religious socialization score was developed by Mader (1972) utilizing seven items dealing with religious background and training. The total scores were collapsed into four categories. Individuals are scored one through four with one representing low religious socialization and four representing high socialization.

Religious socialization was crosstabulated with the four intrinsic-extrinsic combinations of religious orientation and with the Yinger scale (dichotomized into low and high). Chi-square was computed as a test of significance and gamma as a measure of association.
The hypotheses for this research were:

1. There will be significant differences on the Yinger scale by the four religious orientation combinations, which include the pro-religion category.

2. Of the four religious orientation categories, intrinsic religion will have the highest percentage scoring high on Yinger, and pro-religion will also have a high percentage of high scorers on the Yinger scale. The categories of extrinsic religion and antireligion will be represented by low percentages scoring high on the Yinger scale.

3. There will be relationships between separate items of the Yinger scale and proreligion, dichotomized into low and high.

4. There will be no relationship between Hollingshead's social position index and the Yinger scale.

5. There will be no relationship between any single item of the Yinger scale and Hollingshead's index of social position.

6. There will be no relationship between religious socialization and proreligion.

7. There will be no relationship between religious socialization and the Yinger scale.

Item intercorrelations (phi coefficients), item-total or point biserial coefficients, and alpha coefficients were computed for determining the reliability of the intrinsic-extrinsic scale and the Yinger scale. For a discussion of the point biserial coefficients see Guilford (1965:322-325). Item intercorrelations computed as phi coefficients are also discussed by Guilford (1965:498-501). Alpha
coefficients were computed using Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 (Guilford, 1954:380-381).

Tables 1 and 2 give the alpha coefficients, the item intercorrelation matrix, and point biserial correlations for each item against the total score, for the intrinsic-extrinsic indices and the Yinger variable. In Table 1, point biserial coefficients are given for each item within the intrinsic or extrinsic category. Examination of Table 2 reveals that the alpha coefficient and item intercorrelations for Yinger's items are extremely weak and cast doubt upon the reliability of his scale. Two factors are evident in the intrinsic-extrinsic correlation matrix. Item intercorrelations and point biserial correlations on these scales are high enough to assume inter-item reliability for these separate scales.

The question may be raised whether or not the four intrinsic-extrinsic combinations (antireligion, extrinsic, intrinsic, and proreligion) are theoretically distinct categories. Allport and Ross have already established a certain degree of concurrent validity by relating the four factors to prejudice. In order to further establish concurrent validity of these four combinations as distinct religious orientations, they were crosstabulated with Lenski's (1963) three religiosity variables. Tables 3, 4, and 5 report the findings. Certain expectations for the results of this crosstabulation may be derived from operational definitions of the concepts. The writer expected the proreligion category to be highest in doctrinal orthodoxy and the antireligion category to be lowest in doctrinal orthodoxy. Intrinsic religion was also expected to be high in doctrinal orthodoxy...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic Items</th>
<th>Item Intercorrelations</th>
<th>Item-Total ( r's^* )</th>
<th>Item-Catgry. ( r's^{**} )</th>
<th>% Pos. Kesp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha = 0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.</td>
<td>0.64 0.61 -0.01 0.00 0.14 0.65</td>
<td>0.86 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.</td>
<td>-- 0.64 0.03 0.02 0.12 0.68</td>
<td>0.88 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.</td>
<td>-- -0.06 -0.04 0.12 0.63 0.87</td>
<td>0.87 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extrinsic Items</th>
<th>Item Intercorrelations</th>
<th>Item-Total ( r's^* )</th>
<th>Item-Catgry. ( r's^{**} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha = 0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The purpose of worship and prayer is to gain personal security and happiness.</td>
<td>-- 0.31 0.54 0.52 0.79 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. What religion offers most is comfort when sorrow and misfortune strike.</td>
<td>-- 0.36 0.47 0.72 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.</td>
<td>-- 0.65 0.82 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^* \) point biserial correlation coefficients, each item against total
\( ^{**} \) point biserial correlation coefficients, each item against total within its intrinsic or extrinsic category
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Item Intercorrelations</th>
<th>Item-Total Rel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Efforts to deal with the human situation by religious means,</td>
<td>.15 .06 .15 .03 .01 .17 .50</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whatever the content of the beliefs and practices, seem to me to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be misplaced, a waste of time and resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Suffering, injustice, and finally death are the lot of man; but--</td>
<td>-.02 -.05 -.11 .04 .00</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they need not be negative experiences; their significance and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects can be shaped by our beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In the face of almost continuous violence in life, I cannot see</td>
<td>-.02 .10 -.03 .15 .56</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how men are going to learn to live in mutual respect and peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with one another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There are many aspects of the beliefs of the world's religions</td>
<td>-.04 .04 .06 .36</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with which I do not agree; nevertheless, I consider them to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable efforts to deal with man's situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Somehow, I cannot get very interested in the talk about &quot;the</td>
<td>-.12 .02 .43</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic human condition,&quot; and &quot;man's ultimate problems,&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Man's most difficult and destructive experiences are often the</td>
<td>-.07 .24</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source of increased understanding and powers of endurance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Despite the often chaotic conditions of human life, I believe</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that there is order and pattern to existence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

alpha = .15

*point biserial correlation coefficients, each item against total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Orientation (intrinsic-extrinsic combinations)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Percentage scoring low and high on Doctrinal Orthodoxy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antireligious</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proreligious</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 36.5  
P < .001  
Contingency Coefficient = .40
### TABLE 4
Religious Value Orientation and Religious Devotionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Orientation (intrinsic-extrinsic combinations)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage scoring low and high on Religious Devotionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antireligious</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proreligious</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 30.3  \( P < .001 \)

Contingency Coefficient = .37
TABLE 5
Religious Value Orientation and Religious Associational Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Value Orientation (intrinsic-extrinsic combinations)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage scoring low and high on Religious Associational Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antireligious</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proreligious</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 36.7  
$P < .001$  
Contingency Coefficient = .40
but not as high as proreligion. The findings presented in Table 3 confirm these expectations, but the difference between antireligion and extrinsic religion is slight, and the difference between proreligion and intrinsic religion is also slight. The writer expected intrinsic religion to be the highest category in devotionalism and antireligion to be the lowest, with extrinsic religion also low and proreligion high, though not as high as intrinsic religion. The findings presented in Table 3, however, suggest that the intrinsic-extrinsic variable is more a dichotomy than a four-factor variable. Intrinsic religion was expected to be the category highest in associational involvement with proreligion second highest. The findings presented in Table 4, however, suggest that the intrinsic-extrinsic variable is more a dichotomy than a four-factor variable. Intrinsic religion was expected to be the category highest in associational involvement with proreligion second highest. The findings presented in Table 5 suggest that the four combinations of the intrinsic-extrinsic variable are indeed distinct when crosstabulated with associational involvement. Chi-square was computed for all three relationships described above, and all three were significant at the .001 level.

While on such variables as associational involvement and prejudice there is a clear theoretical distinction between antireligion, extrinsic religion, intrinsic religion, and proreligion, it can be concluded that there are other areas of inquiry where the intrinsic-extrinsic variables may be dichotomized, but not crosstabulated with each other.

Another question may be raised concerning the representativeness of the sample, since only 55 percent of the questionnaires mailed were returned, and the possibility exists that students returning the questionnaire may have a greater than usual tendency to be concerned with religion. The writer feels that due to the nature of the variables in this research it is unlikely that findings would be
influenced by an overrepresentation of students concerned with religion. In order to test whether this is true a three-item religious saliency index (Mader, 1972) was dichotomized into low and high and crosstabulated with the four intrinsic-extrinsic combinations. Mader's three items of religious saliency concern religious interest, religious importance, and importance of religious participation. The findings are tabulated in Table 6, and the data suggest that students who are in the categories of intrinsic religion and proreligion exhibit higher religious saliency than those in the other two religious orientations. Chi-square was computed as a test of significance and the contingency coefficient as a measure of association. The relationship was significant at the .001 level. On the other hand, there were significant numbers of students who could be categorized as antireligious or high on extrinsic religion. Students of both orientations (low and high on religious interest) returned the completed questionnaires; and this fact made possible the testing of the hypotheses.
TABLE 6

Religious Value Orientation and Religious Saliency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Orientations (intrinsic-extrinsic combinations)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antireligious</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proreligion</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 76.6  \( P < .001 \)

Contingency coefficient = .54
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The question of greatest interest in this research concerns whether intrinsic religion or proreligion explains the Yinger variable. The writer hypothesized that of the four religious orientations, students of the intrinsic category will have the highest tendency to endorse the Yinger scale. Proreligion will also be a high Yinger endorsement category, since Allport noted that a proreligious individual had a tendency to endorse intrinsic religion as well as extrinsic.

The Yinger scale and religious value orientation are cross-tabulated in Table 7. Percentages scoring low and high on the Yinger scale were computed for each category of the religious orientation variable. Individuals scoring high on antireligion and extrinsic religion tend to score low on the Yinger scale, while individuals scoring high on intrinsic religion and proreligion score high on the Yinger scale. Of respondents classified in the intrinsic religion category, 65.9 percent scored high on the Yinger scale, and only a slightly larger percentage, 68.8 percent of the proreligious respondents were high on the Yinger scale. Chi-square was computed to test the significance of the relationship, and it was found to be significant at the .01 level. A contingency coefficient of .27 was computed, signifying a moderately
strong relationship. The conclusion, then, is that intrinsic religion is probably the factor which determines a high score on the Yinger scale, not proreligion or yeasaying. The first hypothesis is supported by the data; hypothesis 2 is supported with the exception of the provision that the intrinsic category will have the highest percentage scoring high on the Yinger scale. Proreligion has a slightly higher percentage.

Each of Yinger's items was crosstabulated with proreligion (dichotomized into low and high with low representing no-response and other orientations), and only items 1 and 2 (see Table 2) were significantly related to proreligion when chi-square was computed for each table. Therefore, it is concluded that hypothesis 3 is not supported by the data.

Next the questions may be asked: does social position explain the Yinger scores, and does social position explain proreligion? Hollingshead's two-factor index of social position was crosstabulated with Yinger's scale and with religious orientation (the four intrinsic-extrinsic combinations), but these two tables are not included in this thesis, as no significant relationship was found to exist in either crosstabulation. Each Yinger item was crosstabulated with social position, and it was found that only items 2 and 6 (see Table 2) are significantly related when chi-square was computed for the tables. The conclusion, then, is that social position cannot explain the Yinger scores. Hypothesis 4 is supported by the data, and hypothesis 5 is partially supported by the data.
### TABLE 7
Religious Value Orientation and the Yinger Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Orientation (intrinsic-extrinsic combinations)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antireligious</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proreligious</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 13.4 \( P < .01 \)

Contingency Coefficient = .27
Table 8 represents a test of hypothesis 6. Kader's socialization score is collapsed into four ordinal levels. Percentages were computed for each of the four intrinsic-extrinsic categories. Individuals scoring low on religious socialization tended to be in the category of anti- or extrinsic religion. Individuals with a slightly higher degree of religious socialization (level 2) retained a tendency to be antireligious, but individuals in this category had less tendency to be extrinsic and a higher tendency to intrinsic and proreligion. Level 3, representing a slightly higher religious socialization score than level 2, was represented by a moderately high percentage in the categories intrinsic religion and proreligion. Students classified in this level of religious socialization had a higher tendency toward antireligion than extrinsic religion. Students with a high (level 4) religious socialization score had a strong tendency to be proreligious. These students also had a moderate tendency toward intrinsic religion, but not as great as the tendency toward proreligion. The relationship in this table was found to be significant at the .001 level, and a contingency coefficient of .8 indicates a strong relationship. The conclusion, then, is that a high level of religious socialization is a strong determinant of intrinsic religion. Hypothesis 6 is not supported by the data.

Table 9 summarizes the data for testing hypothesis 7. Religious socialization is specified in the same manner as in Table 8; percentages are computed in each level for the scoring of low and high on the Yinger scale. Of the individuals at the lowest level of religious socialization, 35.8 percent scored high on the Yinger scale,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of religious socialization</th>
<th>Percentage representing each of four religious value combinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(low)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(high)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 54.5 \( P < .001 \)

Contingency Coefficient = .48
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of religious socialization</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage scoring low and high on Yinger Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(low) 1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Low: 64.2, High: 35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Low: 50.9, High: 49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Low: 34.9, High: 65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(high) 4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Low: 36.8, High: 69.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 13.3, P < .01
Gamma = .38
compared to 69.2 percent for those scoring highest on the religious socialization scale. The relationship in this table is significant at the .01 level, and a gamma of .38 indicates a moderately strong relationship.

Conclusions drawn from the findings reported in this chapter are reported in Chapter VI.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

The general conclusion is that Yinger's scale is possibly more a measure of intrinsic religion than was originally expected. However, the research offers evidence for caution in using it as such. Table 6 indicates that both intrinsic religious and proreligious students tend to endorse Yinger's items, while extrinsic religious students tend not to, and this suggests that Yinger's items have an intrinsic concern. However, Yinger's scale cannot distinguish the intrinsic religious from the proreligious. Research indicates that the categories intrinsic religion and proreligion are often theoretically indistinct. It is highly possible, therefore, that both categories have common motivational elements. Another conclusion of this research is that high scores on both Yinger's nondoctrinal religion and intrinsic religion have a common explanatory category, religious socialization. Yet high religious socialization explains proreligion as well as intrinsic religion.

The finding that social position is not related to the Yinger scores is probably explained by some previous findings that social class background tends to become "invisible" in the college environment, and that social groups tend to be formed according to criterion other than family's social status. Feldman (1969) gives sufficient evidence to suggest that such an explanation is possible. Although value orientations
of entering students are highly differentiated along the lines of social class, some studies report that students whose orientations are incongruent with the demands of the college will be more affected by the college environment. Feldman's conclusion is that the relative impact of college relates to the particular college and the particular student's position in the social life of the college.

Intrinsic religion has been shown by Hunt and King (1971) to be an ambiguous concept which is poorly operationalized and multidimensional. From their research, it can be concluded that intrinsic religion, in its present stage of development as a concept, is simply a name given to certain religious orientations (implying a selfless emphasis) which are empirically associated with one another. From such an assessment we would certainly have reason to conclude that Yinger's items might represent intrinsic religion. Yet Yinger, himself, is cautious about the scale's validity and usefulness. Hunt and King found that there were several distinct orientations such as idealism, pietism, and unselfishness, all of which have been confounded in the single concept of intrinsic religion. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the Yinger item intercorrelations and alpha coefficient for the sample under study were weak and suggest that more than one factor was represented by the Yinger variable. Because of the unreliability of Yinger's scale in this sample, caution should be taken in drawing inferences using this sample.

The writer is in basic agreement with Yinger that sociologists must first ask what is basic and intrinsic to religion before attempting to describe the form of religion in a given social situation.
Yet this and other research suggests that the problem of what specific elements and orientations comprise intrinsic religion is still baffling to sociologists. Further research in this area is needed. Identification of sociological correlates of the various religious behaviors and attitudes lends insight for a causal understanding of phenomena sociologists call religion.
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