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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

This first chapter presents the background for the problem under study. The purposes for the study are stated along with questions for which answers are being sought. These questions are stated as hypotheses. To establish a common frame of reference, a list of definitions appropriate to the study is also offered. After certain limitations are stated and a brief statement is made pertaining to the importance of this study, a final section of the chapter outlines for the reader the organization of the entire study.

Background

Ordinarily, learner participation is integral to the effectiveness of any adult education program. Virtually every aspect of adult education revolves around this participation.

For a long time, learner participation has been tied to the programming skills of adult educators. Among these are the selection of an appropriate setting, utilization of proper methods of instruction,
employment of the best instructor and development of a curriculum that will meet the needs of prospective participants. Of the four, the most crucial is the last one. Verner and Davis write:

adults enroll in educational activities in response to an internal need and to achieve some personal objective that may or may not be perceived clearly (1964, p. 157).

Thus, we can assent to Axford's statement in Adult Education: The Open Door: "The more we know about the adult learners the better we can program for their needs" (1969, p. 89). Adult educators speak generously of knowing the learners with whom they work. Indeed, to gain such knowledge is one of the fundamentals in the organization and administration of an adult education program. Whether the goal of the adult education is to remedy deficiencies or fill vacuums in previous formal education, to help the individual gain a deeper personal or social outlook, to enable him to qualify for a better job, or make a better citizen, knowledge of the learner is the ground . . . the point of departure on which relevant programs can be defined and maintained.

But the saying and the doing remain some distance apart for substantial reason. Focusing in on a prospective learner for an educational program generates a myriad of variables. Not only are there complexities
internal to the learner, but also—as suggested above—there are matters related to the setting, instructional methods, the teacher, the curriculum, and the interaction of all the foregoing. These variables cross many disciplines.

Hence the paucity of analytical research and evaluation of the prospective learner in all the various adult education programs is not surprising. The track record of adult educators in engaging in the procurement of such information is not too impressive. At worst, untested assumptions, superficial surveys, intuition . . . meager data indeed . . . often serve as the base for adult education programs. At best, serious adult educators have attempted to delineate and comprehend a number of characteristics of the clientele with whom they work. Generally researching demographic and socio-adaptive data, such attempts are to be faulted in that they have not gone far enough.

"Far enough" requires some expansion. As the various types of adult education (i.e., adult basic education, vocational-technical education, family life education, religious education) have gained more definition, there has been a hesitancy in differentiating the factors, or categories of factors, present in participants in such types of programs. Here I refer to
everything from the usual demographic data such as age, sex and educational level to increasingly complex factors such as psychological needs and motivations. Such analysis would add appreciably to the understanding of learners thereby having significant implications for program planning and the resultant participation therein.

At the same time, several variables pertaining to adults have been assessed and reported by other disciplines. These include such matters as how adults learn (Thorndike, 1935; Miller, 1964), the growth and decline of intelligence (Jones and Conrad, 1933), changes in the sensual acuity of the aging (Miles, 1933), motivations for learning (Maslow, 1954), appropriate methods for maximal learning (Carpenter, 1969), and the psychological needs of adults (Havighurst, 1959; Bischof, 1969). Assuredly, these insights have enhanced the programming skills of the adult educator.

However, the amount of work that remains is substantial. Given the importance of the connecting link between knowledge about the learner, programming for his needs and interests, and the resultant participation in said programs on the part of the learner, it is the obligation of adult educators to engage
increasingly in research that broadens and deepens their understanding of the learner. General study of participant-learners is positive. But, much refinement is in order. As indicated above, the possibilities for study are myriad. One such refinement is an analysis of the characteristics of learners involved in a specific type of adult education. In a preliminary way, such an analysis is the substance of this study.

Purposes of this Study

In keeping with the foregoing, the purposes of this study are two. The first purpose is to gain some further definition of participant-learners in an adult religious education program in a middle, upper-middle class suburban Protestant Church. This is to be accomplished--through a limited psychological and sociological analysis hereinafter defined--by comparing the participant-learners in the adult religious education program with an equal number of randomly selected non-participants, both groups being members of the same church. The second purpose is to isolate any variables within the parameters of the analysis that would predict participation in such a program. More specifically, the study will seek to answer several questions.

1. Is there a difference between the number of
men and the number of women who are part of the participant-learner group in this study?

2. Are a significant number of the participant-learners married rather than single, divorced or widowed?

3. Are there differences between the average monthly church attendance of the participant-learners and the non-participants?

4. Are there differences in the amount of annual family giving to the church between the participant-learners and the non-participants?

5. Are there differences in the number of church organizations to which participant-learners belong compared to non-participants?

6. Are there differences in the average number of monthly church meetings that participant-learners attend compared to such meetings attended by non-participants?

7. Are there differences in the number of organizations outside the church to which participant-learners belong compared to non-participants?

8. Are there differences in the average number of monthly meetings outside the church which participant-learners attend compared to such meetings attended by non-participants?
9. Do the participant-learners or the non-participants have more of their closest friends in this local church?

10. Are there differences in the overall level of self-esteem of the participant-learners compared to that of the non-participants?

11. Are the perceived self concepts of the participant-learners more unified or integrated than those of the non-participants?

12. Are there differences in the religious orientation of the participant-learners compared to the non-participants?

13. Within the limits of this analysis, are there independent variables that predict participation in a similar program?

It is a secondary purpose of this investigation to discuss the implications for the continued study of participant-learners in this specific setting.

**Hypotheses**

The null hypotheses that follow are written for each of the first twelve questions in the preceding section. The numbering of each hypothesis corresponds to the number of the specific question. The variables in the first two hypotheses are to be tested by means of a chi square test. The variables in the hypotheses
numbered three through twelve are to be tested as a multivariate analysis of variance test in order to determine whether there is a significant difference between participant-learners and non-participants. Given such significant difference, a separate analysis of variance is to be run for each variable individually.

1. There will be no significant difference between the number of women who are participant-learners and the number of men.

2. There will be no significant difference in the number of married persons who are participant-learners as compared to persons who are single, widowed or divorced.

3. There will be no significant difference between the average monthly church attendance of the participant-learners and the non-participants.

4. There will be no significant difference in the amount of annual family giving between the participant-learners and the non-participants.

5. There will be no significant difference in the number of church organizations to which participant-learners belong compared to non-participants.

6. There will be no significant difference in the average number of monthly church meetings that participant-learners attend compared to such meetings attended by non-participants.
7. There will be no significant difference in the number of organizations outside the church to which participants belong compared to non-participants.

8. There will be no significant difference in the average number of monthly meetings outside the church to which participant-learners attend compared to such meetings attended by non-participants.

9. There will be no significant difference in the number of closest friends that participant-learners have within the church as compared to non-participants.

10. There will be no significant difference between the level of self-esteem in the participant-learners and the non-participants.

11. There will be no significant difference between the perceived integration of the self concept of the participant-learners as compared with the same in the non-participants.

12. There will be no significant difference between the religious orientation of the participant-learners and the non-participants.

The thirteenth question, "within the limits of this analysis, are there independent variables that predict participation in a similar program?" is to be answered by means of a step-wise regression analysis of the independent variables utilized in the hypotheses three through twelve in this study. Through this
process the magnitude of the variance that each variable contributes to participation in the adult religious education program will be assessed. Additionally, the dependent variables will be computed through a prediction equation. Then, such computed dependent variable scores will be compared with the actual dependent variable scores in order to ascertain how many people scoring similarly would predictably be participant-learners or non-participants in a similar setting.

Importance of this Study

In Patterns for Life Long Learning, we find the statement:

"It's the challenge of education . . . to let the individual's own motivation, his needs, his desire to learn and grow shape educational policy and educational activity (Hesburgh, et al., p. 53)."

A similar assertion has been a part of the discipline of adult education for more than four decades. Yet, an adequate understanding of the participant-learner in the various adult educational settings remains elusive. Adult educators must change that. It is the intent of this study to contribute to such change. In sum:

1. this study will lend further definition to the participant-learners engaged in religious adult education programs in settings similar to the context of this study. Such information should be helpful to
professional adult educators and the participants themselves;

2. this study will encourage others to continue to research participant-learners in similar settings;

3. and, this study may serve as a paradigm for research on participant-learners in other settings.

Definitions of Terms

In order to establish a common frame of reference for use throughout this study, certain words need definition:

"friend" - Each person in this study placed his or her own definition on this word in assessing how many closest friends belonged to the church.

"self-concept" - This is how an individual perceives himself.

"self-esteem" - In the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale this includes feelings of personal value, self-worth and self-confidence with behaviors commensurate with such feelings.

"integration" - The process of the compartmentalization of certain areas of the self and the perception of these areas as quite related to the remaining areas of the self.

"religious orientation" - For the purposes of this study a person is either intrinsically or extrinsically
oriented religiously. "Intrinsically religious" applies to the person who is motivated to "live" his religious beliefs. An "extrinsically religious" person holds and/or acts on his beliefs for utilitarian purposes (personal gain and the like).

Limitations of this Study

This study is to be limited in several ways.

1. Whether adult educational programming is best approached through an understanding of the needs and interests of adults is not discussed. Such an assumption simply undergirds this study.

2. The sample is limited. It is limited as to size and location. One hundred people are not many for such a study. Further, these people are from one church in a very homogeneous sociological setting. These limitations tend to weaken generalizations that might be drawn for similar programs.

3. The validity of the tests that will be employed in this study is not an issue to be pursued herein.

4. The study is from one point in time, 1972. Nearly everything about the study will change. This tends to detract from the value of the conclusions.
Organization of the Study

Chapter I has provided the background, purposes for the study, these purposes in the null hypothesis form, along with certain definitions and limitations to the study.

The second chapter reviews relevant research. The procedure used for the present study is outlined in the third chapter. Included therein are a description of the sample, the instruments used and data collection and analysis techniques. In the fourth chapter, the results of the data analyses are presented along with discussion of the results. The fifth, and final chapter summarizes the study and offers implications for practice and further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

Three areas of review of research have been selected as pertinent for the present study. The first area generally pursues the manner in which adult educators have dealt with the problem of understanding adult learners, especially their needs and interests. A second area focuses more sharply on the problem of understanding adult learners in the adult religious educational setting. A third area develops a rationale for the utilization of the variables under study.

Understanding Adult Learners, Especially Their Needs and Interests

As stated in Chapter I, a commitment to understand adults—and especially their needs and interests—is not new to adult educators. Examples of such a commitment are several and go back four and five decades (Eckert, 1928; Thorndike, 1935; Turner, 1937; Brunner, et al., 1959; Havighurst and Orr, 1960; Kreitlow, 1964; Knowles, 1970). Over the years, adult educators have done quite well in handling some of these needs such as the delineation of the curricula to be studied. Here
reference is to the curricular developments in program areas that fall under the sponsorship of many institutions and organizations engaged in adult education. Included are adult basic and vocational-technical education, Cooperative Extension, business and industry adult education, and continuing education for the professions. For discussions about these developments see Smith, et al., 1970; Heding, et al., 1967; E. Miller, 1969; McAreavy, 1969; Kidd, 1970. An example of a sophisticated curriculum covering the content of a wide range of adult needs can be found in the 1975 catalog of the Steck-Vaughn Company, Austin, Texas, 78767. Similar pride can be taken in the development of methods that would enhance adult study (Carpenter, 1970; Jensen, et al., 1964; Wiman and Meierhenry, 1969; Smallegan, 1971; Dick, 1972). Much less attention has been given to the relation between teacher and the needs of the adult learner and the relation of the setting to the same needs. More about these topics will be written later in this chapter. Then, as we focus on the factors--the characteristics--that would lend definition as to who the people are and why these people become and remain or cease to be participant-learners in adult education, the research wanes even more. It is this aspect of understanding adults which is addressed now.
In *Completions and Dropouts: A Review of Research*, Verner and Davis (1964) compiled information about thirty studies—spanning 1928 to 1963—dealing with the persistence and the discontinuance of attendance in adult educational programs mostly in vocational and technical subjects. This compilation brought a measure of order and insight into the factors that encourage people to participate or not participate in adult learning. The article also revealed the sparsity and grand variation in studies of this type through the early sixties. The subjects of the studies numbered from two to several thousand. All the studies except three gathered data by interviews, questionnaires, or observations on the part of the person doing the study. Only seven of the studies were concerned with statistical significance. The fourteen studies cited as seeking to understand why participant-learners dropped out resulted in a mixture of personal and home, psychological, class location, job, school and a host of "unclassified" factors. Nothing definitive was ascertainable from the studies. However, Verner and Davis categorized the factors into two sets: Personal Factors and Situation-al Factors. The former Verner and Davis segmented into socio-economic factors (e.g., age, sex, educational level) and psycho-social factors (e.g., intelligence, motivation, social participation). The latter they
divided into non-Institutional factors (e.g., distance from school) and Institutional factors (e.g., time of day, tuition, type of instruction). This cataloguing and categorization have given impetus, in recent years, to the sharpening of those factors, or characteristics that would add definition to the participant-learner in the various circumstances of adult education. Additionally, the study has encouraged the sharpening of research and statistical skills that would aid in the delineation and understanding of such factors.

In *Participants in Adult Education*, Verner, *et al.* (1965) provided further general understandings about participant-learners as were extracted from the literature. Among these were that more education is related to more participation, people from thirty to fifty participate more and married persons participate more.

Johnstone and Rivera (*Volunteers for Learning*, 1965) reported the results of an extensive national survey involving more than 20,000 people engaged in some form of adult education. The study of these two men contributed appreciably to an understanding of the nature and scope of adult education in this country and the demographic characteristics of those who participate therein. Their survey indicated that a participant-learner is just as often a woman as a man, is typically under forty, has completed high school or
more, enjoys an above average income, works full time and most often is in a white collar occupation, is married and has children, lives in an urbanized area, but more likely in a suburb rather than a large city, and is found in all parts of the country, especially in the West. Further, the field was broken down by subject matter and estimates were made as to the number of people studying each type of subject matter. Approximately one-third of the participants were in job related subjects and skills. Learning interest was found to be heavily tied to vocational development. At the same time, religious, moral and ethical educational participants accounted for 12 percent of the total population involved in adult education.

Since the mid-sixties, the amount of research pertaining to the general understanding of the participant-learner in adult education has increased. Perhaps there is a strengthening adherence to the view that the value of adult education as a discipline is partially dependent upon whether that discipline deepens its understanding of the people with whom it works or wishes to work (Burgess, 1971). Whatever the case through research efforts in recent years, general factors descriptive of participant-learners have gained a measure of particularity. Research in the following pages will be approached by using the Verner and Davis categories
as a way of ordering the materials (Verner and Davis, 1964).

Under the heading of Personal Factors, the developing understanding of the socio-economic aspects of the participant-learners is investigated first. Several studies have pursued age, sex, education, marital status and dependents, and social class as descriptors of participant-learners.

As pertains to age, the optimum time for significant participation appears to be forty or under (Johnstone and Rivera, 1965; Edwards and House, 1966). However, there is no inherent reason, such as lessening intellectual acumen, for this (Knox and Sjorgren, 1965).

Dealing with the variable of male-female participation, Johnstone and Rivera found that an even number of men and women are involved in adult education. However, scrutiny of the study indicates a wide variation in the ratio of male-female participation in specific types of study. For example, more women than men--by two to one--were engaged in religious studies (Johnstone and Rivera, 1965, p. 80). This is consistent with Boshier (1973) and Verner and Dickinson (1967), London (1970), and Morstain and Smart (1974). The Wisconsin Research Center for Vocational Education (1969) found male involvement in adult education to be strongly
related to vocational matters. Female involvement is adjudged to be more toward non-vocational "personal growth" as in Pfeiffer (1964) and preparation for community service (Morstain and Smart (1974).

In deepening the understanding of the factor of education in relation to learner participation, several dimensions have been explicated. First of all, it has been established that the more education one has, the more likely one is to participate in adult education (London, et al., 1963; Johnstone and Rivera, 1965; Ver- ner and Dickinson, 1967; Dickinson, 1971; Boshier, 1973). Sainty (1971) came to the same conclusion in developing a "non success syndrome" for those least likely to be participant-learners. However, there is some indication that educational level itself does not account for lack of participation in the case of individuals with less than twelfth grade education. Here other factors such as age, adverse employment circumstances and marriage and family activities may prevent participation. Such was not the case in people with an educational level above the twelfth grade (Douglah and Moss, 1968). Sida (1969), within a vocational training setting, found participation correlated with the years of education achieved by the participant's wife. Anderson (1972) studied participant-learners in an evening
school setting and assessed them to be characteristically different from his undergraduate college sample. The former were more satisfied with their major studies, the faculty and other students and had greater independence from their families and peers. Participation has been a function of those who have participated before (London, et al., 1963; Verner and Dickinson, 1967; Sjorgen and Knox, 1968). In this area, definition of participants has been attempted by studying the reasons why participants cease participating. Reasons that persist are conflict related to one's employment (Douglah and Moss, 1968; Hawkins, 1968), personal problems such as illness or failure to keep up with class work (Houle, 1964; Hawkins, 1968), and dissatisfaction with the instructor (London, 1970). Zahn (1964) concluded that participation is dependent upon factors other than academic ability. Finally, Houle (1964) concluded that many students lacked the learning skills necessary to participate in adult education and no deference is given such lack. Sjorgen and Knox (1968) found that knowing how to learn was a significant attribute in a participant-learner.

Turning now to marital status and the presence of dependents and how these define or fail to define participants, several points are apparent. Johnstone and
Rivera (1965) concluded that more married people than single participate in adult education. Verner and Dickinson (1967) narrowed the married category to housewives with children. Studies by Douglah and Moss (1968) and Hawkins (1968) indicated that the presence of children may deter female participation.

Another factor that is often considered as defining participant-learners is social class. In Volunteers for Learning (p. 108 et seq.) it was indicated that adult education interest and activity was highest in middle and upper social class areas. A similar finding has been established in other studies (London, 1970; Douglah and Moss, 1970). However, some adult educators maintain that the reason for the class phenomenon is that the lower and lower middle class population is simply not provided with programs meeting its needs (Verner, 1970; Knowles, 1970). This could account for the relative disinterest in adult and continuing education on the part of the lower class individuals who participated in a Los Angeles study even though these same individuals perceived their lack of education as a real deterrent to their development and success in life (Davis, 1965). The same is true as an explanation for the negative attitudes toward further education and the purveyors of such education on the part of a lower class population in West Milwaukee (Robinson, 1970).
This factor--like all others--is far from being understood as it relates to adult educational participation.

With that, attention is turned to studies of a more psycho-social nature as Verner and Davis categorized them.

In Chapter I, brief mention was made of variables of a psycho-social nature that have been assessed and reported by other disciplines. To reiterate, such studies and writings--though many are very general in approach--have vastly enhanced the work of adult educators as they try to understand the people with whom they work. However, it is a constraint of this chapter to limit discussion to those situations in which psycho-social variables are specifically related to participant-learners in some adult educational setting.

Little has been done in relating intelligence to participation in adult education. Sainty indicated that less intelligent individuals in adult education classes were more likely to drop out without completing the class (Sainty, 1971). Several studies have shown that persons with more education were likely to participate (Johnstone and Rivera, 1965; London, et al., 1963; Boshier, 1973). This may suggest that intelligence and being a participant-learner are related. At this point, the truth or strength of that assertion is unknown.
Some effort has gone into determining the motivational reasons why people participate. The tie with vocational development was suggested above in the discussion about the Johnstone and Rivera study (page 17). Otherwise, the motivational aspects—or the psychological components generally—of a participant-learner have had little emphasis in research. Yet a discussion of what exists is appropriate here. One factor is the need for social relationship or the sharing of an interest with friends. That this is a significant aspect of the participant-learner has been established several times in a variety of settings (Brunner, et al., 1959; London, et al., 1963; Houle, 1964; Morstain, 1974). From a theoretical standpoint Houle (1961) classified participant-learners as being goal oriented, learning oriented and activity oriented. Those in the first category are motivated by some sort of objective. The second group is motivated by a desire to know for the sake of knowing. The third group is interested in activity and the social aspects of adult education. Boshier (1973) has theorized that "deficiency motivated" and "growth motivated" (p. 257) people participate in adult education as he has attempted to develop an instrument that would predict a person's propensity for participation. Sida's study (1969) indicated people participated in vocational training because they
perceived the classroom as a place where they could engage in the decision making process. From a more negative standpoint Puder and Hand (1968) and Zahn (1969) isolated characteristics that deter or cause involvement in learning programs to cease altogether. In the Puder and Hand study, the participant-learner's effectiveness and, in some instances, participation was blocked by the individual's alienation, hostility to authority and fear of schooling. In the latter study, Zahn found that the feeling of powerlessness in relation to job and community contributed to the participant's failure to continue. An attempt to attribute selected personality needs to the participant-learner in a fashion similar to the present study was done by Scharles (1966). Using the Edwards Personal Preference Test, Scharles concluded that males participating in the evening school under study showed more need for affiliation and less need for autonomy. Females in the same study showed more need for abasement and less need for achievement. Though cursory and preliminary, Scharles maintained from the study that personality needs do influence the decision to participate in learning activity.

Finally, we must review a research thrust that shows promise as a means for deepening the understanding of participant-learners. This thrust is taxonomic
in intent similar to Houle's three orientation analyses of adult learners. In fact, three of the studies (Sheffield, Boshier, Burgess) used Houle's work as a point of departure. Drawing from Houle, Sheffield (1964) formulated a list of reasons why people engage in adult educational activities. Then, he reduced the list to a smaller number of categories descriptive of the participant-learner. Four years later, Allen Tough (1968) did a similar exercise on his own. In 1971, Burgess (in St. Louis) and Boshier (in New Zealand) reported their efforts after following the process used earlier and adding a factor analysis. This technique precipitated seven groupings for Burgess and fourteen for Boshier. According to Burgess, participant-learners desire to know, to reach a personal, social or religious goal, engage in some activity, meet a formal requirement of some sort or simply escape. Boshier's participant-learners factored into the following: desire to approve one's ability to serve the community, need for personal associations and new friends, intellectual recreation, other directed or inner directed study for professional advancement, learning for the sake of learning, abhorrence of television, introduction or supplementation to one's understanding and escape. Both men used Houle's study as a theoretical base. Also, Boshier drew heavily from Sheffield.
In 1974, Boshier's effort was replicated by Morstain and Smart at Glassboro College, Delaware. This study resulted in groupings around six factors that were similar to the loadings reported by Boshier. Morstain and Smart concluded with factor headings that indicated participant-learners are adults who need personal association and new friends, who expect to fulfill the demands made on them by persons or organizations external to the learner, or are driven by inner desire to engage in studies for professional advancement. These learners are interested in education that will enhance their ability to be of service to the community or mankind in general. Finally, some learn just to learn and some participate in order to escape from conditions or situations.

Scholars engaged in this aspect of research in adult education contend that their holistic approach grounded in sound theory will begin to delineate an understanding of the adult learner that has been heretofore unattainable (Boshier, 1971). If the theory can be located, the items developed and factors sharpened, this contention may be substantiated.

The first part of this research chapter is concluded with an enumeration of the few situational factors (still adhering to the Verner and Davis categories for analysis) that define participation.
Expectedly, there is indication that the lack of information about where and when a program is being held is a major deterrent to people who would otherwise participate (Cox, 1970; London, 1970). On the other hand, administrative factors such as length, size and frequency of a class and the time of day it was scheduled had no significant bearing on participation or non-participation (Davis, 1966). Both Miller (1964) and Axford (1969) have written extensively—though non empirically—about the aspects of the educational setting and their bearing upon participation. Some effort has been devoted to the teacher in relation to the adult participant-learner. The concern or interest of the teacher for the adult student as perceived by the student has been a factor in encouraging participation (Sida, 1969; Seaman, 1971). An attempt has been made to relate successful teachers to high self esteem as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. However, the results were inconclusive (Clarke, 1971). Lastly, the role of the teacher as a facilitator for adult learning rather than a purveyor of information is gaining importance in adult education (Richardson and Houghton, eds., 1974).
Understanding Adult Learners in the Adult Religious Educational Setting

The task of the second area of focus in this chapter is the problem of understanding adult learners involved in the religious adult educational setting. The task has its frustrations in that considerable research has resulted in little extant literature pertaining to this subject. Such a dearth of material has its positive side. It indicates the need for studies that will elucidate the characteristics of the participant-learner in this specific setting. Historically, the commitment of religious adult educators appears the same as that of educators operative throughout the field; that is, to know the participants and prospective participants in religious adult education in order to more appropriately program for them. Writings to that effect go back many years (McFarland and Sonquist, 1930; Winchester, 1930; Bergevin and McKinley, 1958). However, the search for the fruits of such a commitment leaves one almost empty handed. Brunner, and others, (1959) decried the lack of such studies and called for research pertaining to participants in this area. The need is made more dramatic when it is found that of the more than twenty-nine million people enrolled in adult education in this country in the mid sixties, about 12% were in religious adult education (Johnstone and Rivera,
That is a goodly number of the clientele to know so little about. What there is will be pursued.

Warner and Hilander (1964) found an inverse correlation between the size of the church and the number of adults who participate in religious educational offerings. In a study by Uhl (1967) religious adult education participants were compared with extension class participants. Generally, the former were in a higher social class, sought more to be with friends, and, expressed an obligation to the church. In 1968, Garrow and Schroeder reported on a factorial analysis seeking to describe the reasons people participated in all aspects of the church. Though broader than the scope of the present study, the results were instructive in that three of the six final factors had strong religious adult education implications. People indicated they were related to church because they wanted to know how to improve themselves, they wanted to learn more about how to be good family members and they were simply interested in the study of religion. Shaller reported that religious adult educational settings were role-learning circumstances for participants (1969, p. 55). Brannon (1971) related being a participant-learner in religious adult educational activities with regular attendance at church worship.
In a study of the reasons why people participated in adult church school, Hardee found that persons were motivated by a desire for friendship, a desire to be an individual of value and a desire to live up to the perceived image the teacher had of the person (1972). Finally, in an extensive study of participants, or former participants, in the church's adult education, the United Methodist Church (1972) reported that the three most significant reasons for withdrawal from the educational program were that the persons did not feel the group to be friendly, the lessons were irrelevant and the teachers were perceived to be poor. With that, attention is turned to the third aspect of this chapter.

Rationale for the Utilization of the Variables under Study

There were a number of reasons why the variables of this study were chosen. Most of these reasons have been cited in other places within this study. Nonetheless, it is appropriate that they be presented in an orderly fashion at this time.

Johnstone and Rivera found that two women to each man participated in religious adult education. They also found that more married people than single
(including widowed and divorced) were involved in such studies (1965, pp. 72, 80).

There is some indication that people who attend church more regularly also participate in other aspects of the church, especially the religious education program (Glock, 1961; Brannon, 1971). A similar relation is suggested for annual family giving (Andrews, 1953; King, 1967; Glock, et al., 1967; Shaller, 1969), the number of church organizations to which participants belong and the average number of monthly meetings that participant-learners attend (Fichter, 1954; London, et al., 1963; King, 1967; Uhl, 1967) compared with non-participants.

On the other hand, people who are strongly involved with church organizations and church meetings are expected to have significantly less involvement with organizations and the resultant meetings outside the church (Glock, et al., 1967, p. 23).

The desire for friendship and social interaction, generally, has been shown as a substantial reason for persons' involvement in the church (Uhl, 1967; Hardee, 1972; United Methodist Church, 1972). Therefore, it is expected that participant-learners will have more friendships than non-participants.

Though there is virtually no literature relevant to the matter, it has been suggested that as
psychological impairment increases, participation in organized religious activity decreases. Conversely, as participation increases, psychological impairment decreases (Lindenthal, et al., 1970). Therefore, it is concluded that participant-learners will have significantly stronger self-esteem scores.

The level of the integration of the self as perceived by the participants and non-participants in this study is tied to the Religious Orientation Scale score. Allport maintained that the intrinsically religious are those who are "oriented toward a unification of being" (Allport, 1966, p. 455). A similar conclusion was made by Ghougassian (1972, p. 25). Additionally, McConnell (1969) suggested that the intrinsically religious are mature and integrated selves. Though meager, from the foregoing citations, it is expected that participant-learners will show more integration of the self and score as more intrinsically religious compared with the non-participants in this study.

In this chapter three areas of research have been pursued. The first dealt with the manner in which adult educators have handled the problem of understanding adult learners, especially their needs and interests. The second area focused on the problem of
understanding adult learners in the religious adult educational setting. The third area gave some bases for the selection of the variables used in this study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains a description of the setting in which the study took place, the procedures by which the sample for the study was selected, instrumentation utilized in the study and a discussion of the organization and analysis of the data.

Setting

The setting for this study was a Protestant suburban church near Columbus, Ohio. At the time of the study, the church had a membership of 1713 persons who were eighteen years of age or older. The membership was almost entirely derived from the suburban community in which the church is located. 1970 Census information pertaining to the dwellings in the area, the annual income, occupational levels and the predominantly white make-up of its families indicate a homogeneous, middle, upper-middle class population (Verner, 1960). The assessment of homogeneity is further substantiated by such factors as rootlessness (Winter, 1961), classlessness (Seeley, et al., 1956), and the "upgrade to optimism" (Whyte, 1956).
Selection of the Sample

The participant-learner group numbered fifty (50). All were members of the above church and eighteen years of age or older. The participant-learner group was selected from fifty-four adults who enrolled and participated in the adult religious education programs presented by the church during the calendar year 1971. Of the fifty-four, two chose not to be involved in the study. Two others left the community before the data were gathered.

The non-participant group numbers fifty (50). These all were members of the same church described above. This group was selected randomly. Each member (1713) was assigned a number from 0001 to 1713. Then a table of random numbers was entered randomly and the last four digits of every tenth number read until fifty-five non-participants were selected. This number was designated in case some people selected chose not to be involved or moved before the study could be completed. As it turned out, all the first fifty people selected completed the study as requested.

Instrumentation

Each participant-learner and non-participant was administered three instruments.

The first is designated the Religious Adult
Education Questionnaire (Appendix A, p. 78). It consists of nine items of a demographic nature as follows: sex, marital status, average monthly church attendance, annual amount of family giving to the church, the number of monthly meetings attended directly connected with the church, the number of organizations outside the church to which the subject belonged, the number of monthly meetings attended in organizations outside the church, the number of organizations within the church to which the subject belonged, and the number of the "three closest friends" of the subject who belong to this church. The questionnaire was completed by circling the appropriate answer or filling in the appropriate blanks.

The second instrument was the Religious Orientation Scale (Appendix B, p. 88) formulated by Gordon W. Allport and J. Michael Ross. The Scale divides the religiosity of an individual into an intrinsic orientation or an extrinsic orientation.

Allport and Ross maintained that as an individual develops, there comes into being an ego which is the more stable, driving and therefore unifying inner "core" of his personality. The individual's warmer and more enduring meanings and values are involved in that ego. If the individual's religious orientation, whatever
its context, is a formative factor in this ego, then its motivating power will be strong and directive. His religious attitude will be intrinsic. But the personality has motives and meanings that are extrinsic to the unity giving core. They are lukewarm or cold because they are thus extrinsic to the basic intentions of the person. His religious motivations may be relatively peripheral, and therefore extrinsic. Most religious persons fall somewhere along the continuum from the intrinsic to extrinsic poles. The extrinsically motivated person uses his religion, whereas the intrinsically motivated lives his. The extrinsic person subordinates and tailors religious practices and beliefs to the satisfaction of personal motives. The intrinsic person is viewed as subordinating and tailoring personal motives and practices to the precepts of religion (Allport and Ross, 1967).

Sociologically, the Religious Orientation Scale is rooted in the writings of Fichter (Fichter, 1954) and Lenski, especially in The Religious Factor (Lenski, 1963). Also, a debt is due W. C. Wilson and J. R. Feagin for their early work on this continuum. Wilson first devised an extrinsic scale (Wilson, 1960). Feagin developed both factors in a southern fundamentalistic setting (Feagin, 1964). The present Scale has been drawn from three sources. First, some of the
Scale's statements come from the Social Problems Questionnaire, an unpublished questionnaire dealing with subtle anti-minority feelings. Second, portions of the Custodian Mental Illness Ideology Scale were utilized by Allport and Ross. This scale was devised to further define the kinds of ideologies held by certain diagnostic types in mental hospitals (Gilbert, 1956). Third, a potpourri of items are related to what Allport called a "jungle" philosophy, that is, a philosophy suggesting a generalized suspiciousness and distrust.

The Religious Orientation Scale consists of twenty statements for which the subject may select one of four possible responses. These responses are numbered one through four. The lower the score, the more intrinsic the individual. The higher the score, the more extrinsic.

A third instrument used in this study is the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Appendix B, p. 80), developed by Dr. William H. Fitts. The author began work on this scale in 1955. The original purpose was to develop a research instrument that might contribute to the difficult criterion problem in mental health research.

In the early development of the scale a large pool of self descriptive items was compiled. This pool was derived from a number of other self concept
measures including those designed by Balester (1956), Engle (1956), and Taylor (1953). After a time, a phenomenological system was developed for classifying items on the basis of what they themselves were saying. This evolved into the two dimensional, 3 X 5 scheme employed on the score sheet of the Scale. The Scale contains ninety items equally divided into positive and negative items. The remaining ten items comprise the Self Criticism Scale.

For purposes of this study only the Total P Score and the Total V Score will be utilized. The P Score is the most important single score in the Scale. It reflects the overall level of self esteem. Persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves and act accordingly. Conversely, low scoring individuals are doubtful about their own worth, view themselves as undesirable, often feel anxious and depressed and have little faith in themselves.

The Total V Score represents the total amount of variability for the entire scale. High scores mean that a person's self concept is so variable from one area to another as to reflect little unity or integration. High scoring persons tend to compartmentalize certain areas of self and view these areas quite apart
from the remainder of self. Well integrated people generally score below the mean (Fitts, 1965).

**Data Collection Process**

Each person selected above was called by telephone and, after the study was explained, asked to be a subject for the study. If the person agreed, an appointment was made for a home visit.

Out of this initial step a master sheet of names, addresses and phone numbers of all the participants and non-participants was formulated. Each name was given a number. The participants were numbered P-1, P-2 . . . P-50. Similarly, the non-participants were numbered NP-1, NP-2 . . . NP-50. A file folder was prepared for each subject. Each folder contained all of the instruments utilized in this study and the answer sheet for the *Tennessee Self Concept Scale*. All the instruments and the folder were given the subject's number from the master file.

At the appointed time, each subject was visited. The instruments were explained. That is, each item on the *Adult Religious Education Questionnaire* was discussed and the appropriate methods for answering the other two instruments were discussed. Each subject was given a week to complete the instruments. After seven days a second appointment was made by telephone.
During the second visit the completed folders were collected.

The collected instruments were scored. Then each item pertinent to this study was coded for the computer. For example, participants were given the number 1. Non-participants were defined by the number 2. Males were numbered zero and females numbered 1. The resultant coding was placed on a Fortran Coding Form. Then, these data were transcribed to computer cards—one card for each subject. The entire process was proofed twice. At this point, the cards were processed in the computer according to the programs that have been written for this study.

**Statistical Analysis**

The statistical procedures used to determine the differences between the participant-learners and non-participants, as pertains to the variables employed in this study, were as follows.

For the first two hypotheses, the chi square test was used to ascertain whether the number of women and the number of married persons who are participant-learners differ significantly from the expected frequency of such categories of people in this particular population under study.

Since the population from which the subjects have
been drawn numbers 1713 it is unnecessary to hypothesize about the expected frequencies of women and marrieds. A ratio of females to males and marrieds to single, divorced and widowed can be established. Consequently under the first hypothesis, the obtained number of female participant-learners were compared to the percentage of females in the population under study. Similarly, the obtained number of marrieds were compared to the percentage of marrieds in the same population. Significance for these tests will be at the .05 level critical value of chi square with one degree of freedom.

For hypotheses three through twelve, a multivariate analysis of variance was run on all the variables as a group involved therein (ten variables). The resultant F ratio indicated a significant difference between participant-learners and non-participants at the .05 level. Therefore, a separate analysis of variance was run for each individual variable in the study. This clarified the variables on which there are differences--and the magnitude thereof--between participants and non-participants.

The last part of the analysis consisted of a step-wise regression analysis in order to determine the relationship between the variables in this study
and participation or non-participation in the adult religious education program. By means of a prediction equation, the actual scores of each subject were related to predicted scores. From this process, it can be shown that, given another member with the same score on one or several variables, the member would predictably be a participant or a non-participant in adult religious education in a similar setting.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter are presented the results of the data analyses from the present study. Discussion of the results is also included. The analyses are grouped to yield order and meaning to the discussion. The first portion of this chapter is to determine if a significantly greater proportion of women were participant-learners as compared to men and if a significantly greater proportion of married persons were participant-learners rather than those persons who were single, widowed or divorced. The analysis, in both instances, was the chi square test. The second part of this chapter utilizes the multivariate analysis of variance. In it, differences, or the lack thereof, between the participant-learners and the non-participants are assessed. These differences pertain to average monthly church attendance, annual family giving to the church, number of church organizations and the number of monthly meetings in church to which the subjects in each group belong and attend, respectively, the number of organizations outside the church to which
the subjects belong, the number of meetings outside
the church to which the subjects attend each month,
the number of closest friends that the participant-
learners or the non-participants have in the church,
the level of self-esteem and perceived personality in-
tegration between the two groups and the religious ori-
etation of the two groups under study. The third por-
tion of the chapter utilizes a step-wise regression
analysis of the independent variables just enumerated
for the second portion of the study. Through this
process, the magnitude of the variance that each vari-
able contributes to participation in the adult religious
education program will be assessed. Additionally, the
resultant dependent variables were computed through a
prediction equation. Then, such computed dependent
variable scores were compared with the actual dependent
variable scores in order to ascertain how many people
scoring similarly would predictably be participant-
learners or non-participants.

The Chi Square Analyses

Observation and discussion of the analyses of the
first two hypotheses are in order. In the null form
these were:

1. There will be no significant difference between
the number of women who are participant-learners and the number of men.

2. There will be no significant difference in the number of married persons who are participant-learners as compared to persons who are single, widowed or divorced.

Since the total population (church membership) was known to be 1713 at the time of the study, the number of women and men of which that population consisted could be determined. A count determined that 55% of the population were women and, hence, the remaining 45% men. This means that the frequency expected under the null hypothesis would be 27.5 women and 22.5 men. From the fifty participant-learners the frequency obtained was 32 women and 18 men. The chi square analysis was performed and is summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBTAINED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES OF MEN AND WOMEN WHO WERE PARTICIPANT-LEARNERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obtained</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 (1) = 1.64, \text{ ns}. \]
The resultant chi square statistic \( X^2 = 1.64 \) failed to achieve significance, hence the null hypothesis is retained. In sum, although the observed data tended to support the Johnstone and Rivera (1965) findings that women, more than men, tend to participate in religious adult education, the observed differences did not exceed chance expectations.

In the second hypothesis, the number of married participant-learners was 41. Nine were single: that is, never had been married, were widowed or divorced. From the population of 1713, it was found that 80% of the people were married and 20% in one of the single states. This resulted in an expected frequency of 40 married persons and 10 single persons. To determine if a significantly greater proportion of married persons were participant-learners, a chi square analysis employing one degree of freedom was performed. The data from this analysis is in Table 2. The resultant chi square statistic \( X^2 = 1.25 \) failed to achieve significance. Hence, in this setting, the hypothesis that there will be no significant difference in the number of married persons who were participant-learners compared with the group of single, widowed or divorced persons is sustained. Obviously, there are many more marrieds than the different types of singles as these types have been combined in this study. However, given
the expected frequency of the population, that difference is not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 2

OBTAINED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES OF MARRIED PERSONS OR SINGLE, WIDOWED OR DIVORCED PERSONS WHO WERE PARTICIPANT-LEARNERS

(N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obtained</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, divorced and widowed</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 (1) = 1.25, \text{ ns.} \]

The Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Turning now to the second portion of this chapter, hypotheses in the null form numbered three through twelve are to be dealt with. These are as follows:

3. There will be no significant differences between the average monthly church attendance of the participant-learners and the non-participants.

4. There will be no significant difference in the amount of annual family giving between the participant-learners and the non-participants.
5. There will be no significant differences in the number of church organizations to which participant-learners belong compared to non-participants.

6. There will be no significant difference in the average number of monthly church meetings that participant-learners attend compared to such meetings attended by non-participants.

7. There will be no significant difference in the number of organizations outside the church to which participants belong compared to non-participants.

8. There will be no significant difference in the average number of monthly meetings outside the church to which participant-learners attend compared to such meetings attended by non-participants.

9. There will be no significant difference in the number of closest friends that participant-learners have within the church as compared to non-participants.

10. There will be no significant differences between the level of self-esteem in the participant-learner and the non-participants.

11. There will be no significant difference between the perceived integration of the self
concept of the participant-learners as compared with the same in the non-participants.

12. There will be no significant difference between the religious orientation of the participant-learners and the non-participants.

For the variables in the above hypotheses the means and standard deviations for the participant-learner and non-participant groups are in Table 3. Since the purpose of this portion of the study is to ascertain whether there were significant differences between the participants and non-participants, all the variables were tested as a group by a multivariate analysis of variance. The MANOVA yielded an overall $F$ of 16.956, significant at the .001 level. Thus, taking all the variables as a group, the $F$ ratio indicated that there was a significant difference between the group centroids of participant-learners and non-participants.

Next, a separate analysis of variance was run for each variable individually to ascertain the specific nature of differences in participants and non-participants. The results of these univariate $F$ tests are in Table 4.

This separate analysis of variance performed for each variable individually indicated that participant-learners differ significantly, at at least the .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Par.-learner</th>
<th>Non-Par.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Average monthly church attendance</td>
<td>M 2.640</td>
<td>1.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.711</td>
<td>1.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Annual family giving</td>
<td>M 436.400</td>
<td>312.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 408.421</td>
<td>378.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Church organizations belonged</td>
<td>M 2.320</td>
<td>0.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.168</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Church meetings attended monthly</td>
<td>M 4.120</td>
<td>0.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 2.939</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Outside organizations belonged</td>
<td>M 2.280</td>
<td>1.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 3.010</td>
<td>2.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meetings outside the church attended monthly</td>
<td>M 1.840</td>
<td>2.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 2.044</td>
<td>4.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Closest friends</td>
<td>M 1.820</td>
<td>0.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.155</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Level of self-esteem</td>
<td>M 344.540</td>
<td>339.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 31.874</td>
<td>29.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perceived integration of the self</td>
<td>M 42.840</td>
<td>47.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 8.460</td>
<td>12.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Religious orientation</td>
<td>M 1.937</td>
<td>2.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 0.040</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4
UNIVARIATE F TESTS FOR EACH VARIABLE INDIVIDUALLY TO ASSESS SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PARTICIPANT-LEARNERS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F(1, 98)</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>P less than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Average monthly church attendance</td>
<td>5.448</td>
<td>12.250</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Annual family giving</td>
<td>2.483</td>
<td>384518.938</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Church organizations belonged</td>
<td>74.836</td>
<td>70.559</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Church meetings attended monthly</td>
<td>68.305</td>
<td>320.406</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Outside organizations belonged</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>2.890</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meetings outside church attended monthly</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>8.410</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Closest friends</td>
<td>47.302</td>
<td>46.240</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Level of self-esteem</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>660.483</td>
<td>0.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perceived integration of self</td>
<td>4.536</td>
<td>542.900</td>
<td>0.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Religious orientation</td>
<td>65.039</td>
<td>132203.938</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .01.

**P < .05.
level, from non-participants in average monthly church attendance, the number of church organizations to which participants belong and the number of monthly church meetings which they attend, the number of closest friends participants have in the church, the perceived integration of the self and religious orientation. Now, these data are to be related to the hypotheses three through twelve.

The third hypothesis in the null form stating that there will be no significant difference in the average monthly church attendance of participant-learners as compared to non-participants is denied. The average monthly church attendance of participant-learners (2.64) is significantly greater than that of the non-participants (1.94).

The fourth null hypothesis stated that there will be no significant difference in the annual family giving to the church between the two groups tested. With P less than 0.118, the probability is strong that any differences are a matter of chance. This null hypothesis is sustained.

The null hypothesis numbered five stated that there will be no significant difference in the number of church organizations to which participant-learners belong as compared to non-participants. Null hypothesis number six stated that there will be no significant difference
between participants and non-participants in the average number of monthly church meetings which they attend. Both these hypotheses were rejected at the .001 level. The data showed participants belonged to a significantly greater number of church organizations and attended a significantly greater number of church meetings each month.

Hypothesis seven stated that there will be no significant differences in the number of organizations outside the church to which participants and non-participants belong. This hypothesis is sustained.

Hypothesis eight stated that there will be no significant differences in the average number of monthly meetings outside the church to which participants and non-participants attend. This hypothesis is sustained.

Hypothesis nine, in null form, stated that there will be no significant difference in the number of closest friends that participant-learners have within the church as compared to the number of closest friends in the church of non-participants. With P less than 0.001, there is a significant difference indicated. This null hypothesis is rejected. The data showed that participants have a significantly greater number of close friends in church than non-participants.

The tenth hypothesis, that there will be no
significant difference between the level of self-esteem in the participant and non-participants, is sustained.

Hypothesis eleven is rejected. In the null form this hypothesis stated that there would be no significant difference between the perceived integration of the self concept of the participant-learners as compared with the same in the non-participants. This indicates a significant difference beyond a chance occurrence. Participants perceived themselves to be more integrated than non-participants to a significant degree.

Hypothesis twelve in the null form states that there will be no significant difference between the religious orientation of the participant-learners and the non-participants. This is rejected. With P less than 0.001, the magnitude of the difference is significant.

The Step-wise Regression Analysis

Finally, it was a secondary purpose of the study to find any independent variables utilized herein that would predict participation or non-participation in an adult religious education program in a similar setting. This was accomplished by a step-wise regression analysis of the variables in hypotheses three through twelve in order to assess the magnitude of the variance that each
variable contributed to participation in the adult religious education under study.

The step-wise regression analysis of all variables is summarized in Table 5. From this regression analysis, it can be seen that approximately 64% of the variance in the dependent variable (the $R^2$) is explained by the first four variables entered: church organizations to which belonged, religious orientation, closest friends and perceived integration of the self. Additionally, the $F$ value to enter is significant at the 0.01 level with 1,98 degrees of freedom.

Similarly, the magnitude of the Standardized Discriminant Analysis weights can be interpreted for the purpose of determining which independent variables contribute most to the regression equation. Specifically, since the weights presented in Table 5 are in standardized form, they can be used to identify the variables that provide the greatest contribution to the prediction system (Tatsuoka, 1970, p. 169-170). Scrutiny indicates that the weights iterate the findings stated in the paragraph preceding.

Next, by means of the basic equation of simple linear regression (Kerlinger, 1964, pp. 604f.) a formula for the prediction of participation or non-participation was developed. The basic equation is:

$$Y = a + bX$$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Variable entered</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Standardized Discriminant Analysis Weights</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R² Increase in</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>to enter or remove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Church organizations to which belonged</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>74.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Religious orientation</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.564</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>29.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Closest friends</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>14.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Perceived integration of the self</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.304</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>6.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Annual family giving</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Average monthly church attendance</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Variable entered</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Standardized Multiple Discriminant R Analysis Weights</th>
<th>Increase in R²</th>
<th>F value to enter or remove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Outside organizations to which belonged</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Level of self-esteem</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Meetings outside the church attended monthly</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Church meetings</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant (1, 98) for the distribution of F at 0.01.
"X" is the score for the independent variable. "a" is the intercept constant. "b" is the regression coefficient. And, "Y" is the predicted score of the dependent variable; in this instance participation or non-participation. Scores for each participant and non-participant were computed using only the four variables that were shown to contribute significantly to the prediction equation. When these computed scores were compared with the actual scores of the participants and non-participants in this study, it was found that 89 of the 100 subjects were correctly classified. This means that knowledge of the presence of any or all of these four variables in the members of a church congregation in a setting similar to that of this study would effectively predict those persons likely to participate in a program of adult religious education.

This chapter has presented the results of the analyses of the data for this study. The final chapter following summarizes the study and offers conclusions and implications for practice and future research.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

In the preceding chapters the problem, with which the present study deals, has been stated, relevant research has been reviewed, the methodology used for the study has been presented, and the results of the study have been presented and discussed. The final chapter includes a summary of the study. The conclusions drawn from the study, along with the implications for practice and further research, are also presented.

Summary

Learner participation is integral to the effectiveness of any adult education program. Traditionally, such participation has been tied to the various programming skills of the adult educator. Though these skills are several, one of the most crucial is the development of a curriculum that will meet the needs of present or prospective participants. Those needs are elusive. Focusing on such needs a prospective or actual participant learner for an adult educational program generates many variables. Quite frequently, these variables cross a number of disciplines such as sociology,
psychology, research and business administration (Jensen, et al., 1964, Section II). Yet, in spite of the difficulty in delineating these needs of participants across so many disciplines, the knowledge derived from such delineation is vital to adult education. Indeed, a case has been made that adult education as a discipline (or field) is dependent upon the development of such knowledge (Burgess, 1971). The validity of that argument is beyond this study. Nonetheless, it is generally agreed that this knowledge of the participant-learner is fundamental to the construction of adequate adult education programs. Unfortunately, over the years, the research pertaining to the definition of participant-learners has been minimal and tenuous. Positively, in the last half of the sixties indications are that understanding of the adult-learner is being given increasingly serious consideration. However, much refinement is needed. One such refinement is an analysis of the characteristics of learners involved in a specific type of adult education. That refinement is the substance of this study.

Primarily, it has been the purpose of this study to gain some further definition of participant-learners in an adult religious education program in a middle, upper-middle class suburban Protestant church. This was
accomplished through a limited psychological and sociological analysis and comparison of fifty (50) participant-learners in the program with a random sample of fifty (50) non-participants. The analysis and comparison were made on the variables of sex, marital status, average monthly church attendance, annual family giving, the number of church organizations to which subjects belonged, average number of monthly church meetings the subjects attended, organizations outside the church to which subjects belonged, average number of monthly meetings attended outside the church, number of closest friends in the church, level of self-esteem, perceived integration of the self of the subjects, and the religious orientation of the subjects. The subjects in this study were members of the same church in 1972 when the study was conducted.

A secondary purpose was to ascertain what, if any, of a number of the independent variables utilized in this study would serve to predict participation or non-participation in adult religious education programs in similar settings.

Three instruments were used in the study. The first, the Religious Adult Education Questionnaire (Appendix A, p. 78) consisted of nine items of a demographic nature. The second instrument was the Religious
Oriental Scale (Appendix B, p. 88) formulated by Gordon W. Allport and J. Michael Ross. The third instrument was the **Tennessee Self Concept Scale** (Appendix B, p. 80). This instrument, widely used for psychological assessments in mental health settings, was authored by Dr. William H. Fitts.

In the summer of 1972, the fifty-four persons who had participated in the adult religious education programs in the church during the winter and spring preceding were contacted about the study. All except two agreed to complete the instruments. However, two others left the community before this was accomplished. Therefore, fifty subjects remained. These made up the participant-learner group. After their instruments were completed and scored, the resultant data were placed on computer cards. At the same time, fifty-five randomly selected non-participants completed the instruments. The first fifty of these became the subjects of this study. Their instruments were scored and the resultant data placed on computer cards.

The data obtained pertaining to the male/female ratio and the married/single, widowed and divorced persons ratio were tested for significant differences by means of the chi-square test. The remaining variables were subjected to a multivariate analysis of variance, initially as a group in order to establish the
probability, or lack thereof, of difference between the groups. Probability of group difference was indicated. Next, a separate analysis of variance was run for each variable individually. Further, a step-wise regression analysis of the variables was made. Four variables showed especial relation to participation. The regression analysis was run a second time with the process limited to these four variables. The linear combination of these four variables accounted for approximately 65% of the variance for participation. Finally, computed scores were compared with actual scores and it was found that the computed scores accurately predicted participation in 44 of 50 subjects, or non-participation in 45 of 50 subjects, for a total of 89 of the 100 cases in this study.

Conclusions and Implications Specific to this Study

The conclusions and implications for practice and further research specific to this study are presented first. General conclusions and implications for practice and further study follow at the end of this chapter.

First as pertains to the variables of sex and marital status, no significant differences were found in either case given the expected frequencies that were known in this particular population from which the subjects were drawn for this study. Even though the
differences are not significant, they are substantial enough for both variables to be noteworthy in program planning and for further study. The male/female ratio replicates that found in Johnstone and Rivera (1965), p. 72). Similarly, the literature has indicated that more married people than all single types together participate (Johnstone and Rivera, 1965, p. 80; Verner and Davis, 1964, p. 172). This study has reinforced that finding. Now, the components in being a woman and in being married that contribute to participation in adult education need further delineation. At the same time, the percentage of the opposite categories (in this instance, males and single, widowed and divorced persons) is sufficiently high to warrant additional study for the purpose of deepening an understanding of these types.

The remainder of the variables were first treated as a group in order to assess overall participant/non-participant differences. Then a univariate analysis was performed for each variable separately.

The multivariate test of significance for these grouped variables indicated there was a difference between participant-learners and non-participants. The difference was significant at the 0.001 level. That there are such differences is fundamental. First, it implies that there may be differences between
participants and non-participants in other settings and such differences need analysis and clarification. Second, this conclusion can be used as a point of departure for the refinement and extraction of further implications pertaining to the variables utilized herein. And, certainly, the conclusion should lead to the continued enumeration of other variables which would define participant-learners.

Several conclusions can be derived from the analysis of each variable separately.

The difference between participants and non-participants in average monthly church attendance was significant at the .02 level though it had little strength in the regression analysis. This variable, along with the number of church organizations to which persons belonged and the average number of monthly church meetings attended (p < 0.001 in both instances) appear as significant characteristics for participant-learners in the setting for this study. This is in keeping with what little suggestion of relationship there was in the literature (Chapter II, p. 32). Additionally, the "church organizations to which the person belonged" variable ranked first in accounting for variance in the regression analysis. The "number of monthly church meetings attended" variable was least in the regression. It is suspected that the magnitude
of the latter precipitated to the former.

The amount of annual family giving did not significantly differentiate participants from non-participants under the .05 level of constraint of this study. The literature referred to in Chapter II had made some suggestion of relationship of greater giving with participation. In fact, the mean giving of participants was greater, but not significantly so. This variable had a measure of strength in the regression, ranking a low fifth in that analysis. This variable needs further study to clarify its relevance as a characteristic of the participant-learner.

Turning to the variables "outside organizations to which persons belong" and "meetings outside the church attended monthly," the literature held some small indication that persons belonging to outside organizations would relate strongly to those through attendance at meetings outside the church (Glock, et al., 1967, p. 23). This relationship was reinforced by the data of this study, though to no significant degree. The mean number of outside organizations to which participants belonged was greater ($M = 2.28$) than those to which non-participants belonged ($M = 1.94$). However, the difference is not significant. With reference to monthly meetings outside the church, the non-participants
attended more ($M = 2.42$) compared with participant-learners ($M = 1.84$). Again, the difference is insignificant. Thus, this data indicates that participants and non-participants are involved in about the same number of organizations outside the church, with non-participants spending more (though not significantly more) time in these outside organizations.

It is interesting to compare the two groups by adding the mean number of organizations both inside and outside the church to which each group belongs and the mean number of meetings (inside and outside the church which each group attends. Participant-learners belong to a mean number of 4.6 organizations. Non-participants belong to a mean number of 2.6 organizations. Participant-learners attended a mean number of 5.96 meetings per month while non-participants attended 2.96 meetings per month. Whether the differences are significant was not tested. However, these data seem to be reinforcing the findings of other recent studies which concluded that participant-learners are adults who need personal association and friends (Burgess, 1971; Boshier, 1971; Morstain and Smart, 1974). This point is further substantiated in the discussion of the next variable.

One of the most significant variables in the study
was the number of closest friends in the church each subject had. The difference was significant ($p < 0.001$) in the univariate analysis with participant-learners having more than non-participants ($M = 1.82$) for participants compared to $M = .46$ for non-participants). Also, this variable ranked third in the regression analysis. Adult educators involved with religious education in settings similar to the one for this study need understand the nature and extent of the apparent relationship between closest friendships and participation in adult studies within the church. Moreover, the significance of close friendships and participation in adult education in all its manifestations is an appropriate subject for further research.

Turning to the variable "self-esteem," the null hypothesis stated there would be no significant difference in the level of self esteem between participant-learners and non-participants. The null hypothesis was sustained. Actually, the scores were higher for participants ($M = 344.54$) than for non-participants ($M = 339.40$). But the difference is negligible. The scores indicate an average level of overall self-esteem for the subjects in both groups (Fitts, 1965, pp. 3, 14). In the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, self esteem is the cumulation of several scores pertaining to how one sees himself in
a number of ways. These include the physical self, the moral-ethical self, the personal self, the family self and the social self (Fitts, 1965, pp. 2-4). Scrutiny of the scores in each category indicates wide divergence among subjects. The significance of difference between said scores is untested. These categories offer fertile ground for further delineation of differences between participant-learners and non-participants.

For the variable "perceived integration of the self" the hypothesis, stated in the null form, was that there would be no significant difference between the two groups who were subjects in this study. That hypothesis was not sustained. Participants scored lower (M = 42.84) than non-participants (M = 47.50) thereby showing less variability from one category of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale to another and, hence, more unity or integration of the self. The probability that this was more than chance was at the .03 level. The strength of the difference between groups needs further study. Additionally, in striving for the definition of participant-learners, it would be valuable to ascertain in what precise areas the variability of the self is most pronounced.

From a research standpoint several questions arise. Does the participant ask for programs in adult education that relate to the most or least integrated aspects of the
self? How does the perceived integration of the self affect participation over a period of time? How does the perceived integration of the self affect the person's selection of subject matter to be studied?

Lastly, the null hypothesis was stated that there would be no significant differences in the religious orientation between participants and non-participants. The null hypothesis was not sustained. With a mean score of 1.93 for participant-learners and a mean score of 2.66 for non-participants, the difference was significant at the .001 level. Such data show that these participants have religion as a formative factor within themselves. This religion is a strong and directive motivating power (Allport, 1966; Allport and Ross, 1967). This finding suggests a number of thrusts for further research. It would be interesting to ascertain the relation between the intrinsic score and the value the participant-learner scored in the moral-ethical section of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. And, how do these affect participation in adult religious education? Is this religious orientation score actually a valid indicator of participation? If so, why? How does the intrinsically religious orientation relate to the various categories of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and constructs tested in similar instruments?
In sum, then, these variables have shown participant-learners to differ from non-participants in that the participants were substantially female and married, attended worship regularly and a goodly number of church meetings each month, belonged to a significant number of church organizations as well as organizations outside the church, had close friends within the church, perceived themselves to be integrated psychologically and were intrinsically oriented toward religion.

Turning to the secondary purpose of the study, namely the isolation of those variables that would predict participation or non-participation in programs in a similar setting, the four variables accounting for about 65% of the variance from the mean of the scores of these subjects do just that. In other situations, it is predictable that finding those church members who belong to the most church organizations, who are assessed to be intrinsically religious, whose closest friends are in the church and who perceive themselves to be integrated personality-wise, one would find the prospective or actual participant-learners in the adult religious educational program of that church. The computed scores correctly named as participant-learner or non-participant 89 of the 100 subjects in this study. Such predictability is valuable for adult educators involved with
religious education and serves as a sturdy foundation for further research in this area.

General Conclusions and Implications

The general conclusions and implications are several. First, the variables utilized herein need replication in order to ascertain their reliability as descriptors of participant-learners both in settings similar to the one for this study and in different sociological settings as well.

Second, at the time the writer wrote about the paucity of analytical research and evaluation of the prospective learner in adult education (Chapter I, pp. 2, 3), he was not aware of the full dimension of that paucity. Through some two years of continuous research, the strength of this deficiency is adequately impressed upon his mind. Likewise the dearth of theory indigenous to the field of adult education on which to build such research is evident. Both these situations need correction.

Third, it seems that adult educators must give more thought to the theoretical aspects—what might be termed the philosophical base—of the field known as adult education. Especially is this true for such aspects as pertain to a deeper understanding of the participant-learner.
Moreover, building research on a theoretical base takes researchers. Some view adult education as a service having little to do with research. That view has reduced the field to what Penfield terms: "a spirit in search of substance" (1975, p. 107). Professional adult educators must be imbued with an understanding of research and a desire to engage in it.

Among other things, this assertion means that knowledge of instruments for testing must be upgraded and new ones hybridized for the purposes of particular research in adult education.

The above leads to the conclusion that those institutions involved in adult education need to come to see theory and research as integral to good practice. Therefore, said institutions need to subsidize and encourage professionals to pursue both avenues as legitimate for career enhancement. This is especially true for the religious institutions. Education has been at the foundation of the Judeo-Christian tradition since its inception. Yet, that tradition's examined understanding of its educational participants and their needs pertaining to the curriculum, the setting and the instructor is nothing short of impoverished.

With regard to research, there is an intense desire to derive hard data from such efforts. This
desire, while noble, may be preventing other valuable data from surfacing. The research is so sparse and so new. Correlations at less than .05 may have more "mileage" than the first blush reveals. Also, there needs to be latitude in ascertaining what the significant variables are for a given participant-learner sample in a specific setting. For example, as pertains to the present study, the variables are virtually endless. These need pursuit with openness and the "hard" or "soft" designation fluidly applied after a measure of substantial research is accumulated. The same may be said for the utilization of various research methods (Weiss, 1972).

Finally, borrowing a page from the field of marketing (Beckman, et al., 1973, pp. 608ff), let adult educators devote some effort to the non-participants. What is the message conveyed by their non-participation? Once understood, can adult educators anticipate and satisfy the demand this segment of our society may have for education in its various forms?
APPENDIX A

ADULT RELIGIOUS EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE
ADULT RELIGIOUS EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Participant_______
Non-Participant_______

Please complete each part of the questionnaire.

1. Male____ Female____  2. Married____ Single____
   Widowed____ Divorced____

3. Average monthly church attendance 0 1 2 3 4

4. Annual amount of family giving to the church ______

5. How many times a month do you attend meetings directly
   connected with church other than Sunday services of
   worship? (teacher's meetings, Bible study, commit-
   tees, work areas, church school classes, etc.)____

6. How many organizations other than the church (such as
   lodges, social clubs, unions, professional groups,
   etc.) do you belong to at the present time?____

7. How many meetings a month do you attend in organi-
   zations outside the church?____

8. Check the number of organizations within the church
   to which you belong at the present time
   _____Work Area  _____Focus Group
   _____Committee  _____Woman's Society
   _____Church School  _____Growth Group
   _____Youth Activities  _____Other

9. How many of your three closest friends belong to this
   church?____
APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS
TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

by

William H. Fitts

Published by
Counselor Recordings and Tests
Box 6184 - Acklen Station
Nashville, Tennessee 37212
INSTRUCTIONS

On the top line of the separate answer sheet, fill in your name and the other information except for the time information in the last three boxes. You will fill these boxes in later. Write only on the answer sheet. Do not put any marks in this booklet.

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item! Read each statement carefully, then select one of the five responses listed below. On your answer sheet, put a circle around the response you chose. If you want to change an answer after you have circled it, do not erase it but put an X mark through the response and then circle the response you want.

When you are ready to start, find the box on your answer sheet marked time started and record the time. When you are finished, record the time finished in the box on your answer sheet marked time finished.

As you start, be sure that your answer sheet and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a circle around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Completely false</th>
<th>Mostly false and partly true</th>
<th>Mostly true</th>
<th>Completely true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will find these response numbers repeated at the bottom of each page to help you remember them.
1. I have a healthy body ......................................................... 1
3. I am an attractive person .................................................... 3
5. I consider myself a sloppy person ...................................... 5
19. I am a decent sort of person ............................................. 19
21. I am an honest person .................................................... 21
23. I am a bad person .......................................................... 23
37. I am a cheerful person .................................................... 37
39. I am a calm and easy going person ................................. 39
41. I am a nobody ............................................................... 41
55. I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble .................................................. 55
57. I am a member of a happy family .................................... 57
59. My friends have no confidence in me ............................. 59
73. I am a friendly person .................................................... 73
75. I am popular with men ................................................... 75
77. I am not interested in what other people do ................... 77
91. I do not always tell the truth .......................................... 91
93. I get angry sometimes .................................................. 93

Responses - Completely Mostly Partly false false false partially true partly true Mostly true true true

1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I like to look nice and neat all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am full of aches and pains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am a sick person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I am a religious person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I am a moral failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I am a morally weak person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I have a lot of self-control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I am a hateful person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I am losing my mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>I am an important person to my friends and family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>I am not loved by my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I feel that my family doesn't trust me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>I am popular with women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>I am mad at the whole world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>I am hard to be friendly with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: 1 - Completely false, 2 - Mostly false, 3 - Partly false and partly true, 4 - Mostly true, 5 - Completely true
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am neither too fat nor too thin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I like my looks just the way they are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I would like to change some parts of my body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my moral behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my relationship to God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I ought to go to church more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I am satisfied to be just what I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I am just as nice as I should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I despise myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my family relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>I understand my family as well as I should.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>I should trust my family more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>I am as sociable as I want to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>I try to please others, but I don’t overdo it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>I am no good at all from a social standpoint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>I do not like everyone I know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: Completely false, Mostly false, Partly false and partly true, Mostly true, Completely true
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I take good care of myself physically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I try to be careful about my appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I often act like I am &quot;all thumbs&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I am true to my religion in my everyday life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I sometimes do very bad things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I can always take care of myself in any situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I take the blame for things without getting mad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I do things without thinking about them first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>I try to play fair with my friends and family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>I take a real interest in my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>I get along well with other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>I do not forgive others easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>I would rather win than lose in a game.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I feel good most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I do poorly in sports and games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I am a poor sleeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I do what is right most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I have trouble doing the things that are right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I solve my problems quite easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I change my mind a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I try to run away from my problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>I do my share of work at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>I quarrel with my family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>I do not act like my family thinks I should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>I see good points in all the people I meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>I do not feel at ease with other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>I find it hard to talk with strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses:
- Completely false
- Mostly false
- Partly false and partly true
- Mostly true
- Completely true
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>PAGES 5 AND 6</th>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>PAGES 3 AND 4</th>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>PAGES 1 AND 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INQUIRY CONCERNING SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS VIEWS

The following items deal with various types of religious ideas and social opinions. We should like to find out how common they are.

Please indicate the response your prefer, or most closely agree with, by writing the letter corresponding to your choice in the right margin.

If none of the choices expresses exactly how you feel, then indicate the one which is closest to your own views. If no choice is possible you may omit the item.

There are no "right" or "wrong" choices. There will be many religious people who will agree with all the possible alternative answers.
1. What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike.
   a) I definitely disagree 1
   b) I tend to disagree 2
   c) I tend to agree 4
   d) I definitely agree 5

2. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.
   a) I definitely disagree 5
   b) I tend to disagree 4
   c) I tend to agree 2
   d) I definitely agree 1

3. One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.
   a) definitely not true 1
   b) tends not to be true 2
   c) tends to be true 4
   d) definitely true 5

4. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being.
   a) definitely not true 5
   b) tends not to be true 4
   c) tends to be true 2
   d) definitely true 1

5. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.
   a) I definitely disagree 1
   b) I tend to disagree 2
   c) I tend to agree 4
   d) I definitely agree 5
6. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.
   a) this is definitely not so 5
   b) probably not so 4
   c) probably so 2
   d) definitely so 1

7. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.
   a) I definitely disagree 1
   b) I tend to disagree 2
   c) I tend to agree 4
   d) I definitely agree 5

8. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services.
   a) almost never 5
   b) sometimes 4
   c) usually 2
   d) almost always 1

9. Although I am a religious person I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.
   a) definitely not true of me 1
   b) tends not to be true 2
   c) tends to be true 4
   d) clearly true in my case 5

10. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church:
    a) more than once a week 1
    b) about once a week 2
    c) two or three times a month 4
    d) less than once a month 5
11. The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships.
   a) definitely disagree 1
   b) I tend to disagree 2
   c) I tend to agree 4
   d) I definitely agree 5

12. If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join (1) a Bible Study group or (2) a social fellowship.
   a) I would prefer to join (1) 1
   b) I probably would prefer (1) 2
   c) I probably would prefer (2) 4
   d) I would prefer to join (2) 5

13. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in my life.
   a) I definitely disagree 1
   b) I tend to disagree 2
   c) I tend to agree 4
   d) I definitely agree 5

14. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.
   a) definitely disagree 5
   b) tend to disagree 4
   c) tend to agree 2
   d) definitely agree 1

15. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.
   a) definitely true of me 5
   b) tends to be true 4
   c) tends not to be true 2
   d) definitely not true of me 1
16. I read literature about my faith (or church).
   a) frequently       1
   b) occasionally      2
   c) rarely           4
   d) never            5

17. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity.
   a) definitely not true of me    1
   b) tends not to be true          2
   c) tends to be true              4
   d) definitely true of me          5

18. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.
   a) frequently true               1
   b) occasionally true             2
   c) rarely true                   4
   d) never true                    5

19. Occasionally I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.
   a) definitely disagree          1
   b) tend to disagree              2
   c) tend to agree                 4
   d) definitely agree              5

20. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.
   a) I definitely agree           5
   b) I tend to agree               4
   c) I tend to disagree            2
   d) I definitely disagree         1
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