

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Undergraduate Honors Capstone Projects

Honors Program

5-1987

The Multidimensional Concept of Religiosity and its Application to the Construction of Mormon Religiosity Scales

Jeff Black

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/honors>



Part of the [Sociology of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Black, Jeff, "The Multidimensional Concept of Religiosity and its Application to the Construction of Mormon Religiosity Scales" (1987). *Undergraduate Honors Capstone Projects*. 310.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/honors/310>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors Program at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Honors Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL CONCEPT
OF RELIGIOSITY AND ITS APPLICATION
TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF MORMON RELIGIOSITY SCALES

By
JEFF BLACK

Utah State University

May 1987

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of Honors Program requirements
for graduation.

OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
- II. The Dimensions of Religiosity
 - A. The Intuitive Formulation of Dimensions
 - 1. Fukuyama
 - 2. Lenski
 - 3. Glock and Stark
 - 4. Criticisms
 - B. The Factor Analytic Method
 - 1. King and Hunt
 - 2. Limitations of Factor Analysis
- III. Different Views of the Nature of Religion and Religiosity
 - A. Luckmann and Burger
 - B. Bellah
- IV. The Construction of L.D.S. Specific Religiosity Scales
 - A. Hardy
 - B. Christiansen
 - C. Cornwall, Albrecht, Cunningham and Pitcher

Bibliography

Appendix 1 -- Hardy Scale

Appendix 2 -- Christiansen Scale

Until the 1960's, the concept of religiosity in sociology was very underdeveloped. Although many earlier social scientists were interested in religion, the concept of religiosity was conceptually and theoretically unsophisticated. Religiosity or religiousness was most often determined by church attendance or sometimes simply church membership. In the last two decades, much has been done to rectify this condition.

This paper will attempt to outline the development of the multidimensional conception of religiosity. Two basic approaches have been used: the conceptual method which begins with the intuitive formation of different dimensions and the factor analytic method which uses analysis of empirical data to discover the most prominent factors of religious involvement. The different procedures yielded very similar results. Today there is widespread support for the multidimensional view of religiosity. However, the question of the aspects of religious commitment is far from a definitive answer. There is still wide disagreement about the definition of the word "religious," and no one has adequately separated religious commitment per se from commitment to an organized religion and its dogma. None of the researchers mentioned below deals successfully with this problem. It is important to keep in mind that all of the research mentioned here is limited to that aspect of religion that is institutionalized, and further limited to religions in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Some research indicated that even in the Judeo-Christian world there are enough differences to suggest

that a separate set of dimensions are necessary for each particular denomination. The last section of this paper describes three attempts to create and validate religiosity scales that deal specifically with members of the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints (the Mormon Church).

Charles Glock is the name most closely associated with the multidimensional concept of religiosity, but he certainly was not the first to suggest the idea. Fukuyama (1961), Lenski (1961), and others suggested classification schemes that are very similar to the one suggested by Glock in his very influential article, "On the Study of Religious Commitment" (Glock, 1962). Fukuyama's fourfold scheme consists of the following dimensions:

Organizational Activity: Basically church attendance.

Doctrinal Knowledge: How much a person knows about the doctrines specific to his religion.

Doctrinal Adherence: Level of adherence to orthodox religious doctrines.

Communalism: The extent of involvement in extra church social life.

Lenski's analysis also used four dimensions:

Associationalism: Church attendance.

Communalism: Religious endogamy and choice of friends by religion.

Orthodoxy: Level of acceptance of prescribed doctrines of the church.

Devotionalism: Amount of private prayer and reference to the divine in everyday decision making.

Since the typology developed by Glock and later Glock and Stark (1965) has become the most frequently used and discussed, it is worth looking at more closely. Glock's scheme is based on five general propositions:

(1) Religion is not the same to all men: different religions expect different things from their adherents. (2) There nevertheless exists among the world's religions considerable consensus as to the more general areas in which religiosity ought to be manifested. (3) These general areas may be thought of as the core dimensions of religiosity. (4) Five core dimensions can be distinguished....These dimensions can be identified as the experiential, ritualistic, ideological, intellectual, and consequential. (5) These dimensions provide a theoretical frame of reference for studying religion and assessing religiosity (Glock, 1962:100).

The labels used by Glock and Stark (1965) are different than those originally used by Glock (1962), but the concepts are essentially the same.

The Experiential Dimension concerns "all those feelings, perceptions, and sensations which are experienced by an actor or defined by a religious group as involving some communication, however slight, with a divine essence" (Glock and Stark, 1965:20).

The Belief Dimension concerns belief in orthodox Judeo-Christian tenets. People are considered more religious the closer their beliefs are to those tenets.

The Ritual Dimension measures such things as church attendance, attendance at mid-week services, financial contributions, private prayer, and Bible reading.

The Knowledge Dimension is related to, but independent of, the belief dimension. It is possible to know without believing, just as it is possible to believe without having extensive knowledge. Measurement of this dimension involves a simple test, usually of scriptural knowledge and sometimes church history.

The Consequential Dimension is related to the effects of the other four dimensions applied in the secular world. In their 1968 article, Glock and Stark dropped this dimension. "It is not entirely clear the extent to which religious consequences are part of religious commitment or simply follow from it" (Stark and Glock, 1968:16).

Faulkner and DeJong (1966) were the first to test the practical applicability of Glock's conceptualization. Using procedural definitions which they believed paralleled Glock's substantive definitions, they developed measures for each of the five dimensions. They found that the dimensions were independent of one another; that they were positively related to each other; and that the belief dimension was the most important on the grounds that it was the most highly intercorrelated with the other dimensions (Wilson, 1978:445).

Glock and Stark (1968) came up with essentially the same conclusions. In their study the belief dimension was found to be the most important, but the dimensions were found to be quite

independent of each other. A correlation of .70 or more is generally accepted as the level at which the dimensions are measuring the same thing. All of the correlations were well below this level. Factor analysis confirmed the independence of the dimensions. They found that "no item had its maximum loading on a factor in which another dimension also had its maximum loading" (Stark and Glock, 1968:18).

Clayton (1968) replicated the Faulkner-DeJong study using students at religious colleges in the South and confirmed the earlier findings. Campbell and Fukuyama (1970), using similar dimensions, surveyed members of the United Church. They also found their dimensions to be independent, yet, positively related. They found belief to be the most important dimension. In addition, Finney (1978:277) found that the multidimensional scheme worked especially well among people who were members of an organized religion. There seems to be considerable evidence that religiousness is a multidimensional phenomenon and that certain specific dimensions consistently appear.

The multidimensional view of religiosity has widespread support, yet, the method used in the formulation of the dimensions in the above mentioned studies has been subject to criticism. The problem with the intuitive approach is that dimensions that have been conceptually formulated will often be "discovered" through the process of operationalization whether or not they are really there (Wilson, 1978:449). In other words, the researchers essentially think up dimensions, then design

questionnaire items that are related to each dimension. The simple fact that certain aspects of religiosity are emphasized and others are not can bias the results to a certain extent.

There are also some other areas of concern related to the measurement of the dimensions of religiosity. All of the researchers cited have found belief to be the most important dimension. It is mentioned most frequently and seems to be the most internally consistent. But this fact may be misleading. Critics point out that nearly all of the studies were limited to Jews and Christians. Both of these religions have well-defined systems of belief. Other faiths that emphasize ritual or experience would probably yield different results. Also, the items that are used to measure belief have been criticized for not measuring belief per se but closeness to Judeo-Christian orthodoxy. Wilson (1978:447) has pointed out that the scale items cannot accurately measure strength of religious belief in widely diverse religions. Another problem is related to salience of beliefs. The researchers all recognize that the prominence of beliefs is every bit as important as their number, but no method of measuring salience has been developed (Wilson, 1978:447).

The scale items used by Faulkner and DeJong (1966) and Clayton (1966) have also been criticized for not actually measuring knowledge, ritual, and experience dimensions, but beliefs about these aspects of religion, thus casting doubt on the actual independence of the various dimensions. In fact, the belief dimension is of such overriding importance in the above

studies that "some have argued that religiosity is not really multidimensional at all, but consists merely of different ramifications of a central belief dimension" (Wilson, 1978:448). Clayton and Gladden (1974), using the same items suggested by Faulkner and DeJong, found that 83 percent of the variance was accounted for by the belief dimension alone. Gibbs and Crader (1970) reanalyzed Glock and Stark's original data and found that the correlation between dimensions was high enough to suggest that the different dimensions were likely measuring the same thing.

In spite of all the criticisms of Glock and Stark's dimensions, few would suggest a return to a one-dimensional scheme. Most critics simply propose new dimensions of their own. The criticisms of the more intuitive approach have lead some sociologists to a more inductive method that lets the facts speak for themselves.

The use of factor analysis allows for the identification of items that correlate highly with each other but not with the whole. The identification of these areas is not influenced by the intuitive ideas of the researcher. Of course, the investigator must decide which items are selected for study, and once the factors have emerged they must be labeled and interpreted. Nevertheless, this method leaves much less room for the biases that are unavoidable in operationalizing conceptually derived dimensions (Wilson, 1973:669).

King and Hunt (King, 1967; King, 1969; King and Hunt, 1972; King and Hunt, 1975) were the first to factor analyze responses to questionnaire items drawn from scales developed by Lenski, Glock and Stark, and others. Their studies indicate that there are six separate dimensions with two broken down into further subdimensions as follows:

Credal Assent or orthodoxy is very similar to Glock's belief dimension.

Devotionalism is much like Lenski's devotionalism. This dimension relates to a person's private and personal feelings toward religious beings and institutions.

Congregational Involvement concerns church activity and financial support.

Knowledge deals with basic knowledge of church doctrines.

Orientation to Religion is divided into two subdimensions: openness to religious growth and extrinsic religiosity. The latter deals with the social benefits of religious involvement much like Lenski's communalism.

Salience, the final dimension identified, contains two subdimensions: importance of religious behavior and importance of religious beliefs.

That the two different approaches both produce very similar dimensions gives the multidimensional view of religiosity a great deal of support (see Table 1). But factor analysis has its own specific limitations. First, this method can only be as good as

the items it includes. The items used by King and Hunt were taken from earlier conceptually formulated scales and would be subject to the biases of those researchers.

Table 1

A Comparison of Dimensions of Religiosity
Formulated by Various Researchers

	<u>Intellectual</u>	<u>Behavioral</u>	<u>Social</u>	<u>Other</u>
Fukuyama	Doctrinal Knowledge	Doctrinal Adherence	Communalism	
Lenski	Orthodoxy	Associationalism Devotionalism	Communalism	
Glock-Stark	Belief Knowledge	Ritual		Experiential
King-Hunt	Creedal Assent Knowledge	Devotionalism Orientation to Religious Growth Salience of Religious Behavior	Congregational Involvement Extrinsic	Salience of Beliefs

Second, studies using this method have been limited to church members. This leads to some rather serious problems. Since the range of variation in the area of importance of church activity is much more limited within the group of church members than it is likely to be within the general population, this area has been virtually eliminated as a variable. But an even more serious problem is that church members are more likely to make subtle distinctions among the scale items than are nonchurch members. The few studies that have included those not affiliated with any church have produced only one or two factors on which a whole cluster of items is loaded (Keene, 1967). Nudelman (1971) analyzed the data gathered by Stark and Glock (1968) from a

rather large and diverse sample and found only two factors. One, which Nudelman called devotion, accounted for half of the variance. This was the subjective area of prayer, belief, and personal religious experience. The other area, called participation, included items dealing with communalism, ritualism, and knowledge. This factor accounted for one quarter of the variance. Thus, even the use of factor analysis has not definitively answered the question of the number and nature of the dimensions of religiosity.

A rather serious limitation remains no matter which approach is used. It appears to some critics that all that is really being measured is conformity to and belief in traditional orthodox Judeo-Christianity. The various techniques used, then, are only useful within a well-defined institutionalized religious framework (Wilson, 1978:452).

A very different view of the nature of religion has been developed by social scientists outside the Glock and Stark-King and Hunt tradition. This approach emphasizes that "religious" experiences and "religious" commitment are not necessarily limited to participants in formal religious organizations. The whole region of mysticism and astrology has been ignored by most social scientists. Also the partisans of many secular ideologies such as Freudianism or secular humanism share certain characteristics with members of organized religions. This viewpoint would likely require a drastically different conceptualization of

religiosity. In order to point out how much divergence there is concerning the nature of religion and religious involvement, we will look at these concepts a little more closely.

Luckmann (1967) and Burger (1967) have developed a rather all-encompassing social conceptualization of religiousness. Although Burger and Luckmann are considered to be in the same camp, Luckmann's view is much more radical than Burger's.

Luckmann (1967) conceptualized religion as the capacity of the human organism to transcend its biological nature through the construction of objective, morally-binding, all-embracing universes of meaning. In other words, a person's world view is inherently "religious" in nature. Luckmann argues that all that is cultural has the latent but very important function of providing "overarching motives" in a system of "ultimate relevance." In Luckmann's view religion is much more than a system of faith in and worship of supernatural powers; whatever provides a person with "overarching motives" and "ultimate significance" could be considered that person's "religion."

While Luckmann's definition of religion is very general and functional, Burger favors a more substantive definition. His view is more traditionally sociological. It is based mainly on the distinction between sacred and profane and the system of belief and ritual that relate to the sacred realm. The social functionality of religion, according to Burger, is a totally

separate matter. Burger does share many of Luckmann's presuppositions and both agree that the sociology of religion has been incorrectly fixated on institutionalized religion.

An essential element in the Burger-Luckmann orientation is the concept of secularization. Burger (1969) sees human existence as essentially an externalizing activity. By this he means that unlike other animals, people must create the world they live in. They must attempt to conceive the world as being humanly significant. "When viewed historically, most of man's worlds have been sacred worlds" (Burger, 1969:23). In these historical worlds religious institutions claimed exclusive right to interpret matters of ultimate significance in the secularized society. Religiosity does not rest entirely on the religious institutions, nor is it diffused throughout the institutional structure of society as in more traditional cultures. The process of secularization has resulted in the sacred cosmos being internalized in an isolated religious strata of the personality. Historically, personal identity meshed much more fully with an existing system of ultimate relevance. In modern industrialized societies we are no longer limited to traditional Judeo-Christianity for the interpretation of matters of ultimate significance. Luckmann describes the modern sacred cosmos as assortments of ultimate meaning. The religious consumer can select themes of ultimate significance from a wide assortment:

Syndicated advice columns, 'inspirational' literature ranging from tracts on positive thinking to Playboy Magazine, Readers Digest versions of Popular

Psychology, the lyrics of popular hits, and so forth articulate what are, in effect, elements of models of ultimate significance" (Luckmann, 1967:104).

These themes are selected and built into a somewhat precarious private system of ultimate significance. Since this system is not mediated through a specific cultural institution, it tends to be much more subjective and difficult to articulate. It is much harder for an individual to formulate an all-encompassing, internally consistent world view. So, secondary institutions like those mentioned above exist to cater to the needs of the subjective religious consumer. The dealers who are labeled "religious" have an advantage in that only they can claim a traditional connection to the Judeo-Christian universe. People with a religious orientation to begin with will tend to deal with the religiously grounded systems, but people who do not see themselves as "religious" are likely to choose one of the systems designed as a replacement for religion. However, even these counter religious systems and hierarchies deal with ultimate meanings and thus are seen by Luckmann as "late mutations of traditional religion" (Luckmann, 1967).

The idea of civic religion put forth by Bellah (1970) is another example of the more anthropological view of religion. He argues that a sacred dimension is an inherent part of all social life. Durkheim (1954) was the first to make this argument. He held that society could not exist independently of religious forms of sentiment and action. Religious forms of expression will inevitably intrude into any social event. The distinction

between sacred and profane objects is a basic form of religious expression that is inherent in secular society. Things that represent values, sentiments, and beliefs that are held in common often have the quality of sacredness. Bellah carries Durkheim's argument into a more secular age by pointing out the sacred nature of many civic institutions. In modern industrial societies the civic realm has taken on many of the functions that were previously left to institutionalized religion. The state now provides us with holidays, "sacred" documents, saint-like founding fathers, and all sorts of other sacred objects that provide the sacred foundation for a nearly religious sense of community.

The idea of a social form of religion has thus far not been taken into account by researchers dealing with the dimensions of religiosity. It seems that it would be particularly difficult to do so. for example, how would one go about developing a questionnaire or scale for the discovery and measurement of an individual's private system of ultimate significance? A few hundred years ago a person's individual religiosity and the institutional ideal would have correlated highly. Today, however, segmentation and secularization in the sacred realm has created a situation where an institutional ideal is not given any thought by a whole class of people. Yet, these people--if the Burger, Luckmann, and Bellah viewpoints are accepted--are certainly as "religious" as their churchgoing counterparts.

Our inability to deal with the social conception of religion in the development of measures of religiosity underscores how limited our understanding of religiosity is. In addition to this limitation is the fact that even within the relatively (compared to all of the world's religions) homogenous world of Christianity, we have yet to develop a comprehensive pan-denominational measure of religiosity. Cardwell (1979:18) argues that the development of a meaningful all-embracing religiosity scale is not possible. It seems likely that a different multidimensional scheme will have to be developed for every specific group.

The following section deals with attempts to develop and validate scales to measure aspects of the religiosity of members of one specific denomination, the Mormon Church.

The same basic procedure was followed by the researchers in all three processes of scale development. First, the object of measurement was defined. Second, an appropriate measuring technique was chosen. The actual scale items were then formulated. The scale was then administered, then tested for reliability (the extent to which it is internally consistent) and validity (whether the scale actually measures what it is supposed to measure). Finally, the scale was revised and finalized.

The first scale we will look at was developed by Hardy (1969). It was designed to be part of a larger research project, part of which would be the factor analysis of the data gathered from the scale he developed. The factor analysis was never done,

so the scale was never broken down into subscales measuring different dimensions. However, his intention was to use factor analysis to determine "those factors which might be associated with favorability or unfavorability to the church (or loyalty-disloyalty, or belief-disbelief. Call it what you will)" Hardy, 1969:2). In this, he anticipated the move toward a multidimensional definition of religiosity. The instrument he developed has become one of the most widely used for the determination of an overall measure of commitment among Mormons.

Hardy used the method of equal appearing intervals. This technique was developed by L. L. Thurstone to determine the scale values of the various statements he constructed. In this method, each statement is written on a separate piece of paper. Judges then sort the statements into eleven equally spaced piles along a favorable-disfavorable continuum. A large number of judges complete this process. The median of judgments then becomes the final scale value of the statement. A relatively equal number of statements from each segment of the continuum are included in the completed scale. It is administered to individuals who check those statements with which they agree. Their "score" is the median of the scale values of the items checked off (Hardy, 1969:9).

Hardy began the process of formulating the actual scale items by designing a set of statements in fifty-seven different areas. Most of these were five-statement sets regarding one particular aspect of Mormonism. There were wide disagreements

among the judges on the placement of several of the statements, so Hardy was forced to drop those items from his scale. He was left with twenty-five aspects of religious attitude. A typical five-statement set, this one dealing with attitude toward Missionary work, follows:

- 5.6* I believe that missionary work is primarily an opportunity to develop the missionary.
- 2.5 I believe that missionary work affords a good opportunity to engage in unselfish activity.
- 10.0 I believe that missionary work is largely a waste of time.
- 9.7 I believe that missionary work is not much more than an opportunity to travel and meet people.
- 1.3 I believe that missionary work is a choice opportunity to serve God and help others (Hardy, 1949:52).

The finalized scale was then distributed in several randomly selected areas throughout Salt Lake City, Utah. Since the purpose of the survey was to validate the scale itself, not to use it to make inferences about what the average church member believes, no attempt was made to achieve a representative sample.

The validity of the scale depended on the assumption that the judges' attitudes did not affect their ratings of the statements. There was some disagreement about whether this was actually the case. There were, however, some things that could be done to establish at least some degree of validity. Hardy

* The number to the left of each statement indicates the scale score of each statement on an eleven point continuum.

used a questionnaire that was filled out along with the scale. The questionnaire allowed the respondents to be evaluated in terms of several different criteria: church attendance, church leadership positions held, tithing payment, compliance with Mormon dietary restrictions, and frequency of individual prayer. The questionnaire scores were then correlated with the scale scores. A high degree of correlation indicated that the scale had at least some degree of validity. This, of course, assumes that the questionnaire criteria had a relatively high degree of validity. The overall correlation ratio between the scale scores and the criteria measures was .79, which indicated good to excellent validity (Hardy, 1949:41).

The reliability of the scale was determined by using the split half method. In this method, the scores from the even numbered items are correlated with the scores from the odd numbered items. Hardy found a .95 reliability coefficient, which is very satisfactory.

The main problem with the Hardy scale is that since the factor analysis was never completed, its usefulness with regard to the multidimensional theory of religious commitment is limited.

The scale constructed by Christensen (1966) concentrates on a single dimension of religiosity, specifically the area of ideological commitment or the degree of acceptance or rejection of Mormon church doctrines. This corresponds to Lenski's orthodoxy dimension and to a large degree to Glock's belief

dimension. The scale Christiansen developed used a slightly modified Likert technique of summated ratings. This method uses a statement followed by six choices ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree," with the "don't know" category eliminated in this case. The statements all concerned beliefs specific, but not necessarily exclusive, to the L.D.S. Church. The scale was then administered to two groups of university students. The reliability of the scale using the split half technique was found to be .96 for one group and .99 for the other. The scale was revised according to the suggestions of a panel of experts which included high level church leaders, L.D.S. Institute of Religion instructors, sociology professors, written comments on the scale given by the subjects, and a statistical analysis to determine the internal consistency of the scale. This final analysis was done by correlating the scores of all of the items with each other and then with the total score. Those statements that did not correlate highly were dropped. On the basis of these criteria, fourteen items were dropped from the scale and several others were altered. The finalized scale was found to have a reliability coefficient of .98.

The validity of the scale was checked in two different ways. Its face validity was determined by a panel of judges. It was then applied to two different groups known to be at opposite ends of the attitude continuum. The scale was determined to be valid at least at the two extremes.

The scale does have some shortcomings. It was never tested on an adequate cross section of the Mormon population. Since Christiansen concentrated on only the two extremes, the scale's validity was never determined for those falling somewhere between the two extremes. Also, the scale purports to measure only one dimension of religiosity. This fact limits the functions for which it can be used. Additionally, the scale is only an ordinal scale. It cannot be used to make absolute comparisons among individuals. Finally, the scale is not finely tuned enough to record small differences among those who are already relatively highly committed.

The most ambitious project yet to develop a religiosity scale that relates specifically to Mormons was done by Cornwall, Albrecht, and others (1986). They used a combination of conceptual and factor analytic methods to construct a seven dimensional model of religiosity that is directed specifically at Mormons but which could be adapted to the study of other religious groups.

Their conceptual scheme is composed of three general components: belief, commitment, and behavior. The belief area is similar to Glock's cognitive dimension. The area of commitment can also be called the affective or feeling dimension. The behavioral dimension concerns what is actually done. Church attendance, personal prayer, and religiously oriented behavior are included in this component. The scheme also includes two modes of religious involvement: the personal mode and the

institutional mode. Lenski (1961) made a similar distinction between individualized and formalized modes with his "religious group involvement" vs. "religious orientations." The personal mode is comprised of religious beliefs, feelings, and behaviors that are personal and individual. The institutional mode deals with beliefs, feelings, and behaviors that are related to the institution or the formalized area of religion.

By cross-classifying the two modes of involvement (personal and institutional) with the three components of religiosity, a six dimensional classification scheme was developed as follows:

	Belief	Commitment	Behavior
Personal	Particularistic Orthodoxy	Spiritual Commitment	Religious Behavior
Institutional	Traditional Orthodoxy	Church Commitment	Religious Participation

The model was operationalized by creating a set of Likert-type statements for each of the six categories. Most of the statements had five response alternatives: "strongly agree," "agree," "not sure," "disagree," and "strongly disagree."

The belief component was broken down into the area of traditional orthodoxy on the institutional side and particularistic orthodoxy on the individual side. Traditional orthodoxy is belief in traditional Christian doctrines. Items such as "There is life after death," and "I believe in the divinity of Jesus

Christ" were used in this scale. Particularistic orthodoxy is related to specifically Mormon doctrines. This scale includes items dealing with belief in Joseph Smith and the Book of Mormon.

The affective area was divided into spiritual and church commitment. Spiritual commitment relates to personal faith in God. Items like "I am willing to do whatever the Lord wants me to do," and "The Holy Ghost is an important influence in my life" were used to indicate spiritual commitment. Church commitment is oriented toward identification with and loyalty to the church and the religious community. A typical scale item here is "The church programs and activities are an important part of my life."

Religious behavior and religious participation are the two behavioral dimensions. Religious behavior is the personal mode of involvement. This type of behavior does not require membership or participation in an organized religion. Personal prayer and admitting one's sins to God are examples of behavior in this category. The religious participation dimension has been the one that is most frequently looked at by other researchers. It is generally measured by church attendance and financial contributions. The use of factor analysis revealed another aspect of religious participation that is more private than church attendance. This area was labeled home religious observance. This dimension includes family prayer, family scripture reading, and family religious discussions.

Several previously identified dimensions were left out of this model: the area of communal involvement, the intellectual or knowledge dimension, the subjective religious experience dimension, and the consequential dimension. These were all seen as either consequences or antecedents of one or more of the six core dimensions.

The completed scale was administered to 1,874 church members from twenty-seven randomly selected wards throughout the United States. The results were factor analyzed and seven scales were created. The only significant difference between the conceptual model and the test results was in the area of religious behavior and religious participation. A distinction was made between religious behavior which emphasizes people's relationship with God and Christian behavior which emphasizes relationships with other men. The religious participation dimension was dropped and replaced by the area of home religious observance because the participation dimension correlated so highly with the church commitment dimension. As was suggested by the model, the greatest amount of separation was found between the personal and institutional modes; while the greatest amount of overlap was found among the belief, behavior, and commitment components. Overall, the conceptual scheme was supported by the statistical analysis.

The three Mormon scales are much like the others in that they attempt to measure religiosity in an institutional context. They all have the limitation of ignoring individuals who may have deeply held religious beliefs that do not correspond to the official model.

A few conclusions can be extracted from this review of attempts to conceptualize and measure religiosity. The multidimensional approach has widespread support. Nearly everyone would agree that the concept must include both the areas of belief and behavior. About various other dimensions, there is still disagreement. There is general agreement that the most important dimension in the Judeo-Christian tradition is belief. The importance of the belief dimension is so great that it is still suggested by some that religion is not multidimensional afterall, but consists merely of different ramifications of a central belief dimension. There is really no way of determining the relative merits of the intuitive and factor analytic methods of discovering the dimensions of religiosity. Right now there is really no need to, since they both produce quite similar schemes. This seems to further validate the idea that at least several dimensions do exist.

The strongest criticism of nearly every attempt to measure religiosity has been that in reality what is being measured is closer to the degree of acceptance and practice of traditional Judeo-Christian orthodoxy than the level of religious commitment per se. As Burger and Luckmann point out, everyone creates

systems of ultimate significance, and many people's lives are guided by very important moral and ethical values whether or not they belong to an organized religion. So it is very important to keep in mind that the various scales discussed here are useful only within a well-defined institutional framework (Wilson, 1978:450-453).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Berger, P. L. The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion. Garden City, New York: Anchor. 1969.
2. Campbell, T. and Yoshio Fukuyama. The Fragmented Laymen. Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press. 1970.
3. Christiansen, James W. The Construction of a Mormon Ideological Commitment Scale. Unpublished Master's Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Utah. 1966.
4. Clayton, R. "Religiosity in 5-D: A Southern Test," Social Forces, 47:80-83. 1968.
5. Cornwall, Marie, Stan Albrecht, Perry Cunningham, and Brian Pitcher. "The Dimensions of Religiosity: A Conceptual Model with an Empirical Test," Review of Religious Research, 27:226-243. 1986.
6. Durkheim, Emile. The Elementary Forms of Religious Life. Translated by J. W. Swain. New York: Free Press of Glenco. 1954.
7. Faulkner, J. Z and Gordon DeJong. "Religiosity in 5-D: An Empirical Analysis," Social Forces, 45:246-254. 1966.
8. Fukuyama, Y. "The Major Dimensions of Church Membership," Review of Religious Research, 2:154-161. 1961.
9. Gibbs, D. J. and K. Krader. "A Criticism of Recent Attempts to Scale Glock's and Stark's Dimensions of Religiosity," Sociological Analysis, 31:107-114. 1970.
10. Glock, C. Y. "On the Study of Religious Commitment," Research Supplement to Religious Education, 57:98-110. 1962.
11. Glock, C. Y. and Rodney Stark. Religion and Society in Tension. Chicago: Rand McNally. 1965.
12. Hardy, Kenneth R. Construction and Validation of a Scale Measuring Attitudes Toward the L.D.S. Church. Unpublished Master's Dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Utah. 1949.
13. King, Morton and Richard Hunt. "Measuring the Religious Variable: Amended Findings," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 8:321-323. 1969.

14. King, Morton and Richard Hunt. "Measuring the Religious Replication," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 11:240-251. 1972.
15. King, Morton and Richard Hunt. "Measuring the Religious Variable: National Replication," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 14:13-22. 1975.
16. Lenski, Gerhard E. The Religious Factor. Garden City, New York: Doubleday. 1961.
17. Luckmann, Thomas. The Invisible Religion. New York: MacMillan. 1967.
18. Stark, R. and Charles Glock. American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment. Berkely and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1968.
19. Wilson, J. Religion in American Society. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. 1978.

APPENDIX A

SCALE FORM B

Following is a list of statements about religious beliefs.

Please read each statement carefully. You will find yourself agreeing with some and disagreeing with others. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it.

Please mark every one. Use +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3 to indicate your opinion on all statements.

- +3 I strongly agree.
- +2 I moderately agree.
- +1 I tend to agree but with some reservations.
- 1 I tend to disagree but with some reservations.
- 2 I moderately disagree.
- 3 I strongly disagree.

It should be understood that these statements are not intended to test your knowledge on any subject but rather are designed to determine how you personally feel about certain ideas and beliefs. Therefore the best answer to each statement is your personal opinion.

If you have any questions, reservations or problems of interpretation pertaining to any of the statements would you please make this known by writing a note in the margin. Your responses will be kept anonymous.

- ___ 1. The Mormon church is not the only true church in the world today.
- ___ 2. Jesus will return to the earth and rule for 1,000 years.
- ___ 3. Before this life each of us lived as spirits without Father in heaven.

- ___ 4. John the Baptist did not really appear to Joseph Smith to restore the Aaronic Priesthood.
- ___ 5. The Lord has not actually commanded us to pay one-tenth of our income to the Church.
- ___ 6. Temple marriage is not really a part of the Lord's eternal plan.
- ___ 7. Evil spirits led by Lucifer (the devil) are continuously attempting to thwart the plans of God.
- ___ 8. The ten tribes of Israel will not actually return.
- ___ 9. The Lord has not really commanded us to refrain from using alcohol, tobacco, coffee or tea.
- ___ 10. God the Father and Jesus Christ are separate, distinct personages with glorified bodies of flesh and bones.
- ___ 11. Some time after the death of the early apostles the power and authority to act in the name of God was taken from the earth.
- ___ 12. God has not actually commanded us to refrain from engaging in sexual relations outside of marriage.
- ___ 13. Peter, James and John did not actually appear to Joseph Smith and restore the Melchizedek Priesthood.
- ___ 14. In the pre-existence each of us was allowed to choose for himself whether or not to come to earth and take up a physical body.
- ___ 15. The Lord did not really command us to attend sacrament meetings.
- ___ 16. The practice of baptism for the dead is not a part of the Lord's eternal plan.
- ___ 17. Joseph Smith did not actually see and hear God the Father and Jesus Christ.
- ___ 18. The Church is not actually led today by direct revelation from God to his appointed prophet.
- ___ 19. Only those ordinances performed by those holding authority (the Priesthood) will be recognized as valid in the eyes of God.
- ___ 20. The fall of Adam did not really bring death into the world (to the human race).
- ___ 21. Lucifer (the devil) led those souls in the pre-existence who refused to accept the gospel plan.
- ___ 22. Baptism by one holding authority is essential to admission in the Celestial Kingdom.

- _____ 23. Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is essential if one is to receive exaltation in the Kingdom of God.
- _____ 24. Joseph Smith translated the book of Mormon from gold plates given to him by an angel of God.
- _____ 25. Joseph Smith was not really told by the Lord that all the religions of his day were false.
- _____ 26. All men, after having had full opportunity to hear the gospel plan, will eventually be judged and assigned to one of the degrees of glory. (except the sons of Perdition)
- _____ 27. According to the revealed word of the Lord the Negro is not entitled to all of the blessing of the Priesthood at the present time.
- _____ 28. In order to have family ties to continue in the hereafter the necessary temple work must be done.
- _____ 29. The Mormon Church is the only true church in the world today.
- _____ 30. The Lord has commanded us to pay one-tenth of our income to the Church.
- _____ 31. We really didn't live as spirits with our Father in heaven before this life.
- _____ 32. Joseph Smith saw and heard God the Father and Jesus Christ.
- _____ 33. Evil spirits are not really attempting to thwart the plans of God.
- _____ 34. Baptism by one holding authority is not really essential to admission in the Celestial Kingdom.

**ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS OF LDS
CHURCH MEMBERS TOWARD THEIR
CHURCH AND RELIGION**

This questionnaire is composed of two sections: one consisting of multiple-choice items, the other made up of single statements. In the first section, read carefully each of the five statements in the item, then check (✓) the statement which best expresses your own attitude. Then go on to the next item. If none of the statements in an item expresses your attitude fairly well, you may leave the item blank, but choose one statement whenever possible.

Scale
Value

- | | | |
|------|---|--|
| 2.7 | 1 | I believe that God hears prayers and may at times act upon them. |
| 0.7 | | Prayer is a demonstration of one's ignorance and helplessness. |
| 6.4 | | I'm not sure that God answers prayers but praying does a person good. |
| 1.1 | | I know that God hears and responds to prayers. |
| 10.2 | | Prayer is probably just a waste of effort and time. |
| 8.4 | 2 | I feel that the Church provides only little opportunity for unselfish activity. |
| 2.2 | | I feel that the Church provides many excellent opportunities for unselfish activity. |

Reference: K. R. Hardy. Construction and validation of a scale measuring attitudes toward the L.D.S. Church. Unpublished master's thesis, Univer. of Utah, 1949. Items obtained from author and published with his permission.

- 2.0 I feel that the Church provides some fine opportunities for unselfish activity.
- 5.6 I feel that the Church provides a few good opportunities for unselfish activity.
- 9.7 I feel that the Church provides no opportunities for unselfish activity.
- 5.1 3 I believe the MIA program is good in general but there are some weak areas.
- 8.0 I believe the MIA program is failing to influence and appeal in many respects.
- 10.4 I believe the MIA program is a complete waste of time and energy.
- 9.1 I believe the MIA program is "on the rocks" and needs a complete revision.
- 1.7 I believe the MIA program is excellent at all age levels.
- 1.4 4 I believe strongly in personal immortality: the continued existence of the individual as a separate, distinct being.
- 9.4 I have grave doubts about the possibility of personal immortality.
- 7.8 I am frequently beset with doubts about personal immortality.
- 7.0 I am at times beset with doubt about personal immortality.
- 10.7 I do not believe in immortality.
- 5.6 I believe that missionary work is primarily an opportunity to develop the missionary.
- 2.5 I believe that missionary work affords a good opportunity to engage in unselfish activity.
- 10.0 I believe that missionary work is largely a waste of time.
- 9.7 I believe that missionary work is not much more than an opportunity to travel and meet people.
- 1.3 I believe that missionary work is a choice opportunity to serve God and help others.
- 10.1 6 I believe that LDS Church members are much poorer neighbors because of the Church's influence.
- 9.9 I believe that LDS Church members are poorer neighbors because of the Church's influence.
- 2.3 I believe that LDS Church members are much better neighbors because of the Church's influence.
- 3.7 I believe that LDS Church members are somewhat better neighbors because of the Church's influence.
- 7.8 I believe that LDS Church members are no better neighbors because of the Church's influence.
- 2.3 7 When other people criticize the Church, I generally strongly defend it.
- 6.7 When other people criticize the Church, I generally remain silent.
- 8.0 When other people criticize the Church, I generally passively agree.
- 9.7 When other people criticize the Church, I generally join with them in criticism.
- 5.3 When other people criticize the Church, I generally mildly defend it.
- 9.8 8 The good done by the Church is not worth the money and energy spent on it.

- 5.9 There is much energy and money wasted in the Church, but the good done probably compensates for it.
- 10.1 Time and money spent in the Church are a nearly complete waste.
- 1.4 Time and money are nowhere better spent than in the Church.
- 3.7 The time and money invested in the Church are probably well spent.
- 6.1 9 I feel that the Relief Society is probably a good thing but I am not impressed with it.
- 2.0 I feel that the Relief Society is a splendid organization.
- 9.3 I feel that the Relief Society is one organization which has little usefulness.
- 3.2 I feel that the Relief Society is one of the better auxiliary organizations.
- 9.9 I feel that the Relief Society is just a scheme to keep the women from getting dissatisfied with the Church.
- 9.6 10 The Word of Wisdom is of little if any practical value.
- 6.5 Some of the parts of the Word of Wisdom are good advice, but it certainly is not to be considered a commandment.
- 1.2 I believe the Church is absolutely correct in its teachings about the Word of Wisdom.
- 5.9 The Word of Wisdom is probably a good thing, but many other things are more important.
- 5.3 I believe in the Word of Wisdom, but I think the Church leaders stress it too much.
- 4.4 11 I think that the MIA is probably a good thing to have to keep the young people off the streets.
- 2.6 I think that the MIA is a Church auxiliary and therefore all those eligible should attend its meetings.
- 3.9 I think that the MIA is a fine auxiliary program for those interested in attending.
- 9.7 I think that the MIA is something to be disregarded.
- 9.7 I think that the MIA is not much better than nothing at all.
- 5.4 12 I believe that a few of our present leaders are occasionally inspired by God.
- 6.5 I believe that our leaders today are generally good men who are directing the affairs of the Church without supernatural aid.
- 9.6 I believe that Church leaders were inspired in Joseph Smith's day but are not any more because of unworthiness.
- 1.2 I believe that the Church remains under inspired leadership today.
- 10.8 I believe that the Church has never been under inspired leadership.
- 13 In cases where the findings of science seem to conflict with the teachings of the Church, I generally tend to:
- 3.8 favor the Church over scientific findings.
- 9.8 defend strongly the findings of science.
- 2.4 defend strongly the Church's position.
- 6.1 favor neither the Church nor science to any extent.
- 8.8 favor the scientific findings over the Church's position.

Scale
Value

- 8.1 14 I feel that I only rarely benefit when I attend Church meetings.
 3.5 I feel that I usually benefit when I attend Church meetings.
 5.2 I feel that I benefit occasionally when I attend Church meetings.
 9.8 I feel that I never benefit when I attend Church meetings.
 2.0 I feel that I benefit greatly whenever I attend Church meetings.
- 1.5 15 I believe that the Church's method of selecting leaders is excellent.
 5.4 I believe that the Church's method of selecting leaders is good but could be improved.
 9.7 I believe that the Church's method of selecting leaders should be entirely revised and a good system substituted for it.
 9.8 I believe that the Church's method of selecting leaders is unscientific and unfair.
 6.1 I believe that the teachings of the Church have helped me tremendously in enjoying life.
- 6.3 16 I believe that the teachings of the Church have neither helped nor hindered me to any extent in enjoying life.
 9.7 I believe that the teachings of the Church have hindered me to an appreciable extent from enjoying life.
 2.7 I believe that the teachings of the Church have helped me to an appreciable extent in enjoying life.
 1.7 I believe that the teachings of the Church have helped me tremendously in enjoying life.
- 10.7 17 On the whole, I believe the missionary program is a stupid waste of time and money.
 1.9 On the whole, I believe the missionary program is excellently conceived and carried out.
 5.4 On the whole, I believe the missionary program is falling down in spots but is generally progressing well.
 8.1 On the whole, I believe the missionary program is not doing nearly as well as it should.
 9.9 On the whole, I believe the missionary program is largely wasted effort.
- 8.1 18 My attitude toward the Church is passive, with some tendency to disfavor it.
 10.9 I have little but contempt for the Church.
 6.4 The Church is probably a good thing, but I'm not able to get interested in it.
 1.1 I believe that the Church is the most important organization in the world.
 2.9 I believe that the Church is one of our more important organizations.
- 1.8 19 I continually receive inspiration from our Church leaders to lead a better daily life.
 2.3 I often am inspired to improve my daily behavior by the messages of our Church leaders.
 8.4 I feel that the leaders of the Church do not deal with the practical problems of life.

Scale
Value

- 8.0 I feel that the Church authorities deal too infrequently with life's practical problems.
 6.4 I feel that the Church leaders should spend a greater part of their time dealing with life's practical problems.
- 9.2 20 I believe that the Church wastes much of its money.
 6.7 I believe that the Church makes only fair use of its money.
 2.1 I believe that the Church makes excellent use of its money.
 3.7 I believe that the Church generally makes good use of its money.
 10.0 I believe that the Church wastes most of its money.
- 1.9 21 I feel that the Church has an excellent program for satisfying the needs of its members.
 6.6 I feel that the Church has only a fair program for satisfying the needs of its members.
 3.0 I feel that the Church in general satisfies well the needs of its members.
 9.8 I feel that the Church has a very poor program for satisfying the needs of its members.
 4.2 I feel that the Church has a fairly good program for satisfying the needs of its members.
- 10.4 22 When other people argue favorably for the Church, I usually strongly disagree.
 5.4 When other people argue favorably for the Church, I usually passively agree with them.
 6.3 When other people argue favorably for the Church, I usually remain silent.
 3.3 When other people argue favorably for the Church, I usually join actively with them.
 8.2 When other people argue favorably for the Church, I usually mildly disagree.
- 6.0 23 I feel that the tolerance and love fostered by the Church probably balances the intolerance fostered.
 10.4 I feel that the Church greatly fosters intolerance and bigotry on the part of the members.
 2.2 I feel that the Church greatly fosters an attitude of love and good will toward non-members.
 8.8 I feel that the tolerance and love fostered by the Church is outweighed by the intolerance and bigotry fostered.
 6.5 I feel that the Church on the whole fosters tolerance and love, but at times fosters intolerance and bigotry.
- 9.7 24 I have strong doubts about the reality of the pre-existence.
 10.1 The reality of the pre-existence seems impossible.
 4.5 I believe strongly in the reality of the pre-existence but occasionally have doubts.
 9.8 The reality of the pre-existence seems highly improbable to me.
 1.2 I believe wholeheartedly in the reality of the pre-existence.

Scale
Value

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 8.6 | 25 | I feel that the Church is greatly declining in influence upon its membership. |
| 2.4 | | I feel that the Church is gaining greatly in influence upon its membership. |
| 8.6 | | I feel that the Church is measurably declining in influence upon its membership. |
| 6.2 | | I feel that the Church is not measurably gaining or declining in influence on its membership. |
| 4.2 | | I feel that the Church is gaining in influence on its membership to a certain degree. |