1984

A Multitrait-Multisource Examination of the Relationship Between Moral Judgment and Religiousness of Eighth Grade Students.

Kathleen Trudeau Cranford
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses

Recommended Citation
https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/3953

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.
INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or “target” for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is “Missing Page(s)”. If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of “sectioning” the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.
Cranford, Kathleen Trudeau

A MULTITRAIT-MULTISOURCE EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MORAL JUDGMENT AND RELIGIOUSNESS OF EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS

The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical Col. Ph.D. 1984

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeib Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106
A MULTITRAIT-MULTISOURCE EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MORAL JUDGMENT AND RELIGIOUSNESS OF EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Psychology

by

Kathleen Trudeau Cranford
B.S., University of Southwestern Louisiana, 1973
M.A., Louisiana State University, 1976
May, 1984
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my longtime advisor, Dr. Felicia Pryor, for her unfailing support and encouragement. I am grateful to Dr. Ray Buss for being very generous with his time, ideas, and resources. Dr. Ralph Dreger, Dr. Robert Coon, and Dr. June Tuma deserve my gratitude for their accumulated wisdom and helpful suggestions. I acknowledge with much appreciation the cooperation of Mr. John P. Downey and Mr. R. Dana Magee, principals of Pearl River Junior High School and Boyet Junior High School respectively. The eighth grade students of Mrs. Janice Mohr, Mrs. Marlene Rouse, and Mrs. Marilyn Harsch were willing and able participants, and I extend my gratitude to them and their teachers. I am also indebted to Dr. James Firnberg for his valuable contributions to the study.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ..................................................... 1
   The Importance of the Study of Moral Reasoning
   Approaches to the Study of Moral Development
   Piaget's Theory of Moral Development
   Kohlberg's Extension of Piaget's Theory
   Kohlberg's Contributions - The Importance of His Theory
   Criticisms of Kohlberg's Theory
   Religion in Relation to Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development
   Empirical Support for Kohlberg's Position Regarding Religion and Moral Judgment
   Empirical Support for the Relation of Religion to Moral Judgment
   Toward the Formulation of the Present Study

PROBLEM .......................................................... 19

HYPOTHESES ..................................................... 21

METHOD .......................................................... 22
   Subjects
   Measures
   Procedure
   Statistical Analysis
RESULTS .............................................................. 32
Alpha Coefficients for Rating Scales in Sample
Hypothesis I
Hypothesis I.A. - Multitrait-Multisource Matrix
Hypothesis I.B. - DIT and RBQ
Descriptive Statistics for Test Scores
Gender Differences in Peer Ratings
Canonical Correlation Analysis

DISCUSSION ............................................................ 62
REFERENCES .......................................................... 74
APPENDICES .......................................................... 83
VITA ................................................................. 104
### LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reliability of Rating Scales - Coefficient Alpha for Teacher and Self Ratings of Pilot Group</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reliability of Rating Scales - Coefficient Alpha for Teacher and Self Ratings of Sample Group</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Correlation Coefficients</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coefficients of Correlation between Religiousness and Moral Judgment Variables</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Multitrait - Multisource Matrix with All Peer Ratings</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A. Multitrait - Multisource Matrix Including All Peer Ratings with Self Ratings Extracted</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Multitrait - Multisource Matrix with Same Sex Peer Ratings</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A. Multitrait - Multisource Matrix Including Same Sex Peer Ratings with Self Ratings Extracted</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Multitrait - Multisource Matrix with Opposite Sex Peer Ratings</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A. Multitrait - Multisource Matrix Including Opposite Sex Peer Ratings with Self Ratings Extracted</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Religious Belief Questionnaire - Distribution and Percentages of Scores</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Descriptive Statistics for Test Scores</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. DIT Average P% Scores of Eighth Graders</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Peer Rating Mean Scores - Sex Differences by Group</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Peer Rating Mean Scores - Male-Female Sex Differences</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DIT Stage Score Usage - Group Stage Profile</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

Since results have been equivocal about the relationship between religion and moral judgment, this study was undertaken to determine whether there was evidence for the relationship, using a multitrait-multisource technique. Criticisms of Kohlberg's theory of moral development were reviewed in regard to the issue. Teacher, self, and peer ratings were obtained on scales of religiousness, moral judgment, and social skill, which was included as a discriminant variable. A pilot group of 67 eighth graders was assessed to determine the reliability of the rating scales. Thirty-four eighth graders in the sample completed the religiousness, moral judgment, and social skills rating scales as well as the Defining Issues Test (DIT) of moral judgment and the Religious Belief Questionnaire (RBQ). Pearson product moment correlations were determined among the variables, and the correlations from the rating scales were examined in a multitrait-multisource matrix. Results supported the hypotheses that there would be a positive relationship, statistically significant at the .05 level, between religiousness and moral judgment, especially when individuals are rated regarding these characteristics by other people. Though the DIT and the RBQ failed to correlate at a statistically significant level, the DIT did correlate significantly with self ratings of religiousness.

Social skill was found to correlate with religion and, even more
so, to moral judgment, in much the same way that religiousness and moral judgment related to each other. A partial correlation controlling for the effect of social skills revealed that the relationship between teacher ratings of religiousness and moral judgment remained at a statistically significant level, whereas the correlations between students' ratings of religiousness and moral judgment were nonsignificant when the effects of social skills were controlled.

Gender differences in peer ratings were examined. Girls' ratings of other girls were significantly higher than were girls' ratings of boys and boys' ratings of other boys on religion, social skills, and moral judgment. This finding was consistent with previous research.
"It is important that as few people as possible should think about morality - consequently it is very important that morality should not one day become interesting" (Nietzsche, 1886). In spite of Nietzsche's wishes, morality, which has long been a subject of philosophical inquiry, has become a serious topic of thought and investigation by psychologists, especially in the last decade. Before 1970 there was no listing in the Psychological Abstracts for either morality or moral development.

The reluctance to investigate this area can be attributed in part to an emphasis on empirical methods and a reaction to psychodynamic notions of superego and conscience. Ossowska (1970) states:

How can we explain this lack of interest in problems as fascinating as these are? Are we reluctant to discuss problems so emotionally loaded or so deeply integrated into our personality? Perhaps we are skeptical as to the possibility of studying moral problems in a scientific way because of the vagueness of the concept of morality. But concepts of religion, art, and law are no less controversial. Robinson and Shaver (1969) concur:

Many psychologists consider value judgments outside the boundaries of empirical discipline. They seem to have confused making value judgments, which is incompatible with scientific objectivity, with studying objectively how other people make them - a phenomenon as amenable to psychological study, in principle, as other forms of human learning and choice.

There has been increasing recognition that moral reasoning plays a significant part in people's lives. The impact that moral
reasoning and behavior have on mental health has been cited by many. DeMenasce (1961) has asserted, "Every psychosis seems to be a behavioral complex that is derived more or less distantly, from an insurmountable contradiction in the face of ethical behavior." Jung (1933) has observed the importance of moral reasoning as well as the significance of the related area of religion; moral reasoning and religion are the two areas the present study proposes to examine. Jung has written:

Among all my patients in the second half of my life - there has not been one whose problem in the last resort was not that of finding a religious outlook on life. The modern attempt to uproot the objective basis of religion and ethics, to reduce man to a bundle of nonmoral complexes has driven men in upon their subjectivity and severed them from the rational and moral order on which human value depends. Such a despair about the worthwhileness of moral ideals, such a disbelief in a personal God behind the moral order, was bound to have a potent influence in modifying human conduct. The more sensitive, feeling the strain of an impoverished humanity, seek vainly from psychotherapists the answer to metaphysical problems, in many cases only to emerge as dehumanized animals.

Approaches to the Study of Moral Development

Given the importance of moral reasoning then, examination will now be made of the approaches to the moral development process, especially of the cognitive-developmental school of thought which emphasizes age and cognitive changes as influences on moral development. Piaget and Kohlberg are the leading proponents of this school. A second approach is that of social learning theory, which stresses environmental and socialization influences (Hoffman, 1970). Freudian or psychoanalytic thought is sometimes cited as a separate theory but has also been subsumed under a broadly defined social learning
approach (Windmiller, 1980). The basic difference between the two approaches is the greater emphasis assigned to autonomous cognitive processes or social inputs to moral growth (Wilson & Schochet, 1980).

**Piaget's Theory of Moral Development**

Actually, Piaget's theory of moral development is interactive since it recognizes the importance of cognitive development and social experience, both of which have been shown to accelerate progress through the moral stages. Piaget's oft-quoted central pronouncement is, "All morality consists in a system of rules, and the essence of all morality is to be sought for in the respect which the individual acquires for these rules" (1972). Piaget's notion is that the child generates rules from an understanding of the social situation, that the child's understanding changes in a step-wise fashion, and that the process is universal (Windmiller, 1980). Piaget thought that the child shifted from respect and submission to authority, in heteronomous morality, to self-government and control, in autonomous morality (Hoffman, 1970). The first stage is characterized by obligation to rules, consideration of the consequences of an act in determining its moral value, and a tendency to see behaviors as totally right or wrong. The later stage is marked by cooperation, reciprocal agreement with others, and awareness of intentionality.

**Kohlberg's Extension of Piaget's Theory**

Kohlberg has extended Piaget's theory into a three-level, six-stage developmental system. The first premoral or preconventional level is characterized by external control, awareness of obedience and punishment, and hedonistic and instrumental reasoning. The second
level of conventionality or role-conformity is marked by maintenance of the conventional social order, maintaining good relations with others, doing duty, showing respect, and considering intentions of others. The highest level of self-accepted moral principles or post-conventional thought consists of the morality of contract, individual rights, and democratic law and proceeds ultimately to individual principles of conscience. Though the description of Kohlberg's scheme has changed somewhat over the years (Siegal, 1980), the most recent statement of his moral stages is given in Appendix I (Kohlberg, 1981).

**Kohlberg's Contributions - The Importance of His Theory**

Kohlberg's theory is indubitably the preeminent one in the field at present. His conception is thorough and encompasses the life span from early childhood to adult maturity. His work has stimulated much further research. Many agree with Peters (1971) that Kohlberg's work seems "by far the most important which has been done to date."

Kohlberg has been praised for his conceptual analysis, developmental perspective, and sophisticated and reliable instrumentation (Sullivan, Beck, Joy, & Pagliuso, 1975). "The power of his analysis stems from his ability to combine philosophy, psychology, education, political science, etc. within the purview of his extensive empirical work" (Sullivan, 1977). Alston (1971) credits Kohlberg:

... for doing some very hard and very unfashionable thinking on moral thought as a subject of interest in its own right, and for producing evidence that should force psychologists to take the cognitive aspects of morality seriously as an important influence on behavior.
Criticisms of Kohlberg's Theory

Yet there have been many criticisms as well of Kohlberg's theory. It is the view of some (Peters, 1971) that "Kohlberg adopts too simple and too monolithic an approach to moral development" and that "there is much more to morality than is covered by his theory." Kohlberg's notions have been challenged on philosophical grounds (Hoffman, 1977, 1979) "for having a Western, a male, and a 'romantic individualistic' bias" (Samson, 1978; Simpson, 1974). Peters (1975) noted that Kohlberg "suffers from the rather touching belief that a Kantian type of morality, represented in modern times most notably by Hare and Rawls, is the only one." Sullivan (1975, 1977) concurs that Kohlberg's stage theory of moral development "masks an unreflective liberal ideology."

For example, Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning have been shown to relate to political ideology (Fishkin, Keniston, & MacKinnon, 1973; Fontana & Noel, 1973; Haan, Smith, & Block, 1968). The important philosophical problems with Kohlberg's theory have also been much discussed by Trainer (1977). Some observers have objected to the hierarchical nature of the stages proposed by Kohlberg, as well as the invariance of their sequence, their universality, order, and homogeneity (Fraenkel, 1976; Hoffman, 1977; Kurtines & Greif, 1974; Phillips & Kelly, 1975). Sullivan (1977) contends "that in Kohlberg the moral thought structures (i.e., stages) become reified; that is, take on a life of their own."

Kohlberg (1973) has presented arguments for the moral superiority of his highest stages, yet Alston (1971) has shown that logical dependence of one stage upon another does not imply greater relative worth
of the higher stage. Fraenkel (1976) has charged that the highest
principled stage six has been identified with only three people,
Kohlberg himself, one of his graduate students, and Martin Luther King.
Gibbs (1977) notes that the "apparent rarity of the principled orienta-
tions is evidence against their significance as part of a Piagetian
stage sequence."

The "bag of virtues" approach to building moral character by incul-
cating traits which are generally considered to be positive has been
roundly criticized by Kohlberg (1981). He argues that only the form
of reasoning is important and that a particular stage of reasoning
could embody opposite choices. Yet Alston (1971), Peters (1971), and
Sullivan (1977) have given a more balanced treatment to moral virtues
as having a place in moral psychology. Alston (1971) notes that
"morality is content as well as form, and to understand a particular
person's moral character we need to know both." Wright (1971) concurs
that, "It is not unreasonable to suppose that why a person thinks an
action is wrong is much less important than that he thinks it wrong."
Candee (1976) has concluded that "ultimately structure is related to
choice" and that the "stages would be of little interest if they did
not lead to specific types of decisions."

Critics of Kohlberg also see as important the place of habit in
the moral life. Peters (1971) accuses Kohlberg of not taking "good-
boy" Stage 3 morality seriously enough, and he points out that the
learning of rules must precede autonomous moral functioning. Kohlberg's
idea that moral development does not depend upon teaching is also
questioned.
The theory has been criticized as well for neglecting motivation (Hoffman, 1977; Peters, 1971) "which may be needed for translating moral concepts into moral action." Straughan (1975) finds the clash between principle and inclination a more common and central conflict than the conflict between principles which is so often used in hypothetical moral dilemmas.

Affective elements in moral development have been displaced by the greater emphasis on the cognitive role in Kohlberg's theory, to its great loss according to Alston (1971) and Peters (1971). They maintain that Freud and his superego theory provide much-needed supplementation to Kohlberg's work.

Other researchers have cited Kohlberg's method and instrumentation for psychometric deficiencies, such as the intuitive derivation of the stages, the lack of standardization, undemonstrated reliability, and questionable predictive and construct validity (Kurtines & Greif, 1974). Fraenkel (1976) noted Rest's (1974) conclusion that "there are almost limitless formats for collecting moral judgment data."

DePalma & Foley (1975) have noted that:

Kohlberg's method produces material that is not strictly comparable from subject to subject. The assessments are vulnerable to interviewer and scorer biases, and scoring the material involves complex interpretations and rather great inferential leaps from the data.

In addition, the test-retest reliability was poor in several studies, and the measure correlated only moderately with similar measures. It is to Kohlberg's credit that he has greatly revised his scoring system in light of such criticisms (Colby et al., 1983).
Religion in Relation to Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development

Gutkin and Suls (1979) raised "the question of whether tests of moral reasoning may be biased against those who strongly endorse the legitimacy of law rather than personal conviction." They recommended examining "the extent to which our measures of moral reasoning may carry unnecessary ideological baggage." In his critical analysis of Kohlberg's contributions Trainer (1977) noted: "Kohlberg's analysis makes very little mention of religious principles, which one would expect to encounter frequently in moral thought, and it is not clear at which stage such references should be located." From a scientific standpoint this objection is not valid unless it can be shown that religion is integral to morality. Still, Trainer's viewpoint and remarks merit consideration. It was Trainer's (1977) judgment that:

The (Kohlberg) scheme has a 'secular' or humanistic flavour. Moral maturity is described in terms of reasoned, self-chosen principles which focus on justice and equality, not in terms of willing obedience or humility before an omniscient being. Kohlberg does not explain whether, and if so how, a religious person could exhibit mature moral thought. Stage 6 does not seem to represent what would be regarded as moral maturity by, for instance, a Catholic... No reasoning involving unsanctified principles (and these include many... religious... principles) can rate as good moral reasoning regardless of how erudite and cogent that reasoning is. Good reasoning is defined in terms of the right content, not in terms of facility in a process of inquiry.

Indeed, when speaking of conscience, Kohlberg cites the example that for a Jehovah's Witness, conscience may mean God's law as interpreted by his religious group. However, he notes that, "To count as postconventional, such ideas or terms must be used in a way that makes it clear that they have a foundation for a rational or moral
individual who has not yet committed himself to any group or society or its morality" (Kohlberg, 1973).

Alston (1971) reports that:

Many philosophers who are surely at least as conceptually sophisticated as Kohlberg's stage 6 subjects take positions in moral philosophy that reflect stage 4 or 5. Many highly sophisticated theologians, for example, have espoused a subjection-to-the will-of-God morality that I suppose would be classed by Kohlberg as stage 4.

The issues of ends, goals, purposes, and ultimate meanings are included in a religious perspective which Kohlberg "... separates from morality and therefore justice. It therefore does not enter systematically in his thinking about a just social order" (Sullivan, 1977).

The adoption of a Kantian, liberal social-contract theory has excluded other systems of ethics which have a transcendent religious perspective (Sullivan et al., 1975). Crittenden (1972) states the following about the Kohlberg theory:

It involves the rejection of various positions that make some claim to be moral as, for example, moral conventionalism, religiously based morality, ... any system that appeals to absolute moral standards, the view that there are certain actions one is never justified in doing regardless of the consequences.

Others have stated unequivocally that Kohlberg's "conceptions are judged to be at great variance with the traditional Christian understanding of morality" (Dykstra, 1978). One example is shown in Kohlberg's endorsement of the early Platonic view (1981) that, "He who knows the good chooses the good." Yet Kattsoff (1965) reflects:

A person can will to do evil while knowing full well what he does and that he is wrong in doing it. Too often we feel that to know what is right is to do it, and we assume that a person who does evil does it because he is not really cognizant of its evil. This was the Greek view; it is not
the Christian view.

Hogan (1973) has commented:

Philosophers have typically maintained that neither the ethics of personal conscience or the ethics of social responsibility represents a necessarily higher form of morality, and that the two viewpoints are equally defensible on moral grounds. Within psychology, however, there seems to be a tendency to assign greater virtue to moral judgments based on the dictates of personal conscience.

In researching these dimensions Hogan found that those following the ethics of personal conscience tended to be progressive, rebellious, and unconventional with a tendency toward social activism, while persons espousing the ethics of social responsibility were good-natured, thoughtful, well-socialized, and somewhat conservative politically.

Kohlberg remains adamant that religion has little or no relation to moral judgment (1967, 1981). But the data contributing to this opinion of his are nowhere to be found in his own work. The assertion that religion and moral development are unrelated is more than just a passing observation of Kohlberg's. Indeed, the strict independence of moral life from religious teachings and beliefs is an essential factor in Kohlberg's educational proposals. The complete separation of moral and religious education has been used by Kohlberg to circumvent the Supreme Court decision that Secular Humanism or Ethical Culture is a religion and that the credos of such value systems should be prohibited from state propagation in the public schools (Kohlberg, 1967). Kohlberg has largely succeeded in his persuasion and has implemented his programs of value clarification or moral development stimulation in many school systems.

Of course, such utter estrangement of morality and religion is
seen as untenable by many moral philosophers and researchers (O'Rahilly, 1955). Ossowska (1970) has theorized four ways that morality depends upon religion: moral codes are believed by many to be given to man by a supernatural being who is a lawgiver and judge; there is a logical dependence of moral precepts on one side and religious dogmas on the other; there is an influence of religion on the content of some moral convictions; and behavior often depends upon one's creed. Another writer has suggested that, "The attempt of modern psychologists and psychiatrists to condemn morality and religion, without bothering to investigate these subjects on their own merits, is merely an exhibition of irrational dogmatism" (O'Rahilly, 1955).

In the 1981 Annual Review of Psychology Leona Tyler notes:

Psychological interest in religious experience has been legitimized with the formation of APA Division 36. Such experience is, of course, a fundamental aspect of human life down through the centuries, going back through history and prehistory to the time of our remote ancestors. Anthropologists and philosophers have done research on it. There seems no good reason for psychologists to avoid it. Because moral codes, patterns of social organization, attitudes, and self concepts are linked to religious beliefs, knowledge about them seems important when we try to understand a society that is foreign to us. But it is more difficult to study religion in our diverse, highly secularized society. The fact that Freud and many other influential thinkers considered religion to be an illusion that should be outgrown as rapidly as possible in our scientific age also contributes to the reluctance psychologists have felt to deal with it.

But Kohlberg "can conclude that religion is not a necessary or highly important condition for the development of moral judgment and conduct" (Kohlberg, 1967). He argues further that "formal religious education has no specifically important or unique role to play in
moral development as opposed to the role of the public school and the family in this area."¹ In support of his view that moral principles are independent of religious belief, Kohlberg even invokes the name of St. Thomas Aquinas, a twist which Thomists (Bourke, 1947; Maritain, 1942) might consider captious and sophistic reasoning.

**Empirical Support for Kohlberg's Position Regarding Religion and Moral Judgment**

Turiel (1976), an associate of Kohlberg's, provided support for the supposed lack of relationship between religion and moral judgment. He found that among 104 boys and 106 girls from the sixth, ninth, and twelfth grades, those in a progressive school setting earned higher moral maturity scores (M=3.16) than subjects from a traditional school (M=3.03), who themselves had higher scores than those in a parochial school (M=2.82). There was a statistically significant main effect for school setting (p < .001). Rest (1979a) reported that moral development level is unrelated to either frequency of church attendance or religious denomination. Wahrman (1981) assessed 60 orthodox religious college students, 31 liberal students, and 33 nondenominational undergraduates with the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and Rest's Defining Issues Test and interpreted his findings in support of Kohlberg's theory. He found that frequency of attendance at religious services (r=.012) and number of years of religious education (r=0.20) were not significantly related.

¹Kohlberg contradicts his argument in another article in which he excludes even the family's role, stating categorically that "family participation is not unique or critically necessary for moral development" (Haan, Langer, & Kohlberg, 1976).
to moral development.

In a group of young adults Blackner (1975) also failed to find a relationship between principled level of moral development and degree of involvement in weekly religious education. In another study among 481 college students, moral judgment was found to be strongly and negatively related to both religious and political orientations (Sanderson, 1974). This finding was said to confirm the Kohlberg hypothesis that the higher a person's stage of moral judgment, the greater is the likelihood of his rejection of both orthodox religiosity and right wing politics.

**Empirical Support for the Relation of Religion to Moral Judgment**

The following study ostensibly provided support for the lack of relationship between religion and moral judgment, yet it resulted in much evidence for the relationship. Armsby (1971) studied 240 children and attested that Catholic school children were no more likely than public school children to make intentionality judgments in response to revised Piaget story-pairs. What Armsby failed to emphasize in his findings was that Catholic school children aged six to eight did make intentionality judgments significantly more often than did public school children of the same age to standard Piaget stories. The Piaget stories are regarded as standard not from a psychometric standpoint but from repeated usage by developmental psychologists with many different kinds of subjects. In the Armsby study Catholic students were superior on the standard instrument, but their higher levels were not apparent on the measure that the researcher himself devised. Despite
these results, the researcher somehow concluded that he could discon-
firm the hypothesis that Catholic children would make more mature moral
judgments than public school children.

In forming this hypothesis, Armsby had drawn upon Boehm's (1962,
1963) findings that Catholic school children do make more mature
moral judgments by Piagetian criteria to Piagetian stories than do
public school children. She found that Catholic parochial school
children, regardless of socioeconomic class or intelligence level,
scored higher at an earlier age than public school children in recogniz­ing the distinction between motivation and results of an action and
in independence from adults and peer reciprocity.

Fifteen years later Killeen (1978) found similar results among
adolescents, using Rest's Defining Issues Test and a measure of con­
creteness and abstractness of religious thinking. She found statis-
tically significant differences in the levels of moral and religious
judgments between public and Catholic school adolescents who were formal
thinkers. Her conclusion was that "Catholic school adolescents
attained higher scores in principled moral judgment and abstract reli-
gious thinking, indicating that exposure to direct moral training based
on religious beliefs directs and informs judgment which enables formal
thinkers to make discriminating, precise, and higher level moral
choices." This conclusion is met with some reservations since Killeen
is inferring causation from her results. In a study of 630 high school
students Robinson (1976) concurred that students from a Catholic high
school learning environment have better moral reasoning abilities than
do public high school students, and that changes in moral developmen
are more likely to occur in the Catholic high school than in the public school.

There is evidence as well among Protestant groups who were studied that religious thinking relates to moral development. For example, Miller (1976) found "a significant relationship at the .05 level of confidence between stages of moral development and stages of religious thinking." He had studied 94 subjects aged eight to eighteen in Bible classes of the Church of Christ, using Kohlberg's test of moral development and Goldman's test of religious thinking. Brown and Annis (1978) also found a significant correlation ($r = .44, p < .01$) between subjects' morality and literal scriptural belief in a study of 80 undergraduates' responses to Rest's adaptation of Kohlberg's moral dilemma questionnaire.

Another study of 169 Protestant adults using Rest's Defining Issues Test found that seriousness of religious commitment, as measured by the degree of intrinsic religious orientation (Allport & Ross, 1967) was clearly related to the extent to which adults made moral judgments reflecting the teachings of their congregations (Ernsberger & Manaster, 1981). These researchers also determined that "doctrinal differences apparently relate to strong differences in moral reasoning." For example, the Pearson $r$ between $P$ score, the principled level of moral development in Rest's Defining Issues Test, and degree of religious orientation for United Methodist subjects was .33 ($p < .01$). However, for Unitarian-Universalist subjects no statistically significant correlations were obtained. Ernsberger and Manaster concluded "that both the degree of intrinsic religious orientation and
the moral stages normative for one's religious community are predictors of moral development." In addition, they questioned "Kohlberg's conclusions that religious variables have little evident effect on moral development, at least with regard to adults."

Stevens, Blank, and Poushinsky (1977) studied 272 subjects ranging in age from 15 to 72 years with Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Test and Rest's Defining Issues Test. They determined that religious influences relate to moral reasoning but that the relationship depends upon the type of moral assessment used. This finding is of great importance in pinpointing a central issue in the study of moral development and religion.

Among 315 Jewish senior high school students, religious training and moral judgment were found to be positively related \((p < .01)\) (Sharfman, 1974). Eisenberg-Berg and Roth (1980) used a moral judgment measure of their own and found the positive effects of religious training on the prosocial moral judgments of children. They decided that high religious participation was positively related \((p(32) = .54, p < .001)\) to the use of needs-oriented reasoning and negatively related \((p(32) = -.34, p < .05)\) to hedonistic reasoning.

Personality studies also have related religious behavior to moral traits. In a study of 102 undergraduates Sieracki and Mellinger (1980) found that the best predictor of a moral positivist was current church affiliation \((r = .25, p < .01)\) combined with a conscientious personality \((r = .43, p < .001)\). Wiebe and Fleck in their study of 158 college students (1980) found that intrinsically religious students tested on the 16PF test tended to be higher in
superego strength and emotional sensitivity than extrinsically and non-religious subjects. The profiles of the latter two groups of students correlated at statistically significant levels ($r(14)=.653, p < .01$) and differed at a statistically significant level from the profiles of the intrinsically religious subjects ($F(15,1740)=2.51, p < .01$). The researchers noted that the "intrinsically religious subjects tended to have a greater concern for moral standards, conscientiousness, discipline, responsibility, and consistency than" did the other two groups. In addition, the intrinsically religious were more sensitive, empathetic, dependent, and open to their emotions. Nonreligious and extrinsically religious individuals showed more self-indulgence, indolence, and undependability.

The results of another study using the California Personality Inventory and the Defining Issues Test among 549 adolescents and young adult Catholic students (Polovy, 1980) indicated that those who preferred principled levels of moral reasoning were dependable ($r=.32, p < .001$), rational, creative ($r=.44, p < .001$), intelligent ($r=.36, p < .001$), and accepting of rules and constraints of society ($r=.26, p < .001$), but at the same time, able to think independently and aware of the need for change ($r=.25, p < .001$)."
1981). Because there is doubt about this position, this study was undertaken to try to determine whether additional evidence for the relationship between religion and moral development exists.
PROBLEM

As shown previously, there is controversy concerning the role of religious commitment and religious education in the development of moral reasoning. The choice of measures seems to be crucial, with less religious influence being reflected when Kohlberg's Moral Judgement Interview is used and more religious impact evident when other instruments are employed.

A certain portion of the relevant literature provided evidence that despite Kohlberg's assertion, religion may very well be an important correlate of moral judgment. The purpose of the study then was to determine whether there was further evidence for the relationship between religiousness and moral judgment.

To make such an investigation a multitrait-multisource matrix (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) was proposed to examine the intercorrelations of three traits, (a) religiousness, (b) social skills (Stephens, 1978), and (c) moral judgment, as measured by three sources, (a) teacher ratings, (b) self ratings, and (c) peer ratings. Also proposed was

---

2 For more precise terminology the term multitrait-multisource matrix is used here rather than the more common term, multitrait-multimethod matrix. In this study the method for each trait was a rating scale which was identical for the three different sources, teacher, self, and peer. Campbell and Fiske (1959) referred to "methods" (within quotation marks) when discussing ratings from different sources in another matrix.
a second comparison between religiousness and moral judgment as assessed
by established tests.

The concept of social skills was introduced as a discriminant vari-
able to help assess the relationship between moral judgment and reli-
gion in the obtained results. If there were no clearcut pattern in the
findings regarding religiousness and moral judgment, the addition of a
construct which could be related to either variable could help to dis-
cern meaning from the data. The possibility existed that there might
be an overall cognitive social ability which underlies moral judgment
and religiousness. Even though social skills, religiousness, and moral
judgment can be seen as distinct constructs by a researcher, teacher
and students may view these characteristics in a different way, perhaps
as overlapping or even as synonymous traits. Therefore, a social
skills measure was included to see if the subjects perceived the three
variables as separable or not. The inclusion of this third trait in
the multitrait-multisource matrix, then, was primarily a methodological
desideratum rather than a purely theoretical consideration. The addi-
tion of social skills was meant to help demonstrate discriminant
validity within the matrix and to help clarify the relationship of
primary interest, that between religiousness and moral judgment.
HYPOTHESES

I. It is hypothesized that there is a positive relationship, statistically significant at the .05 level, between religiousness and moral judgment as measured in this study.

   A. Specifically, within the multitrait-multisource matrix used, it is hypothesized that convergent validity but not discriminant validity will be demonstrated. That is, there should be relatively large correlations between ratings of the same trait, religiousness, and between ratings of moral judgment, based on the different rating sources, teacher, self, and peer. And yet correlations should also be high between the different traits, religiousness and moral judgment, based on the same or different rating sources.

   B. It is hypothesized that scores from the Religious Belief Questionnaire (Apfeldorf, 1975) correlate positively, at the .05 level of statistical significance, with scores on the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1979b), the measure of moral judgment used in this study.
METHOD

Subjects

Pilot group. A pilot group of 67 eighth grade students was tested to determine the reliability of the rating scales used. The students consisted of 33 males and 34 females from above-average-level reading and honors-level math classes in a public junior high school in a small city, Slidell, Louisiana. In the pilot group 66 of the subjects were white, and one was black.

Sample group. The sample consisted of 34 eighth grade students from a Louisiana History class in a public junior high school in Pearl River, Louisiana. Pearl River is a community with a population of less than 5,000 and is located in the rural southeastern part of the state, an area known for its religious and political conservatism. The socioeconomic status is at the middle to lower level. The sample consisted of 18 males and 16 females, 27 Protestants and 7 Catholics, 33 white students and one black. The students ranged in age from 12 to 16 years with a mean age of 13.5 years. Within the group two students were 12 years of age, twenty-one were 13, four were 14, three were 15, two were 16, and two ages were not given. The subjects reported that they had known their fellow classmates an average of 4.75 years.

An attempt was made to test students in a larger, more cosmopolitan junior high school. But since there were so many (16) sections of the grade level and since the classes changed hourly, the students in
the larger school lacked sufficient familiarity with each other to perform the rating tasks in this study.

Measures

The five tests used were the (a) Religiousness Rating Scale, (b) Social Skills Rating Scale, (c) Moral Judgment Rating Scale, (d) Religious Belief Questionnaire, and (e) Defining Issues Test. Each test is described in the following sections.

Measure 1 - Religiousness Rating Scale - Appendix II.

As shown in Appendix II, the Religiousness Rating Scale consists of seven items of religious behavior on which students were rated by their teacher, peers, and themselves. A five-point Likert scale was used to rate religious activities according to frequency of occurrence. The seven items were based on similar items in Apfeldorf's (1975) Religious Behavior Questionnaire which concerns "membership in and interaction with a religious congregation, prayers, Bible reading, and relationships with one's fellow man" (Apfeldorf, 1975).

Cronbach's coefficient alpha (1951) was computed in determining the reliability of teacher and self ratings. Coefficient alpha is the mean of all split-half coefficients resulting from different splittings of a test. "Alpha estimates and is a lower bound to the proportion of test variance attributable to common factors among the items" (Cronbach, 1951; Novick & Lewis, 1967). Coefficient alpha is used as a measure of internal consistency of the rating scales. A high alpha is to be desired.

The reliability coefficients of the pilot group ratings are presented in Table 1. The obtained values are at high levels and reflect
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiousness</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiousness</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Judgment</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Judgment</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
high internal consistency of the measures. The alpha coefficient for self ratings of religiousness was .86 in the pilot group (n=58). Because the two teachers in the pilot group thought that they had too little knowledge of the religious practices of their students, too few cases were available for calculation of coefficient alpha. It was impracticable to compute Cronbach's alpha for peer ratings.

**Measure 2 - Social Skills Rating Scale - Appendix III.**

A behavioral measure of social skills was administered to the subjects. The scale was rated according to the five-point scale which was also used for the religiousness ratings. The chosen items were drawn from Factors 1 and 2, Academic Responsibility and Social Responsibility (Stumme, Gresham, & Scott, 1983) of the Social Behavioral Assessment (Stephens, 1978). The sixteen rated items presented in Appendix III were derived from the four highest categories with the greatest factor loadings on Factors 1 and 2, which themselves account for almost 38% of the variance in teacher ratings of students' social skills.

The items concern classroom discussion, asking and answering questions, greeting others, positive attitude toward self, movement around environment, on-task behavior, acceptance of authority, and independent work. These skills comprise those behaviors highly valued by teachers and are more associated with classroom order and control, or social conformity, than with interpersonal interaction.

This scale measures that behavior most apparent to a student's teacher and peers, social conformity at school. The rated moral judgment and religiousness of a given student might or might not be
related to his/her classroom social conformity, depending on the teacher and peers' perception and knowledge of the student, the raters' tendency toward a response set, and the degree of interrelationship of the three traits.

Alpha coefficients for pilot-group teacher and self-ratings of social skills are to be found in Table 1. Coefficient alpha for teacher ratings of social skills was .92 in the pilot group (n=66). For self ratings of social skills coefficient alpha was .88 in the pilot group (n=54). These values indicate high internal consistency of social skills ratings by teacher and self.

Measure 3 - Moral Judgment Rating Scale - Appendix IV.

The eight-item moral judgment rating measure used in the study is found in Appendix IV. Its form and directions are similar to those of the other two rating scales. An effort was made to include items pertaining to moral judgment, not simply moral behavior, in keeping with the focus of the study, with the structural-developmental approach, and with the standardized moral judgment measure, Rest's Defining Issues Test.

The reliability coefficients for teacher and self ratings of moral judgment shown in Table 1 again reflect high internal consistency. Coefficient alpha for teacher ratings of moral judgment was .91 in the pilot group (n=67). For self ratings of moral judgment coefficient alpha was .86 in the pilot group (n=62).

Measure 4 - Religious Belief Questionnaire - Appendix V.

Form A of the Religious Belief Questionnaire and its scoring key are presented in Appendix V. The 64-item questionnaire was designed
(Apfeldorf, 1975) to tap religious beliefs and attitudes within the following categories: God's existence and control of the universe, prayer, the Bible, good and evil consequences, organized religion, religious practices, and duties of daily living. The Religious Belief Questionnaire "was constructed as a multi-denominational religious belief questionnaire designed to be relevant to all individuals in the Judaeo-Christian tradition" (Johnson & Bommarito, 1971). The test samples an individual's own personal beliefs, not necessarily the body of doctrine he or she has been taught in church, home, or school.

Split-half, odd-even reliability of the Religious Belief Questionnaire has been measured as .95 for Form A. The test correlated .69 with the Religious Scale of the Study of Values (Waldrop version). For fifty-four high school boys these two instruments correlated .72. For sixty-eight girls the two tests correlated .53. The Religious Belief Questionnaire also correlated .62 with Apfeldorf's Religious Behavior Questionnaire and .48 with the Religious Behavior Checklist among fifty-three Veterans Administration patients. RBQ scores, which can range from 64 to 320, were correlated with moral judgment scores on the following measure.

Measure 5 - Defining Issues Test (DIT) - Appendix VI.

Because of its multiple-choice design, its objective scoring, its quick and easy group administration, its correlation in the .60's and .70's with Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview, and its wide use in research in the past few years, Rest's (1979b) Defining Issues Test was given to the subjects to measure moral judgment. The short form
of this test, as shown in Appendix VI, has one sample item and three
test dilemmas. Subjects are asked first to rate the importance of
twelve considerations for each moral dilemma story and then to rank
the four most important considerations for each dilemma.

Though the dilemmas are drawn from Kohlberg's Moral Judgment
Interview and the dissertation of another moral researcher, Alan
Lockwood, Rest asserts that the DIT is more than simply an objective
test version of Kohlberg's instrument. Rest reports that he has taken
the same theoretical approach as Kohlberg but used a different data
source, a different method of data categorization, and different ways
of indexing moral development. For example, in Kohlberg's interview
a subject must spontaneously generate a solution to a problem, but in
the DIT a subject need only evaluate considerations that are provided
him. Since a recognition task is easier than a production task, sub-
jects are more advanced on the DIT. A second difference is that a
scoring judge is required in Kohlberg's procedure, whereas the sub-
ject's responses are scored objectively in the DIT. A third distinc-
tion is that Kohlberg's assessment can place a subject within a stage
type, whereas the DIT P index gives an overall score, more like
Kohlberg's Moral Maturity Score. There are also some differences be-
tween the two systems in definitions of stage characteristics (Rest,
1979b).

When hand-scored in the objective manner described in Rest's
(1979b) manual, the Defining Issues Test yields a P% score or percent-
of-principled-morality score which can range from 0 to 95. It is
reported that for the full six-story DIT "test-retest stability over
several weeks averages .81 in a number of samples; internal consistency averages .78" (Rest, 1979). Test-retest correlations for P scores in the short-form DIT have been reported as .77, .67, and .65 for high school through adult samples and .58 for a group of 19 ninth graders. On the short form coefficient alpha for the P index has been found to be .76.

The three stories in the short form (Heinz, Prisoner, Newspaper) were selected by Rest because they had the highest correlation (.91 for P score) of any three-story set with the complete six-story set. Rest (1979b) has concluded "that the shorter version has substantially the same properties as the six-story form."

The test's author notes (1979) that the DIT has special features to safeguard against the three most serious threats to its internal and external validity. A "Consistency check" identifies tests that are answered in a random or meaningless pattern. A number of "M" items - impressive, sophisticated-sounding statements which are lacking in meaning - are included to determine whether subjects are choosing items for their apparent complexity rather than their actual meaning. And several studies have concluded that though subjects can fake low, they cannot fake high without invalidating their tests.

Rest admits that "geographical region of country and religious affiliation have a significant relation to the DIT. Religion can have either a retarding effect or facilitating effect, depending on how dogmatic or humanistic its stance is on ethical issues." He has reported (1979b) that "samples with the lowest P% scores in each education grouping show a disproportionate representation from the
Southern U.S., an area of the country usually noted for a conservative and traditional outlook . . . and a conservative intellectual milieu."

**Measure 6 - Religious Data Survey - Appendix VII.**

Certain demographic religious information was gathered from the subjects using the form found in Appendix VII.

**Procedure**

**Pilot group.** The 67 subjects in the pilot group were administered the Religiousness Rating Scale, Social Skills Rating Scale, and Moral Judgment Rating Scale to assess the reliability of the measures. The tests were given to the group of students in a randomized order over a period of three days. Students rated their peers and themselves from 1 to 5 for increasing frequency of behavior on various items. They were asked to avoid the 0 or "Don't know" response whenever possible. The two teachers in the pilot group were also asked to complete the three rating scales, giving their opinions of all the students in their classes.

**Sample Group.** The 34 subjects in the sample were administered the three rating scales, the Defining Issues Test, the Religious Belief Questionnaire, and the Religious Data Survey over a period of five days. Except for the brief Religious Data Survey, each test took from twenty to fifty minutes to complete. Testing took place over several days to avoid tiring the subjects as well as to ensure the same subject pool within the changing classes of a junior high school. The RBQ and the DIT were given on the first two days of testing, while the order of the three rating scales was randomized, providing a mix of the three scales on the last three assessment days. The teacher of the
class was asked to rate her students with the Religiousness, Social Skills, and Moral Judgment Rating Scales.

**Statistical Analysis**

Coefficient alpha and a partial correlation were computed for the rating scales using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1979). The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) (1982) was used to compute descriptive statistics for the variables, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients among all the test scores, scatter diagrams for the correlation coefficients, and a canonical correlation analysis (Hotelling, 1935, 1936). Intercorrelations for the three rating scales as completed by teacher, self, and peer were analyzed in a multitrait-multisource matrix (Campbell & Fiske, 1959).
RESULTS

Presentation will first be made of the alpha coefficients obtained for the rating scales used in the sample group. Examination of the major findings of the study in relation to the hypotheses will then follow. Finally, other results will be provided including (a) findings concerning the social skills variable, (b) results from a partial correlation, (c) descriptive statistics for the test scores, with particular attention given to the Defining Issues Test, (d) an investigation of peer ratings as affected by gender, and (e) a canonical correlation analysis.

Alpha Coefficients for Rating Scales in Sample Group

The alpha coefficients for teacher and self ratings of religiousness, social skills, and moral judgment in the sample group are presented in Table 2. Coefficient alpha for self ratings of religiousness was .90 in the sample group (n=28). The teacher in the sample group gave complete religiousness ratings for only three subjects, and coefficient alpha for these three cases was .45. For social skills coefficient alpha was .95 (n=30) for teacher ratings and .93 (n=26) for self ratings. For teacher ratings of moral judgment coefficient alpha was .97 (n=30). Alpha coefficient for self ratings of moral judgment was .85 (n=29).

It can be seen from a comparison of Tables 1 and 2 that there is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiousness</td>
<td>Teacher Ratings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiousness</td>
<td>Self Ratings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>Teacher Ratings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>Self Ratings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Judgment</td>
<td>Teacher Ratings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Judgment</td>
<td>Self Ratings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a striking similarity in the levels of the reliability values obtained from both groups tested, the pilot group and the sample group. It might be added that the small differences in the alpha coefficients that do exist between the sample and the pilot groups are almost all in the favor of the sample group.

**Correlation Coefficients**

Person product moment correlation coefficients were determined among all the variables in the study. Scatter diagrams were plotted and inspected for all the correlated scores. Many of the correlation coefficients found are presented in Table 3. As each hypothesis is discussed in the following sections, smaller tables derived from Table 3 will be presented to provide the necessary results without extraneous data.

**Hypothesis I**

The major hypothesis of the study, that there would be a positive relationship, statistically significant at the .05 level, between religiousness and moral judgment, was found to be supported when individual students are rated regarding these characteristics by their teacher and classmates. The pertinent correlation coefficients are presented in Table 4. In this table it can be seen that religiousness and moral judgment correlate .66 (p < .0001) when rated by teacher, .80 (p < .0001) when rated by All Peers, .65 (p < .0001) when rated by Same Sex Peers, and .61 (p < .0001) when rated by Opposite Sex Peers. Teacher ratings of moral judgment correlated .77 (p < .0001) with All Peer ratings of religiousness, .67 (p < .0001) with Same Sex Peer ratings of religiousness, and .63 (p < .0002) with
TABLE 3
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Relig.</th>
<th>Teacher Social</th>
<th>Teacher Moral</th>
<th>Self Relig.</th>
<th>Self Social</th>
<th>Self Moral</th>
<th>All Peer Relig.</th>
<th>All Peer Social</th>
<th>All Peer Moral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Relig.</td>
<td>.62&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Social</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Moral</td>
<td>.66&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.82&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Relig.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Social</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Moral</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.81&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.44&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Peer Relig.</td>
<td>.64&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.78&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.77&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.44&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.44&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Peer Social</td>
<td>.51&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.81&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.87&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.40&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.83&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Peer Moral</td>
<td>.61&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.79&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.87&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.35&lt;sup&gt;#&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.80&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.94&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> p < .05
<sup>b</sup> p < .01
<sup>c</sup> p < .001
<sup>d</sup> p < .0001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Relig.</th>
<th>Teacher Social</th>
<th>Teacher Moral</th>
<th>Self Relig.</th>
<th>Self Social</th>
<th>Self Moral</th>
<th>All Peer Relig.</th>
<th>All Peer Social</th>
<th>All Peer Moral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.S. Peer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig.</td>
<td>.46&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.69&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.67&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.35&lt;sup&gt;#&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.45&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.41&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.87&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.71&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.66&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.46&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.83&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.77&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.36&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.40&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.82&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.94&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.88&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>.56&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.75&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.79&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.75&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.87&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.92&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O.S. Peer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig.</td>
<td>.69&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.52&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.63&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.71&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.65&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.64&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.52&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.67&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.87&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.35&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.73&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.92&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.88&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>.58&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.57&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.81&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.38&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.35&lt;sup&gt;#&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.66&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.81&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.86&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relig. B.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question.</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.36&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defining</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues T.</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.49&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>#</sup> - $p = .05$

<sup>a</sup> - $p < .05$

<sup>b</sup> - $p < .01$

<sup>c</sup> - $p < .001$

<sup>d</sup> - $p < .0001$
TABLE 4
COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN RELIGIOUSNESS
AND MORAL JUDGMENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Moral Judgment</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>All Peer</th>
<th>S.S. Peer</th>
<th>O.S. Peer</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>DIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0002</td>
<td>p &lt; .0010</td>
<td>p &lt; .0006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Peer</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S. Peer</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0017</td>
<td>p &lt; .0198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.S. Peer</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0002</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0007</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opposite Sex Peer ratings of religiousness. Teacher ratings of religiousness correlated .61 (p < .0002) with All Peer ratings of moral judgment, .56 (p < .0010) with Same Sex Peer ratings of moral judgment, and .58 (p < .0006) with Opposite Sex Peer ratings of moral judgment. In addition, All Peer ratings of religiousness correlated .75 (p < .0001) with Same Sex Peer ratings of moral judgment and .66 (p < .0001) with Opposite Sex Peer ratings of moral judgment. All Peer ratings of moral judgment correlated .66 (p < .0001) with Same Sex Peer ratings of religiousness and .64 (p < .0001) with Opposite Sex Peer ratings of religiousness. Also, Same Sex Peer ratings of moral judgment correlated .55 (p < .0007) with Opposite Sex Peer ratings of religiousness, and Same Sex Peer ratings of religiousness correlated .52 (p < .0017) with Opposite Sex Peer ratings of moral judgment.

Though there are fewer statistically significant correlations involving self ratings, it can be observed that self rating of moral judgment correlated significantly with peer ratings of religiousness (r = .44, p < .012, All Peer); (r = .41, p < .0198, Same Sex Peer). Also, self ratings of religiousness correlated significantly (r = .49, p < .0120) with the DIT moral judgment measure.

The statistically nonsignificant correlations that were obtained occurred in some instances when the individual rated himself or responded to the self-endorsed DIT or RBQ. For example, self ratings of moral judgment correlated .24 with teacher ratings of religiousness, .29 with opposite sex peer ratings of religiousness, and .21 with self ratings of religiousness. Self ratings of religiousness correlated -.20 with teacher ratings of moral judgment, -.03 with all peer ratings
of moral judgment, -.01 with same sex peer ratings of moral judgment, -.09 with opposite sex peer ratings of moral judgment, and .21 with self ratings of moral judgment. Scores on The Defining Issues Test, which students answered individually, correlated with religiousness measures in the following ways: .22 with teacher ratings, .13 with all peer ratings, .27 with same sex peer ratings, and -.11 with opposite sex peer ratings. Scores on The Religious Belief Questionnaire, the self-endorsed religious test, correlated with moral judgment measures as follows: .01 with teacher ratings, .15 with all peer ratings, .24 with same sex peer ratings, -.01 with opposite sex peer ratings, .11 with self ratings, and .09 with scores on the DIT.

Because there are statistically significant correlations between religiousness and moral judgment among all of the external respondents who rated each student, there is evidence to confirm Hypothesis I in one sense. That is, there is found to be a statistically significant relationship between religiousness and moral judgment, especially when individuals are rated regarding these characteristics by other people.

**Hypothesis I. A. - Multitrait-Multisource Matrix**

When the correlation coefficients are placed into the multitrait-multisource matrix as planned in section A. of Hypothesis I, the results are quite similar. The matrix using All Peer ratings is presented in Table 5. The matrices with Same Sex and Opposite Sex Peer rating data follow in Tables 6 and 7 respectively. The latter tables are provided in the interests of complete presentation of obtained results. Because Tables 6 and 7 differ from Table 5 only in the peer
TABLE 5
MULTITRAIT - MULTISOURCE MATRIX
WITH ALL PEER RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>TRAITS</th>
<th>1. TEACHER RATINGS</th>
<th>2. SELF RATINGS</th>
<th>3. ALL PEER RATINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher Ratings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self Ratings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All Peer Ratings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# $p < .0512$, $n=32$

Validity diagonals are underlined.
Heterotrait-heterosource triangle ---
Heterotrait-monosource triangle ____

R - Religiousness
SS - Social Skills
MJ - Moral Judgment
### TABLE 5A
MULTITRAIT - MULTISOURCE MATRIX INCLUDING ALL PEER RATINGS WITH SELF RATINGS EXTRACTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>1. Teacher Ratings</th>
<th>2. All Peer Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher Ratings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.62&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>.66&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; .82&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All Peer Ratings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>.64&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; .78&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; .77&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.51&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; .81&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; .87&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.83&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>.61&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; .79&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; .87&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.80&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; .94&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- <sup>a</sup> - \( p < .05 \)
- <sup>b</sup> - \( p < .01 \)
- <sup>c</sup> - \( p < .001 \)
- <sup>d</sup> - \( p < .0001 \)

Validity diagonal - underlined values.

R - Religiousness
SS - Social Skills
MJ - Moral Judgment
TABLE 6
MULTITRAIT - MULTISOURCE MATRIX
WITH SAME SEX PEER RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>TRAITS</th>
<th>1. Teacher Ratings</th>
<th>2. Self Ratings</th>
<th>3. S.S. Peer Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.S. Peer Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.69&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.67&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a - p < .05
b - p < .01
c - p < .001
d - p < .0001

R - Religiousness
SS - Social Skills
MJ - Moral Judgment

Validity diagonals - underlined values.
TABLE 6A
MULTITRAIT - MULTISOURCE MATRIX
INCLUDING SAME SEX PEER RATINGS WITH
SELF RATINGS EXTRACTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>1. Teacher Ratings</th>
<th>2. S.S. Peer Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOURCES</td>
<td>TRAITS R SS MJ R SS MJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher Ratings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS .62c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MJ .66d .82d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. S.S. Peer Ratings</td>
<td>R .46b .69d .67d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS .46b .83d .77d .76d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MJ .56c .75d .79d .65d .89d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a - p < .05  
* b - p < .01  
* c - p < .001  
* d - p < .0001  

Validity diagonal - underlined values.  

R - Religiousness  
SS - Social Skills  
MJ - Moral Judgment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>TRAITS</th>
<th>1. Teacher Ratings</th>
<th>2. Self Ratings</th>
<th>3. O.S. Peer Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher Ratings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self Ratings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. O.S. Peer Ratings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.69&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.52&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.63&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- <sup>a</sup> - p < .05
- <sup>b</sup> - p < .01
- <sup>c</sup> - p < .001
- <sup>d</sup> - p < .0001

Validity diagonals - underlined values

R - Religiousness
SS - Social Skills
MJ - Moral Judgment
TABLE 7A
MULTITRAIT - MULTISOURCE MATRIX
INCLUDING OPPOSITE SEX PEER RATINGS WITH
SELF RATINGS EXTRACTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>1. Teacher Ratings</th>
<th>2. O.S. Peer Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher Ratings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>.66\textsuperscript{d}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. O.S. Peer Ratings</td>
<td>R .69\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>.52\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS .52\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>.67\textsuperscript{d}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MJ .58\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>.57\textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a - $p < .05$

b - $p < .01$
c - $p < .001$
d - $p < .0001$

Validity diagonal - underlined values.

R - Religiousness
SS - Social Skills
MJ - Moral Judgment
correlations and because the same-sex and opposite-sex correlations are derived from the all peer correlations, Tables 5 and 5A will be the chief points of reference for the following discussion.

For convergent validity to be demonstrated in the matrix the designated values in "... the validity diagonals should be significantly different from zero and sufficiently large to encourage further examination of validity" (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). That is, there should be relatively large correlations between measures of the same trait across the different rating sources, teacher, self, and peer. Thus, it was expected that correlations among the three measures of religiousness would be relatively large. However, this requirement was satisfied only with teacher and peer ratings of religiousness ($r = .64$, $p < .0001$). Self ratings of religiousness, whether correlated with teacher ratings ($r = .02$) or peer ratings ($r = .18$) yielded extremely low and statistically nonsignificant correlations. A similar pattern emerged with correlations between ratings of moral judgment. Teacher and peer ratings of moral judgment resulted in a highly significant correlation of .87 ($p < .001$), and yet self ratings, again, showed low and statistically nonsignificant correlations with teacher ratings ($r = .24$) and with peer ratings ($r = .35$) of moral judgment. Similar findings occurred when correlations between ratings of social skills were examined. Teacher and peer ratings of social skills correlated with statistical significance ($r = .81$, $p < .0001$). Yet self ratings, when correlated with teacher ratings ($r = .30$) and with peer ratings ($r = .31$) resulted in low and statistically nonsignificant values.

Only three of the nine correlations in the validity diagonals
of the multitrait-multisource matrix meet the specified requirement of being significantly different from zero and sufficiently large to encourage further examination of validity. Therefore, it cannot be claimed that convergent validity in the matrix has been established. When, however, self ratings are extracted from the matrix, as shown in the reduced matrix in Table 5A (as well as in Tables 6A and 7A) convergent validity is demonstrated.

A second part of Hypothesis I.A. stated that discriminant validity would not be evident in the multitrait-multisource matrix. That is, if religiousness and moral judgment are related in a positive and statistically significant fashion, then correlations between them should be high whether judged by the same source or by different sources, either teacher, self, or peers.

Discriminant validity is determined by three criteria (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). The first is that a value in a validity diagonal should be larger than the values lying in its column and row in the heterotrait-heterosource triangles, or those enclosed by a broken line in Table 5. Since such is not generally the case with the values in the matrix, one requirement for discriminant validity has not been met. It will be remembered from the statement of Hypothesis I.A. that to show a relationship between the variables of religiousness and moral judgment, discriminant validity should not be found. That is, correlations should be high between the different traits, religiousness and moral judgment, based on the same or different rating sources.

A second requirement for discriminant validity "... is that a variable correlate higher with an independent effort to measure the
same trait than with measures designed to get at different traits which happen to employ the same method. For a given variable, this involves comparing its values in the validity diagonals with its values in the heterotrait-monomethod triangles" enclosed by a solid line in Table 5 (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). Again the data in the matrix do not fulfill this condition.

A third condition contributing to discriminant validity is that each triangle in the matrix exhibit a like pattern of trait interrelationship. This provision has been met to some degree, with social skills and moral judgment the highest correlation in 6 of the 9 triangles and the other two correlations within each triangle at a lower level but close in value to one another. So evidence for the third condition for discriminant validity is equivocal.

The overall finding is that correlations are, in fact, generally high between the different traits, religiousness and moral judgment. Since correlations tend to be reduced in a homogeneous group of subjects, such as the students used in this study, one could expect larger correlations in a nonhomogeneous group.

Because some degree of convergent validity has been found and much evidence for discriminant validity is lacking within the multitrait-multisource matrix, Part A of Hypothesis I can be confirmed to some extent. That there is a positive and significant relationship between religiousness and moral judgment is undeniable, but the relationship must be qualified, especially when the individual himself is a respondent.
Hypothesis I. B. - DIT & RBQ

Part B. of Hypothesis I, that scores from the Religious Belief Questionnaire (RBQ) would correlate significantly with scores on the Defining Issues Test (DIT) of moral judgment, fails to gain support in the data. It was expected that the relationship between religiousness and moral judgment would be evident not only in intercorrelations of the multitrait-multisource matrix, but also between two established, standardized tests of religious belief and moral reason. However, the correlation between scores on the two tests, the RBQ and the DIT, was a low $r = .09$. And yet the DIT moral judgment measure correlated .49 with the self rating of religiousness (SRR), statistically significant at the .01 level. The two self-endorsed religious measures, the RBQ and the SRR, themselves correlated .36 ($p < .05$). Though some of the items in both tests are similar - for example: SRR 1. Goes to church and RBQ 52. I believe in keeping the Sabbath; SRR 4. Prays and RBQ 24. I can talk to God in prayer and He hears me; SRR 7. Reads the Bible and RBQ 30. I believe that the Bible is the word of God. - the items express either a behavior or action in the SRR versus a belief or principle in the RBQ. Of course, belief and action are not always consistent.

It is the more behavioral measure of religiousness, the SRR, which produced a statistically significant correlation ($r = .49, p < .01$) with the DIT. Self ratings of religiousness tended toward the positive pole, as did responses on the RBQ. The mean for SRR (3.20, $s = 1.06, n = 30$) is statistically higher ($p < .01$) than the means of teacher ratings of religiousness (2.61, $s = .95, n = 32$) and all peer
ratings of religiousness (2.16, s=.51, n=34). On the RBQ the mean score obtained was 276.97 (s=40.9), which converted to a percentage score of 83.2.

A factor which may account for the RBQ's low correlation with the DIT is the restricted range of scores on the RBQ, as shown in Table 8, and on the DIT. One can observe in Table 8 that 26 of the 32 RBQ scores were distributed in the upper quarter and that only two scores fell below the mid-point of the scale. On the DIT 15 of the P% scores were distributed in the lower quarter; eleven were found in the second quarter; two were placed in the third quarter; and none were apportioned to the upper quarter. It appears that many of the scores on the RBQ clustered near the high end of the scale and that many of the P% indices on the DIT fell near the low end of its scale. If the range of scores were greater, the obtained correlation would likely be higher. On the SRR scores ranged the full bandwidth from a minimum of 1 to a maximum of 5.

Since each hypothesis has been considered in relation to the results, attention can now be turned to the remainder of the results obtained in this study. As stated previously, the findings relevant to the social skills variable will be presented next, followed by results from a partial correlation. A presentation of descriptive statistics for test scores will follow, focusing particularly on the DIT. A fourth part will provide data on the gender differences found in the peer ratings, and a brief section will follow on the canonical correlation analysis.
TABLE 8

RELIGIOUS BELIEF QUESTIONNAIRE

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=32
Mean RBQ score: 276.97
Mean %: 83.2%
Social Skills Variable

Although the concept of social skills was included to help clarify the relationship between religiousness and moral judgment, results from the multitrait-multisource matrix in Table 5 show that social skills related to religion and even more so to moral judgment in much the same way that religiousness and moral judgment related to each other. Social skills and religiousness and social skills and moral judgment showed a positive relationship at statistically significant levels when rated by teacher and peers, and even in some cases, the individual student. These findings will be discussed further in relation to method variance, response set, and interrelationship of the three traits.

Partial Correlation

Partial correlations were computed to show the relationship between religiousness and moral judgment while adjusting for the effects of the social skill variable. The partial correlation is based on the assumption of linear relationships among the variables. By making statistical predictions of religiousness and moral judgment from the knowledge of the effect that social skills has on the two variables and then finding the difference between the original and the predicted values, one derives new variables which are uncorrelated with the social skills control variable. The linear effect of the control variable, social skills, is removed from the religiousness and moral judgment variables, and the correlation between their adjusted values is the partial correlation (Nie et al., 1979).

Whereas the original correlation for teacher ratings of
religiousness and moral judgment was .66 (p < .0001), the partial correlation was .33 (p < .035, n=28). For self ratings of religiousness and moral judgment the correlation was .21; the partial correlation was -.03 (p=.446, n=25). All peer ratings of religiousness and moral judgment correlated .80 (p < .0001); after the effect of social skills was controlled, the correlation was .11 (p=.277, n=31). The correlation for same sex peer ratings of religiousness and moral judgment was .65 (p < .0001); the partial correlation was -.08 (p=.329, n=31). Opposite sex peer ratings of religiousness and moral judgment correlated .61 (p < .0001); the partial correlation was -.001 (p=.498, n=31).

**Descriptive Statistics for Test Scores**

The descriptive statistics for the test scores in the study are presented in Table 9. A more detailed examination of results from the DIT will now be made.

Regarding the moral judgment test, the Defining Issues Test, it can be seen from Table 9 that the P% or percentage of principled level moral choices made by the students ranged from 3.3 to 40.0 with a mean P% score of 19.3. For each subject the P% score is found by adding raw scores from moral stages 5A, 5B, and 6, the principled moral stage levels, and dividing by .3 (3 being the number of stories in the short form DIT).

Since the P% score ignores moral levels below Stage 5, it can be useful to have an indication of scores in the lower stages. For this purpose Rest (1979b) recommends a group stage profile. Such a profile for the sample in this study is presented in Figure 1. The subjects had a group mean score of 23.3 in Stage 2, 27.3 in Stage 3, 34.4 in
## Table 9

### Descriptive Statistics for Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Relig.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Relig.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Peer</td>
<td>Relig.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Peer</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Peer</td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S. Peer</td>
<td>Relig.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S. Peer</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S. Peer</td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.S. Peer</td>
<td>Relig.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.S. Peer</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.S. Peer</td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>RBQ</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>276.97</td>
<td>40.90</td>
<td>147.00</td>
<td>314.00</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1

DIT STAGE SCORE USAGE - GROUP STAGE PROFILE

Note: The mean P% score of 19.29 was determined from scores on Stages 5A, 5B, and 6, the stages of principled moral reasoning.
Stage 4, 15.6 in Stage 5A, 8.5 in Stage 5B, 5.3 in Stage 6, 7.8 of A items which typify an "anti-establishment" orientation, and 7.94 for M items.

The mean P% of 19.3 for eighth graders is comparable to other results reported by Rest (1979b). The average P% scores for eighth graders as reported in several different studies are given below in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though 33 students in this study completed the DIT, five of the tests were invalidated because of inconsistencies (n=3) or excessive choices of "M" items (n=2). "M" items are those lofty but nonsensical statements included in the test to distinguish authentic high level moral reasoning from endorsement of seemingly complex but meaningless items. Rest notes that one typically loses 5-15% of the sample due to the reliability checks in the DIT. The loss of five in this study is within the typical range, though at the high end. The reasons for this are probably because of the subjects' age, which is at the lower limit for the DIT, and possibly, also, because the subjects included students of lower academic ability who might not have understood the test clearly.
Gender Differences in Peer Ratings

As can be seen in Table 9, peer ratings were determined not only across all 34 classmates of both genders but also for same sex and opposite sex peers. Some research with peer ratings has shown a bias in favor of same sex peers over opposite sex peers, particularly at this age level (Hartup, 1970). In the present study the mean ratings given peers of the same sex were consistently higher (religiousness 2.41, \( se = .73 \); social skills 3.07, \( se = .52 \); moral judgment 3.39, \( se = .64 \)) than the means of all peer ratings (religiousness 2.16, \( se = .64 \); social skills 3.04, \( se = .47 \); moral judgment 3.34, \( se = .56 \)), which were in turn slightly higher than the mean scores given peers of the opposite sex (religiousness 2.07, \( se = .47 \); social skills 3.03, \( se = .47 \); moral judgment 3.32, \( se = .56 \)). These results are presented in Table 11. These differences were in the expected direction judging from previous investigations. The difference in religiousness scores between same sex and opposite sex peers was statistically significant (\( t = 2.2880, df = 66, p < .05 \)).

The sex differences by group were broken down into male-female mean ratings for same sex or opposite sex peers. These results are presented in Table 12. Girls gave other female students the highest mean ratings on religiousness (2.83, \( se = .68 \)), social skills (3.32, \( se = .47 \)), and moral judgment (3.64, \( se = .60 \)), whereas boys gave other male students the lowest mean scores on religiousness (2.03, \( se = .57 \)), social skills (2.84, \( se = .46 \)), and moral judgment (3.17, \( se = .62 \)). The differences between the means of girls' ratings of girls and boys' ratings of boys were statistically significant in every case: religiousness
TABLE 11
PEER RATING MEAN SCORES - SEX DIFFERENCES BY GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>All Peer Mean</th>
<th>All Peer S.D.</th>
<th>Same Sex Mean</th>
<th>Same Sex S.D.</th>
<th>Opposite Sex Mean</th>
<th>Opposite Sex S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiousness</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>2.41*</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2.07*</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Judgment</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There was a statistically significant difference between the means of same sex peer rating of religiousness and opposite sex peer ratings of religiousness ($t=2.880, df=66, p < .05$).
### TABLE 12

**PEER RATING MEAN SCORES - MALE-FEMALE SEX DIFFERENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>Same Sex</th>
<th>Opposite Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M by M</td>
<td>F by F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiousness</td>
<td>2.03 ± .57</td>
<td>2.83 ± .68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>2.84 ± .46</td>
<td>3.32 ± .47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Judgment</td>
<td>3.17 ± .62</td>
<td>3.64 ± .60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There were statistically significant differences between the means of the following groups:

- a - \( p < .01 \) Males by males and females by females, religiousness
- b - \( p < .05 \) Males by males and females by females, social skills
- c - \( p < .05 \) Males by males and females by females, moral judgment
- d - \( p < .01 \) Males by females and females by females, religion
- e - \( p < .05 \) Males by females and females by females, social
- f - \( p < .05 \) Males by females and females by females, moral
(t=3.658, df=32, p < .01); social skills (t=2.047, df=32, p < .05); and moral judgment (t=2.253, df=32, p < .05).

A comparison of opposite sex ratings by each gender, however, showed no statistically significant differences. For example, on religiousness girls gave boys a mean rating of 2.08 (s=.58), while boys rated girls 2.06 (s=.33). On social skills girls' mean rating of boys was 2.97 (s=.46), and boys' mean rating of girls was 3.10 (s=.49). The difference again was statistically nonsignificant. On moral judgment girls gave boys a mean rating of 3.25 (s=.46), and boys gave girls a mean score of 3.40 (s=.66). This difference was also statistically nonsignificant.

When the data from the same sex and opposite sex columns were regrouped for girls' ratings of both girls and boys and boys' ratings of both girls and boys, it became apparent that girls' ratings of other girls were higher than were their ratings of boys, and that the differences were statistically significant. On religiousness girls' rating of girls was 2.83 (s=.68) and girls' rating of boys was 2.08 (s=.58): (t=3.437, df=32, p < .01). On social skills girls' rating of girls was 3.32 (s=.47), and girls' ratings of boys was 2.97 (s=.46): (t=2.245, df=32, p < .05). On moral judgment girls' rating of girls was 3.64 (s=.60), and girls' ratings of boys was 3.25 (s=.46): (t=2.098, df=32, p < .05).

Though boys also rated girls higher than they rated other boys on all three measures, the differences between boys' ratings were not statistically significant. On religiousness boys' rating of girls was 2.06 (s=.33), while boys' ratings of boys was 2.03 (s=.57);
(nonsignificant difference). On social skills boys rated girls 3.10 (s=.49), and boys rated boys 2.84 (s=.46). This difference was also lacking in statistical significance. On moral judgment boys gave girls a mean score of 3.40 (s=.66), while they gave other boys a mean score of 3.17 (s=.62). Again, there was no statistically significant difference.

In Tables 11 and 12 it is apparent that boys and girls were alike in consistently rating religiousness lowest, social skills next highest, and moral judgment highest. It will be noted from the more-inclusive Table 9 that, without exception, all groupings of respondents including teacher and self showed this pattern. That is, within each subject group, there was a regular trend of increasing mean scores from religiousness to social skills to moral judgment.

**Canonical Correlation Analysis**

In addition to the Pearson r correlation coefficients that were performed among the variables in the study, a canonical correlation analysis was computed (Hotelling, 1935, 1936). The aim of canonical correlation analysis is to maximize the correlation between two sets of variables. One set of variables consisted of teacher and all peer ratings of religiousness, social skills, and moral judgment, while the other set consisted of scores on the Defining Issues Test of moral judgment and the Religious Belief Questionnaire. The procedure produced results that were non-significant for the two discriminant functions (F=.87, p=.58; F=.74, p=.60).
DISCUSSION

In the introduction of this paper a problematic issue in the study of moral development was set forth: Does religion relate to moral judgment? It was shown that the leading authority in the field of moral development, Lawrence Kohlberg, would probably answer that religion is not a necessary or highly important correlate of moral judgment. He and other researchers can marshal evidence in support of his position. But still other investigators disagree, just as some researchers have differed with other aspects of Kohlberg’s theories, system, and method. These students of moral development can provide experimental results consistent with their conviction that religiousness and moral judgment relate in an important way. So considerable controversy exists on this issue, and the matter awaits resolution.

The debate on the relationship between religiousness and moral judgment is primarily of theoretical importance, but it has practical implications as well. It has a bearing on child-rearing practices, education, and corrections and rehabilitation. By studying the topic of moral reasoning and religion one can gain an understanding of moral development and personality.

Therefore, the subject of religiousness and moral judgment seemed worthy of further investigation. The present study did not propose so ambitious a goal as to quell all argument on the matter but was intended as one of a series of studies which might eventually
produce consequential findings. For example, it was an original aim of the study to compare religiousness and moral judgment in public, private, and parochial schools so as to better address the question of the role of religious education in the development of moral reason. But first an examination had to be made of subjects within one school in order to test the more basic question of whether, in fact, religiousness and moral judgment do relate. If, then, a relationship were found, it could be investigated further in different settings.

The major finding of this study is that religiousness and moral judgment, as rated by a student's peers and teacher, have been shown to relate in a positive way and at statistically significant levels. This finding holds true very strongly for teacher and classmates' perceptions of individuals in this study, and the relationship is shown in some cases for an individual's own self evaluation. Since the results were obtained for eighth grade students, one might expect even more correlation between religiousness and moral judgment if older students and adults were tested. Because of the stage of intellectual development typical at age 13, a youth of this age is not usually capable of generalizing to a great degree and tends to be more specific in terms of behaviors, beliefs, and judgments. With increasing age and capacity for generalization, then, the obtained correlations should be even more pronounced.

In this study the teacher's own appraisals of religiousness and moral judgment showed high and statistically significant agreement, as did peers' estimations of a classmate's religiousness and moral judgment. Results from the partial correlation showed that when the social
skill variable was controlled, teacher ratings of religiousness and moral judgment still correlated at a statistically significant level, whereas peer ratings no longer did. The findings in regard to teacher ratings are therefore strengthened, but the results from the peer ratings are weakened by the information from the partial correlations. Correlation coefficients in this study showed that teacher and peers agreed between themselves at statistically significant levels on the relationship of religiousness and moral judgment for a given student. The individual agreed with his peers' ratings of his religiousness in his self-rating of moral judgment. The individual's religiousness also related to his score on the DIT moral judgment measure.

What the multitrait-multisource matrix demonstrated was the strong relationship among teacher ratings, among peer ratings, and between teacher and peer ratings, and the generally low and inconsistent correlations with self ratings. Self ratings have been shown to be unreliable in other investigations. In their original article Campbell and Fiske (1959) examined a study which involved three rating sources, Staff, Self, and Teammate, which are similar to the Teacher, Self, and Peer of this study. It was noted that the staff and teammate both represented the external point of view, that the ratings were averaged (as in the peer ratings in this study), thus minimizing individual biases and increasing reliability, and that the self ratings tended toward the favorable pole, which reduced the range of the measures. It has been documented in other research that self-report can be undependable when the self has knowledge not available to others or when image or personal interest is at stake, as it might well have been in
rating one's own moral judgment, social skills, and religiousness.

It might be argued that there is considerable method variance present within the multitrait-multisource matrix. It was expected that some method variance would be evident since Campbell and Fiske (1959) had written of this effect in studies using rating methods. They stated, "Within the monomethod sections, errors of measurement will be correlated, raising the general level of values found, while within the heteromethods block, measurement errors are independent, and tend to lower the values both along the validity diagonal and in the heterotrait triangles. These effects, which may also be stated in terms of method factors or shared confounded irrelevancies, operate strongly . . . probably in all data involving ratings."

Because teacher and peers agreed not only on the religiousness and moral judgment of an individual student but also on his social skills, it might be suggested that the external observers' ratings were the product of a response set or "halo" effect. That is, if a student were rated high in a given area, he would also tend to be rated high in other areas. The concept of social skills or social conformity in the classroom, which was included to see if subjects would distinguish it from religiousness and moral judgment, failed to emerge in the data as a separate construct. The initial finding among the correlation coefficients in the multitrait-multisource matrix was that teachers and peers did not discriminate very much in their ratings of the three concepts. One preliminary explanation was that they had a tendency to attribute high or low marks to an individual on all three rating scales because of their perceptions or knowledge of the student as
being "high" or "low" in certain traits. They might even have given students high or low scores based primarily on their familiarity with other characteristics, such as academic or athletic ability, leadership skills, popularity, etc.

However, an alternative and equally plausible interpretation of the high intercorrelations of religiousness, moral judgment, and social skills when rated by teacher and peers was that the three traits, as assessed in this study, do relate strongly with one another and that they share commonality. For example, one might well expect that a student who behaves well at school and shows highly developed socialization is apt to have a good understanding of right from wrong and a commitment to justice and fairness to others, concepts which are related to high moral development. Certainly, for individuals with sociopathic personalities this expectation would not be true. One might also expect that consideration for others and respect for authority, as evaluated in the social skills scale, would also be characteristics of religiousness.

Results from the partial correlations suggest that teacher ratings of religiousness and moral judgment were independent of their ratings of social skills, but that the young students' ratings of religiousness and moral judgment were related to their ratings of social skills, either from a halo effect or lack of knowledge of the distinctions among the three variables.

Discussion will now turn to the lack of confirmation of Hypothesis I.B., which predicted a statistically significant correlation between scores on the DIT and the RBQ. It will be remembered that although the
DIT and the RBQ correlated at low and nonsignificant levels statistically, a serendipitous finding was that the DIT moral judgment test did correlate with statistical significance with the self rating of religiousness. So although Hypothesis I.B. was not confirmed by the single numerical value necessary, the moral judgment measure did indeed relate with statistical significance to a religious measure completed by each individual.

This statistically significant correlation was the sole one found with the DIT, a finding for which chance alone could account. It is striking that the only statistically significant correlation with the RBQ was also the self rating of religiousness. And for the SRR, these two statistically significant correlations were, again, the only ones found. Yet since the self ratings in general were so out of synchrony with teacher and peer ratings, it is interesting that the self rating of religiousness was the only measure which did happen to show statistically significant correlations not only with the RBQ but also with the DIT.

For the subjects in this study there was a high concentration at the upper levels of religious belief on the RBQ. And yet the public junior high school was especially chosen as the source of the subjects so as to have greater dispersion of scores than might be expected in a parochial or private school. It may be that the RBQ evokes generally high levels of religious belief, but it is more likely that the young subjects from the small Louisiana town in this study are on the whole high in religious belief. It must be remembered that religious orientation is a multidimensional construct and that different assessments
can tap different dimensions.

Another consideration is Rest's caveat that the DIT can be significantly affected by regional differences and by the degree of dogmatism or humanism of one's religion. Most of the subjects in this study could be designated as orthodox or traditionally religious persons, judging from their religious affiliations. The denominations, which include conventional and fundamentalistic churches, are as follows: World Wide Church of God (1), Christ Gospel (1), Jehovah's Witness (1), Church of God (1), Mormon (1), Pentecostal (2), Assembly of God (3), Baptist (9), Methodist (5), Episcopal (1), unspecified Protestants (2), and Roman Catholics (7). Further research could investigate differences in religious belief and moral judgment among Catholic, mainstream Protestant, and fundamentalist groups. There were too few subjects in this study to make the appropriate comparisons.

Parenthetically, the low correlations of the DIT with other moral judgment ratings may be due to their sampling in two different domains: the process of cognitive moral reasoning in the case of the DIT and the content of moral knowledge and behavior in the case of the moral judgment rating scale. Though an attempt was made to assess the same construct with the moral judgment measure, the task involved in the rating scale is different from that of the DIT.

The distinction between moral judgment and moral behavior is well documented in the literature (Rothman, 1980). Although Piaget himself did not research the relationship between moral judgment and moral behavior, he did suggest that children's active knowledge may precede their theoretical understanding. Thus, a child's moral behavior may be
at a higher level than his conceptual morality. Often, however, one may not use his moral knowledge in real-life situations, particularly those involving one's self interest.

Rothman (1980) comments that the relationship between moral stage and behavioral choice is complex and often ambiguous. Factors that may affect the influence of moral reasoning on moral behavior include situational variables, ego-strength, affective reactions, and a person's role-taking ability. Still, structuralists believe that moral judgment is predictive of moral behavior under certain conditions, whereas social learning theorists do not recognize a strong link between the two. Kohlberg and his colleagues have reported a greater consistency between moral judgment and behavior in adulthood and at the more advanced moral stages.

A finding relevant to the gender differences in peer ratings will now be discussed. One of the results of this study was that girls rate other girls higher than they rate boys on religiousness, social skills, and moral judgment, and that these differences are statistically significant. This finding is interpreted not so much as a bias in girls' ratings but probably more as an indication of fact. For example, it is not unreasonable to expect that girls of this age do walk through the hall more quietly (social skills) and participate in church-related activities more often (religiousness) than boys of this age. This interpretation is corroborated by the evidence that boys also rate girls higher than other boys on the three rating scales. The magnitude of the differences of the girl's ratings was greater than the boy's ratings.
Some observations concerning the actual assessment and data-gathering will be made at this point. Although most of the subjects accepted the tests with alacrity, a few complained of the length of the tests, especially the social skills rating scale, and the tedious nature of rating 34 classmates on a number of items. The social skills scale (16 items, 34 students = 544 rating decisions) was twice as long as the moral judgment scale (8 items, 272 numerical ratings) and over twice as long as the religiousness scale (7 items, 238 ratings). Over the course of three days each student had to make 1054 ratings. Since the order of the tests was randomized, some of the students finished each day in less than the allotted time, while others labored to complete their ratings within the class period. A few students asked the meaning of words such as relevant and productively on the social skills scale. Since the reliability of all the rating scales was quite high, as shown in Tables 1 and 2, it is expected that the social skills scale could be shortened to one page or less and its wording adapted to this age level without seriously damaging its internal consistency. On the religiousness and moral judgment scales a few of the items could be reworked to reduce ambiguity. Some of the students protested that they had little knowledge of the habits of prayer, Bible reading, and church attendance of their peers for the religiousness rating scale.

Several students also expressed difficulty with the more abstract statements of the Religious Belief Questionnaire. The RBQ was somewhat disappointing in its low yield in relation to the time spent taking the test. It resulted in only a single numerical score with
no other information to be drawn. If other conclusions could be inferred from results on the RBQ, perhaps more meaning could be derived from its low correlation with the DIT and with teacher and peer religious ratings.

The subjects appeared to find the Defining Issues Test an easier task than the examiner expected. This finding was surprising since the subjects were at the lower end of the recommended age range. The most difficult part for the students seemed to be understanding how to rank in order of importance the twelve considerations that were first rated. The printed instructions for this Part B of the DIT seemed confusing even to the examiner.

These remarks about the administration of the measures are made chiefly for full documentation of the study. Overall, there were no major problems with the tests as given. However, choices of different religious and/or moral judgment tests might be made in future research. Stevens et al. (1977) had cautioned that the type of moral assessment used had an effect on the relationship found between religious influences and moral reasoning. Since Hypothesis I.B. was the only one not supported by the data, it would be interesting to see if different instruments would produce different results.

In considering once again the major finding of this study, that perceptions of religiousness and moral judgment correlate at statistically significant levels, especially between teacher and peers, it could be argued that self ratings might better have been omitted. The low and usually nonsignificant correlations with self ratings might be seen as intrusions into the orderly pattern of high and statistically
significant correlations found for teacher and peers.

But in some ways, the low correlations for self ratings are the most interesting parts of the study, aside from the confirmation of Hypotheses I and I.A. The subjects in this study, at the average age of 13, are predominantly at the conventional moral stage according to their DIT scores. One could expect that as the students progress in cognitive development and moral development, they might also increase their self-perspective. For example, their self ratings might correlate more highly with ratings from teacher and peers. Research following the longitudinal development of these subjects would be instructive on this point.

Kohlberg has shown that individuals progress from egocentrism at preconventional moral levels to universal ethical considerations at the principled stage of moral development. Werner also has theorized (Langer, 1970) about the change from egocentrism to perspectivism, saying that there is a "... shift from diffuse self-perception at primitive stages to an articulate self-perspective at advanced stages of development." Through development the individual achieves greater detachment and acquires a transcendent capacity to see himself better and to adopt the perspective of others. Piaget (1970) has spoken of the process in this way:

The gradually emerging equilibrium between assimilation and accommodation is the result of successive decenterations which make it possible for the subject to take the points of view of other subjects or objects themselves. . . One of the fundamental processes of cognition is that of decenteration relative to subjective illusion, and this process has dimensions that are social or interpersonal as well as rational.
In a future study investigating an hypothesized increase in self-perspective, one might use a social role-taking measure to assess the subjects' cognitive capacity to view events from others' perspectives. Other suggestions for future research are to test a sample with a wider range of religious beliefs and to compare subjects at this age level in different school settings to see if the presence of religious education has a bearing on the results. Also recommended is a factor analytic study to distinguish the belief and behavioral elements in both moral reasoning and religiousness.
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APPENDIX II

RELIGIOUSNESS RATINGS

DIRECTIONS:

The purpose of this activity is to find out which people in the class do certain things more than others. You will see 7 sentences listed down the side of the page and your classmates' names listed across the page. Rate each of the students as follows:

- 5 = If the person does the following things very often.
- 4 = If the person does these things a lot of the time.
- 3 = If the person does these things sometimes.
- 2 = If the person does these things a little of the time.
- 1 = If the person does these things almost never.
- 0 = If you don't know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Name 1</th>
<th>Name 2</th>
<th>Name 3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Goes to church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Follows his/her religion in everyday life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participates in church-related activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Speaks of religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Behaves in a religious way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reads the Bible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

DIRECTIONS: SOCIAL SKILLS RATINGS

The purpose of this activity is to find out which people in the class do certain things more than others. You will see 16 sentences listed down the side of the page and your classmates' names listed across the page. Rate each of the students as follows:

5 = If the person does the following things almost all the time. 5 = Almost all the time
4 = If the person does these things a lot of the time. 4 = A lot
3 = If the person does these things sometimes. 3 = Sometimes
2 = If the person does these things a little of the time. 2 = A little
1 = If the person does these things almost never. 1 = Almost never
0 = If you don't know. 0 = Don't know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Name 1</th>
<th>Name 2</th>
<th>Name 3</th>
<th>Name 4</th>
<th>Name 5</th>
<th>Name 6</th>
<th>Name 7</th>
<th>Name 8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participates in class discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tries to answer questions when called upon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Smiles when meeting friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Willingly has work displayed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Walks through the hall quietly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Undertakes new tasks with positive attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Complies with requests of adults in authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Uses time productively while waiting for help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name 1</td>
<td>Name 2</td>
<td>Name 3</td>
<td>Name 4</td>
<td>Name 5</td>
<td>Name 6</td>
<td>Name 7</td>
<td>Name 8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Knows and follows classroom rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Works steadily for the required time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Volunteers answers to teacher's questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Does seatwork assignments quietly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Makes relevant remarks in class discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greets adults and peers by name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Finds acceptable ways to use free time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Enters classroom and takes seat without disturbing objects and others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX IV**

**MORAL JUDGMENT RATINGS**

**DIRECTIONS:**

The purpose of this activity is to find out which people in the class do certain things more than others. You will see 8 sentences listed down the side of the page and your classmates' names listed across the page. Rate each of the students as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>If the person does the following things <strong>almost all the time</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>If the person does these things <strong>a lot of the time</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If the person does these things <strong>sometimes</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If the person does these things <strong>a little of the time</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If the person does these things <strong>almost never</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>If you <strong>don't know</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Name 1</th>
<th>Name 2</th>
<th>Name 3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has high standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is good at determining right from wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has a strong conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is fair toward others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Says and does the same thing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is unselfish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Keeps promises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VII

RELIGIOUS DATA SURVEY

1. NAME:

2. SEX:

3. AGE:

4. GRADE:

5. RELIGION:

6. HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN A MEMBER OF THIS RELIGION?

7. RELIGION OF PARENTS - FATHER:

   MOTHER:

8. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU ATTENDED THIS SCHOOL?

   ANOTHER PUBLIC SCHOOL?

   A CATHOLIC SCHOOL?

   ANOTHER RELIGIOUS SCHOOL?

   ANOTHER PRIVATE SCHOOL?

9. HOW LONG HAVE YOU KNOWN MOST OF YOUR CLASSMATES?
Kathleen Marie Trudeau Cranford was born in Fall River, Massachusetts, on October 27, 1951. She was graduated from the University of Southwestern Louisiana in 1973 with a B.S. degree in psychology. She received an M.A. degree in clinical psychology from Louisiana State University in 1976.
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