

**RELATIONSHIPS AMONG FAITH DEVELOPMENT, EGO DEVELOPMENT, AND  
RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION IN HIV+ INDIVIDUALS:  
A CONSTRUCT VALIDATION STUDY**

by

Susan M. Driedger

B.A. (Hons), University of Manitoba, 1987

M.A., Simon Fraser University, 1989

**Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

in the Department

of

Psychology

© Susan M. Driedger, 1997

**SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY**

**October, 1997**

All rights reserved. This work may not be reproduced in whole or part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Acquisitions et  
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file Votre référence*

*Our file Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-24306-0

## APPROVAL

**Name:** Susan M. Driedger  
**Degree:** Doctor of Philosophy  
**Thesis Title:** Relationships Among Faith Development, Ego Development, and Religious Orientation in HIV+ Individuals: A Construct Validation Study

### Examining Committee:

**Chair:** Dr. Kim Bartholomew, Associate Professor

---

~~Dr. James E. Marcia~~, Professor  
Senior Supervisor,  
Department of Psychology, SFU

---

~~Dr. Anand Paranjpe~~, Professor  
Department of Psychology, SFU

---

~~Dr. Raymond Koopman~~, Associate Professor  
Department of Psychology, SFU

---

~~Dr. David Cox~~, Professor  
Department of Psychology, SFU

---

~~Dr. Lawrence J. Walker~~, Professor  
Department of Psychology  
University of British Columbia  
External Examiner

Date Approved:

Oct 9, 1997

## ABSTRACT

Faith, as defined by Fowler, is the tripartite relationship among self, other, and their shared center of value. The Faith Development Interview (FDI), based on psychological theories of development, assesses a person's stage of faith development by asking questions regarding life history, relationships, and existential values and beliefs. In this study, the FDI is assessed for structural wholeness and is compared with ego development and religious orientation to evaluate their role in the FDI's nomological network. Sixty-five HIV+ adults received the FDI, the Washington University Sentence Completion Test, and the Religious Orientation Scale. As expected, the structural wholeness of the FDI was supported, giving evidence that the FDI measures a single underlying construct. The FDI was most closely related to education ( $r = .48, p < .05$ ). Controlling for SES variables, faith development was significantly related to ego development ( $r = .31, p < .05$ ) and intrinsic religious orientation ( $r = .38, p < .005$ ). However, faith development was not significantly related to extrinsic religious orientation. Religious orientation was not significantly related to ego development. This pattern of relationships was further confirmed with a principal components factor analysis using varimax rotation. Qualitative differences were observed between respondents whose faith development and ego development scores differed by one or more stages. Those whose faith development score exceeded their ego development score tended to be emotionally stable and vitally engaged in living. Those respondents whose ego development score exceeded their faith development score tended to have unresolved emotional issues that had inhibited their ability to develop their faith, as expressed through satisfying relationships. These findings support faith development as a distinct theoretical construct that is related, but not equivalent, to both ego development

and religious orientation. Faith, as measured by the FDI, is a potentially powerful clinical tool that assesses cognitive and emotional processes using personal and existential content, regardless of religious orientation.

## **DEDICATION**

To Gerry, whose faith in me has never flagged and whose heart gives me the strength to love and grow.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When I started this research, I thought I would do it all on my own. In retrospect, I am grateful that many people came to my assistance to help me reach my goal.

First and foremost, I would like to thank Jim Marcia for his kind friendship and wisdom as he has guided me from throughout my graduate studies. My thanks also to Ray Koopman and Anand Paranjpe for sharing their joy of discovery with me. Thanks also to David Cox and Lawrence Walker for their thoughtful comments and suggestions.

I was privileged to have two fine research assistants. Thanks to Tamara Hanoski for her help with the transcriptions. Mary Dolman not only transcribed interviews, but she also helped to keep me and my data organized throughout this project, and she willingly took on the responsibility of scoring interview tapes. Best of all, she has become a good friend.

Several organizations have supported this research at various points. I would like to thank the National Research and Development Program for providing me with funds through their PhD Fellowship program. I would like to thank the People With AIDS Society for allowing me to advertise for research participants in their newsletter and St. Paul's Hospital Infectious Diseases Clinic for allowing me to advertise for research participants in their offices. Thanks to Friends For Life and the Gay and Lesbian Centre for providing space to run support groups. Special thanks go to Lou Demerais, the staff of Vancouver Native Health Society in general, and to Kathy Churchill, Viola Antoine, JoAnn Oppenheim, and Ross Albert in the HIV/AIDS Outreach Clinic in particular.

Thank you for introducing me to potential research participants from the Downtown Eastside, for providing space for a support group, and for generously sharing your time, friendship and support. I would also like to thank the Universal Gospel Choir, Point Grey Inter-Mennonite Fellowship, and the Christians In AIDS support group for helping to keep my spirit buoyant.

I am very grateful to Joan Foster and Elizabeth Michno for their computer expertise and their cheerful willing assistance. I couldn't have made it through this process without Lorie Tarcea's and Bev Davino's friendly and skillful guidance through the university administration.

Thanks to the friends who provided technical support and suggestions just when I needed them: Barry Ledwidge, Al and Wendy Thornton, Mark Bodnarchuk, Russell Pitts, Angela Haig and Russell Day. And thanks to the many friends from near and far who provided emotional support throughout this adventure: Glenn Martens, Marian Barnett, Michelle Langlois, Lisa Kristianson, Lisa Kohlmeier, Nina Preiswerk, Cheryl Bradley, Ann-Marie Neudorf, Jocelyne Lessard, Myles Hurtubise, Michelle Holmes, Jean Dudoward and Stan Matilpi, Anne Harvie, and Rikki Kooy, Isabel Proctor and Douglas Reynolds from the Douglas Reynolds Gallery.

My family helped me sustain the vision of this project long before I even knew what form it would take. Thank you Mum, Dad, Steve, Pat, and Emma for your ongoing love and support (in so many areas!).

Finally, I must extend my deepest gratitude to the men and women who volunteered to share their time and their stories of faith with me as research participants. Truly, I couldn't have done it without you! Over and over you showed the face of God to me. Thank you.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL .....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES .....	xi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Faith .....	2
Theological Roots of Fowler's Faith .....	2
Fowler's Definitions of Faith.....	3
Faith Development.....	5
Stages of Faith .....	6
Aspects of Faith .....	10
Theoretical and Empirical Evaluations of Faith Development	
Theory .....	12
Theoretical Critiques.....	12
Empirically Observed Relationships .....	14

Operationalizing the Vision (establishing construct validity) .....	18
Structural Wholeness .....	19
Adding Ego Development to the Nomological Network .....	20
Adding Religious Orientation to the Nomological Network. ....	24
Generalizing to an HIV/AIDS population.....	26
Research Questions .....	27
<b>METHOD.....</b>	<b>28</b>
Participants .....	28
Measures .....	30
Faith Development Interview. ....	30
Washington University Sentence Completion Test - Form 81. ....	46
Religious Orientation Scale . ....	54
Procedure .....	55
Interview and scale administration.....	55
Scoring. ....	56
<b>RESULTS.....</b>	<b>58</b>
Inter-rater Reliabilities .....	58
Research Question 1: Structural Wholeness of Faith Development .....	60
Relationships Among Faith Development, Ego Development, and Religious Orientation. ....	63
Research Question 2: Degree of relationship between faith development and ego development. ....	68
Research Question 4: Does faith development relate to religious orientation and does it relate more closely to religious orientation than does ego development? .....	76
<b>DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>80</b>
Structural Wholeness of Faith Development.....	80
Faith Development and Ego Development .....	80
Qualitative Differences in Faith Development and Ego Development .....	81
Faith Development, Ego Development, and Religious Orientation .....	82

Limitations of the study .....	84
The Construct Validity of Faith Development: Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research. ....	91

**REFERENCES..... 95**

Appendix A: Values, Belief Systems, and Life Experiences in Persons With HIV/AIDS .....	100
Appendix B: Confidentiality of Records .....	103
Appendix C: Informed Consent Form .....	105
Appendix D: Information about the Life Tapestry Exercise .....	107
Appendix E: Faith Development Interview .....	108
Appendix F: Washington University Sentence Completion Test.....	112
Appendix G: Religious Orientation Scale .....	114
Appendix H: Demographic Information .....	116
Appendix I: Faith Development: Sample characteristics- quantitative.....	118
Appendix J: Faith Development: Sample characteristics-qualitative. ...	119
Appendix K: Ego Development -- Examples and scoring criteria. ....	124
Appendix L: Ego development -- Quantitative characteristics. ....	127

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Stages of Faith (DeNicola, 1993).....	31
Table 2 Aspect A: Form of Logic (Piaget).....	34
Table 3 Aspect B: Perspective Taking (Selman).....	36
Table 4 Aspect C: Form of Moral Judgment (Kohlberg).....	38
Table 5 Aspect D: Bounds of Social Awareness.....	39
Table 6 Aspect E: Locus of Authority.....	41
Table 7 Aspect F: Form of World Coherence.....	43
Table 8 Aspect G: Symbolic Function.....	45
Table 9 Milestones of Ego Development <sup>a</sup> .....	47
Table 10 Correlations Between the Aspects of Faith.....	62
Table 11 FDI and WUSCT Distributions Across Stages in Percentages.....	64
Table 12 Crosstabulation of Frequencies of Stage/Level membership on FDI and WUSCT.....	66
Table 13 Crosstabulation of Rounded Frequencies of Stage/Level membership on FDI and WUSCT.....	67
Table 14 Correlations Between FDI, WUSCT, ROS, and SES Variables (N=61).....	70
Table 15 Partial Correlations: Controlling for Age, Education, and Income.....	71
Table 16 Principal Components Factor Matrix of Faith Development, Ego Development, Religious Orientation, & SES variables.....	78
Table 17 Rotated Factor Matrix.....	79

## INTRODUCTION

"Faith development theory, for all its technical language and abstract concepts, is an expression of the story of our search for communion ... Our restlessness for divine companionship, if denied, ignored, or distorted, dehumanizes us and we destroy each other. Recognized and nurtured, it brings us into that companionship with God which frees us for genuine partnership with our sisters and brothers, and for friendship with creation (Fowler, 1986a, p.40)."

It has been 16 years since James Fowler first published his theory of faith development in Stages of Faith (1981). Faith development theory is a theological theory of the human search for the transcendent and a psychological theory of development. It is a theory that attempts to provide a structural understanding of how faith grows and changes throughout life. It is a theory created on the grand scale of Eriksonian psychosocial development, proposing that there are six stages of faith development, to be evaluated along seven different, but related, aspects of faith, yielding a complex 6x7 array of characteristics of faith.

Fowler incorporates the work of structural-developmentalists Piaget and Kohlberg into his theory, attempting to define a structural progression of faith that has structural wholeness, hierarchy, and invariant sequentiality. However, while attempting to define the stage progression with the precision associated with psychological empiricists, Fowler also maintains that his definition of faith is multifaceted and ultimately ineffable.

Fowler is profoundly aware of the mystery of the Transcendent and the

grace that is given to humanity in our ability to have a relationship with the Divine. This is the essence of faith that breathes life into faith development theory. Unfortunately, it is also the point of departure for the psychological critiques regarding faith development theory. Fowler has not developed an invariant definition of faith, nor has he satisfactorily related the definition of faith to its operationalization in the stages of faith development. For faith and faith development to be acceptable within psychology it is necessary that they be more precisely defined themselves, or that a comprehensive line of construct validation research be completed. Even the generally accepted construct of ego development has lacked precision in its definition, however, the great amount of research that has incorporated Loevinger's measure of ego development has created an understanding of the construct, based upon knowledge of its nomological net (Hauser, 1976). The current research is undertaken in order to contribute to the construct validity and nomological network of faith development.

## ***Faith***

### **Theological Roots of Fowler's Faith**

Fowler draws from liberal twentieth century theologians Paul Tillich, H. Richard Niebuhr, and William Cantwell Smith in attempting to create a definition of faith that has both enough breadth and depth to encompass his vision of faith as a way of seeing and constructing the world (Fowler, 1981).

From the theologian Paul Tillich, Fowler (1981) takes the concept that faith is a function of whatever we hold to be the objects of our ultimate concern. Regardless of whether or not this ultimate concern is religious, it provides us with

the organizing principles of our existence. This concept removes faith from the exclusive province of theology, opening it up for a more psychological inspection.

From the theologian H. Richard Niebuhr, Fowler (1981) takes the view that faith is a function of our ability to trust in our relationships, in the world around us, in a center of value and power that can provide our lives with unity and meaning. This emphasis on faith's relational aspect again invites psychological investigation. According to W. C. Smith (as cited in Fowler, 1981), faith is described as being the basis for humans to relate to transcendence. The opposite of faith is despair, in which the ability to image any transcendent environment is lost.

Regardless of the content of religious beliefs, and regardless of how they are practiced, faith is a universal feature of all of them, and ultimately of being human. Smith equates all religious traditions with having as their ultimate desire that humans come into alignment with the transcendent, into a state of "resting the heart" in the transcendent.

Faith gives a sense of purpose and direction to the totality of one's life, both daily and throughout one's lifetime. The concept that faith might be relative, that religious claims and experiences are only important to the cultures from which they come, is rejected by Smith.

### **Fowler's Definitions of Faith**

Fowler's work is intended to expand on Tillich's idea that faith is not restricted to religion, Niebuhr's faith that is relational, and Smith's faith that is a universal feature of the human experience. Fowler compares faith with a

gemstone (Fowler, 1986b). Just as a gemstone has multifaceted beauty, purity, and invokes a sense of mystery and wonder at its very existence, so too does faith for Fowler. He defines faith from many angles, seemingly reveling in its apparently ephemeral nature. He construes faith to begin at birth, equating it with Erikson's Basic Trust. But faith is more than trust. Faith is deeper and more personal than religion or mere belief. It is meaning-making that may or may not be religious. It is a covenantal triadic relationship between self, other, and a shared center of value. It is our response to the Transcendent (Fowler, 1981).

Fowler's definition of faith has evolved and simplified over time. The formal definition of faith given in *Stages of Faith* (1981) is as follows:

"[Faith is]...people's evolved and evolving ways of experiencing self, others, and world (as they construct them); as related to and affected by the ultimate conditions of existence (as they construct them); and of shaping their lives' purposes and meanings, trusts and loyalties, in light of the character of being, value and power determining the ultimate conditions of existence (as grasped in their operative images -- conscious and unconscious -- of them)" (p. 92).

This complex definition appears to be an attempt to account for all possible facets of faith that could possibly be construed.

In a later definition, Fowler incorporates Robert Kegan's "constitutive-knowing" (Fowler, 1986a).

"Faith is: the process of constitutive-knowing; underlying a person's composition and maintenance of a comprehensive frame (or frames) of meaning; generated from the person's attachments or commitments to centers of superordinate value which have power to unify his or her experiences of the world; thereby endowing the relationships, contexts, and patterns of everyday life, past and future, with significance."(p. 25)



In a more recent, more refined definition, Fowler (1991) defines faith as:

"1) a dynamic pattern of personal trust in and loyalty to a center or centers of value, 2) trust in and loyalty to images and realities of power, 3) trust in and loyalty to a shared master story or core story, and 4) [having] a covenantal structure in which our shared trust transcends us".

Fowler (1981) states that faith functions to bind us to each other with shared beliefs which thus give form and content to how we view the ultimate environment.

### ***Faith Development***

Fowler (1981) looks to the psychological structural developmental theories to provide a framework for his description of the development of faith across the lifespan. Erikson's psychosocial life stages and tasks have deeply influenced faith development theory. The psychosocial stages provide insight into the "functional"(p. 109) aspect of faith, identifying the existential issues that people encounter throughout the lifecycle, regardless of faith stage. Fowler finds it difficult to adequately describe the connection between Erikson's theorizing and his own because the influence has been "pervasive and subtle"(p.110), creating a way of thinking about development at a multiplicity of levels. The breadth and depth of Erikson's theorizing seem to have both inspired and encouraged Fowler to create a theory that is complex and difficult to operationalize.

Fowler (1981) is much more clear about the concrete ways in which structural-developmentalists have influenced faith development theory. He credits the structural-developmental school of thought with four contributions. The first is the utilization of an epistemological approach to understanding faith.

Epistemology emphasizes the process of how knowledge, in this instance faith, is developed, rather than what the tenets are of that faith. Secondly, Fowler adopts the general developmental framework common to established developmental theories, which allows for systematic structural comparisons of faith with these theories. Thirdly, faith development theory adopts the view of development as being based on interactions between self and the environment. Finally, the structural-developmentalists place a normative value on the hierarchy of stages. Fowler is ambivalent on this point. Theoretically, Fowler believes that advancement up the hierarchy provides an increasingly comprehensive and adequate form of faith. However, he equivocates about whether having a higher stage of faith is "better" (Fowler, 1981).

Fowler acknowledges that there are broad parallels between the theory of faith development and Loevinger's theory of ego development as a function of their common roots in Piagetian and Kohlbergian thought (Fowler, 1981). However, he states explicitly that faith development is not to be considered theoretically reducible to cognitive or moral development. Faith development is defined as incorporating the various lines of development into the totality of the way a person makes meaning in the world.

### **Stages of Faith**

The stages of faith provide a formally descriptive model in relation to which the adequacy of our particular ways of being in faith can be assessed and faced. Each new stage expands upon the previously developed capacities of the person's ability to engage with life. The sequence of stages is intended to provide a description of the different ways in which individuals make meaning,

regardless of tradition or cultural context (Fowler, 1981).

There are six stages of faith: 1) Intuitive-Projective Faith, 2) Mythic-Literal Faith, 3) Synthetic-Conventional Faith, 4) Intuitive-Reflective Faith, 5) Conjunctive Faith, and 6) Universalizing Faith. Each stage is assessed with reference to the seven aspects of faith: 1) Form of Logic, 2) Social Perspective Taking, 3) Form of Moral Judgement, 4) Bounds of Social Awareness, 5) Locus of Authority, 6) Form of World Coherence, 7) Symbolic Function. The stages are described below.

Stage 1, Intuitive-Projective Faith, is characterized by preoperational logical thought, egocentric perspective taking, and a sense of morality that is based on the short-term self-relevant consequences of one's actions. Stage 1 boundaries of social awareness include only the immediate family. At this stage, authority is granted to those on whom the individual is dependent, to visible signs of authority, and to anyone who is bigger and stronger. In stage 1, a person makes sense of the world episodically, assuming that he/she is the center of the world, and has no need to create a narrative to understand their place in the world. At Stage 1 there is no distinction made between symbols and reality. Consequently, religious stories and concepts are readily and uncritically incorporated into an individual's understanding of reality at this stage.

Stage 2, Mythic-Literal Faith, is characterized by concrete operational logic in which a person is an empiricist who makes generalizations from concrete particulars. Simple perspective taking is adopted in which there is an awareness of others. However, others function mainly as an audience for one's own experience, rather than as individuals in their own right. Stage 2 morality is based on instrumental hedonism and reciprocal fairness, often involving the

need to control and manipulate others. The boundaries of social awareness divide the world into "us" and "them", based on demographic characteristics such as family ties, ethnicity, race, class, or religion. Authority is externalized and founded on social roles; the salience of this authority is increased by personal relatedness. At Stage 2, authority might be questioned verbally, but not behaviorally. The world is made sense of with the use of the narrative of one's own experiences. Symbols are appreciated at this stage in a unidimensional sense. A clear distinction is made between symbolism and reality, without there being any overlap. This stage is characterized by a concern for the maintenance and respect of the rules and the hierarchy of the particular religious tradition.

Stage 3, Synthetic-Conventional Faith, is characterized by early formal operational logic in which there is inductive, but not deductive reasoning. At Stage 3 one is unable to describe one's own process, and does not differentiate between self and the systems in which self is embedded. Perspective taking is mutual and interpersonal, with the interiority of the other often fantasized. Morality is based on interpersonal expectations and concordance with social norms. Social awareness is focused on the composite of groups within which one has interpersonal relationships, and authority is vested in the consensus of valued groups and in personally worthy representatives of belief-value traditions. At Stage 3, one makes sense of the world with a tacit system of felt meanings that are symbolically mediated and globally held. Symbols themselves are experienced multidimensionally and are appreciated with precritical awareness of their importance. People at this stage tend to focus on the interpersonal ramifications of their religious beliefs.

Stage 4, Individuative-Reflective Faith, is characterized by dichotomizing

formal operational thought so that it is possible to critically distance oneself from one's actions and to view one's self as having an executive ego. Perspective taking is mutual, with a self-selected group or social class, often in the form of a system of thought or an ideology. At Stage 4, moral judgement is based on maintenance of the social order, tempered with a reflective relativism or class-based universalism: "If everyone were just to act reasonably, everything would be fine." The bounds of social awareness are extended to ideologically compatible systems and communities that are congruent with self-chosen norms and insights. Closure is sought after in ideological discussion. At Stage 4, the locus of authority is internalized. All authorities and norms are chosen to reflect one's *own* self-ratified ideological perspective. The world is understood overall with an explicit, consistent, and well-defined system of thought that is conceptually mediated. Symbols are separated from that which they symbolize and are demythologized so that the power of the symbols is understood as coming from the meaning conveyed by the symbols, rather than from the symbols themselves. At Stage 4, one questions traditional religious dogma and symbolism, often rejecting institutionalized religion altogether.

Stage 5, Conjunctive Faith, is characterized by dialectical formal operational thought in which opposites are held in tension. At Stage 5, one is interested in understanding the perspective of groups, classes, and traditions other than one's own. Morally, one attempts to keep a critical distance from society by espousing principles by which a social order may be criticized. The bounds of social awareness are extended to many different groups and traditions, and principles are more important than closure or systematic analysis. At Stage 5, there is a dialectical joining of the judgments and experiences of

Stage 6, Universalizing Faith, is characterized by synthetic formal operational thought in which opposites no longer provoke tension, but are somehow synthesized. At Stage 6 there is a sense of mutuality with humanity and a well-developed ability to adopt the perspective of others. Morality is based on a concrete understanding and enactment of the principals of universality and "loyalty to being" (Fowler, 1981), that is to say, a respect for the sacred nature of simply being alive. At this stage one may consider sacrificing one's self in the service of humanity. The bounds of social awareness extend to all of humanity, excluding no one. Authority is both internal and transcendent, purified of egoic striving and linked by disciplined intuition to the principle of being. The world is understood as a unity and there is a felt sense of participation and loyalty to being. The evocative power of symbols is appreciated as the doorways to the transcendent realm.

### **Aspects of Faith**

The aspects of faith are defined as complex clusters of cognitive skills which are structurally related. The overall development of faith is the sum total of the development in each of these separate areas. The following descriptions are taken from the 1993 Manual for Faith Development Research (DeNicola, 1993).

Aspect A, Form of Logic, is based on Piaget's analysis of the development of logical thought. Stages 1 through 4 follow Piaget's developmental line relatively closely. Stages 5 and 6 depart from Piaget in making use of post-formal operational thought, incorporating dialectical and then synthetic reasoning respectively.

Aspect B, Social Perspective Taking, describes the process by which a person constructs the self, the other, and the relationship between them. It

Aspect A, Form of Logic, is based on Piaget's analysis of the development of logical thought. Stages 1 through 4 follow Piaget's developmental line relatively closely. Stages 5 and 6 depart from Piaget in making use of post-formal operational thought, incorporating dialectical and then synthetic reasoning respectively.

Aspect B, Social Perspective Taking, describes the process by which a person constructs the self, the other, and the relationship between them. It evaluates a person's awareness of the feeling states and thoughts of themselves and those around them.

Aspect C, Form of Moral Judgment, is similar to Kohlberg's Moral Development; however, it is a broader concept. In faith development theory, moral judgment involves patterns of reasoning, grounds of moral justification, the boundaries of social inclusion/exclusion, and social perspective taking.

Aspect D, Bounds of Social Awareness, defines a person's group identification or social world, seeking to establish how the individual relates to those around him or her.

Aspect E, Locus of Authority, evaluates how authorities are selected, how they are related to, and whether the locus of authority is internal or external.

Aspect F, Form of World Coherence, describes how a person constructs the object world around them as well as their perception of the ultimate environment, and is a type of explicit or tacit cosmology.

Aspect G, Symbolic Function, evaluates the way in which a person understands and uses symbols in the process of meaning-making and determining centers of value and images of power.

The line of development described in the faith development stages is

intended to provide insight into how the many different developmental influences optimally combine. The stages are intended to help people to understand how one's personal faith is a function of many different things, requiring time, experience, challenge, and nurture for maturation. They are not meant to be used as an achievement scale. Fowler maintains that one stage of faith is not intended to be "better" than another, and that it would be inappropriate to use the developmental trajectory of faith as a template for therapeutic goals (Fowler, 1981).

### ***Theoretical and Empirical Evaluations of Faith Development Theory***

There has been much theoretical discourse regarding the validity of faith development theory (Dykstra & Parks, 1986; Fowler, Nipkow, & Schweitzer, 1991). From both theological and psychological perspectives, faith development theory needs to be more rigorously defined. However there has been limited empirical validation research (Das & Harries, 1996; Snarey, 1991).

### **Theoretical Critiques**

The theory of faith development has been discussed both as a theological and a psychological theory. From a theological perspective, the points of debate center around four main points (Parks, 1991) regarding the scope of the theory. Fowler's definition of faith is seen as being too broad and inclusive, while his definition of the end stage of development (Stage 6) is too narrow and exclusive in its use of Judeo-Christian language. Theologians question the adequacy of the theory with regards to the beliefs held by particular Christian sects, let alone



those of non-Christian belief systems. Finally, theologians question how well the highly cognitive and verbal Faith Development Interview can "tap the well of the soul" where affect and imagination reside and which may or may not be accessible to conscious verbally-based operations (Parks, 1991; Pitts, 1991).

Faith development theory has been critiqued by psychologists not for being too large in scope, but rather for lacking empirical definition. Smith (as cited in Slee, 1991, p. 141) sums up the psychological critiques gently, noting that it is "unfortunate" that Fowler has published so many popular versions, since it makes it seem that the theory has been well-validated. The main empirical and methodological problems involve the lack of relation between Fowler's definition of faith and the operational definition of faith development and the lack of construct validity.

It has been noted by supporters and detractors alike (Broughton, 1986; Fernhout, 1986; Power, 1991) that the stages do not make reference to metaphysical progression, so designation of these developmental stages as being stages of faith is questioned. In a related issue, it is noted that for a specific construct to have validity, the criteria for that construct must be associated with certain predictable and observable behaviors (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955; Power, 1991). Fernhout (1986) points out that Fowler does not present a detailed argument as to why these specific aspects of development are the components of faith development. It should be noted that, in fact, Fowler makes no claim that these aspects are the exclusive set of aspects necessary to operationally define the domain of faith completely. Rather, Fowler has responded to Fernhout's criticism by stating that these aspects are intended to be "windows" into an understanding of faith. Fowler is steadfast in his stance

that the formal structuring of faith, as described by the stages of faith, without the content, stories and symbols of a person's experience, is an incomplete picture of the person's faith (Fowler 1986b, p. 285). The loose connection between Fowler's theology and definitions of the stages of faith has prompted some to raise the question about whether faith stages are simply another way of evaluating ego development or world view (Fernhout, 1986; Power, 1991). Fernhout (1986) questions whether faith development is actually ego development, insofar as it appears to be a compilation of all possible psychological developmental aspects. Fernhout voices frustration and confusion regarding Fowler's complex and shifting definition of faith. His desire for a fixed operational definition of faith reflects the schism between the disciplines of psychology and theology. Current psychological theory requires empirical validation, with as many observables defined as possible. In direct contrast, theological theory requires that there be an indefinable aspect to it that is the route of contact with the divine, or "Ultimate Environment" as it is currently known (Fowler, 1991).

Apart from these questions regarding the relationship between faith and faith development theory, there are questions regarding issues of construct validity such as whether the stages are indeed universal, and whether the stages are a part of a psychological unity. These questions have begun to be addressed by recent studies aimed at validating the theory.

### **Empirically Observed Relationships**

In the most thorough published research to date, Snarey (1991) set out to establish adequate construct validity for faith development theory for research

purposes. He found strong evidence that the faith development interview reflects a unified construct. All correlations between different aspects were positive, moderately strong, and highly significant. Alpha among the aspects was .93. In a factor analysis of the aspect scores, there was only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than one. This factor accounted for 74% of the variance. And finally, 78% of the research participants had aspect scores that were within the range of one stage across all aspects.

With regards to criterion validity, Snarey found that faith development was related to, but not reducible to, both moral development ( $r = .60, p < .001$ ) and ego development ( $r = .47, p < .001$ ). As expected, faith development was found to be related to education ( $r = .49, p < .001$ ), occupation ( $r = .45, p < .001$ ), social class ( $r = .43, p < .001$ ), and work complexity ( $r = .49, p < .001$ ). These relationships were maintained even after controlling for other developmental domains. Thus, social status variables were effective in distinguishing between levels of faith development. The range of overall faith development scores in Snarey's (1991) research with secular kibbutzes gave evidence for the universal application of faith development theory to religious and nonreligious individuals.

The construct validity of faith development theory was also investigated from a structural-developmental perspective, evaluating the theory for structure and hierarchy, as well as exploring the role of affect and interpersonal interactions in faith development (Pitts, Walker, Chandler, & Lehman, 1992). Support was found for both structural wholeness and for the hierarchical progression of the stages. Structural unity was supported insofar as 81% of individuals' reasoning were scored at their modal stage of faith across the seven aspects; 99.8% of their reasoning fell within two adjacent stages. A significant

relationship ( $r = .41, p < .05$ ) was observed between complexity of thought and faith development, supporting the hierarchy criterion. With regard to affect, positive correlations were observed between faith development and the ego defenses of coping (i.e., intellectuality,  $r = .64, p < .05$ , tolerance of ambiguity,  $r = .60, p < .05$ , and regression in the service of the ego,  $r = .72, p < .05$ ). Negative correlations were observed between faith development and the more primitive ego defenses (i.e., denial,  $r = -.71, p < .05$ ) and repression,  $r = -.63, p < .05$ ). No relationship was observed between faith development and meaning in life, as measured by the Purpose-in-Life Test (PIL). However Pitts et. al. (1992) point out that the PIL appears to measure life satisfaction more than meaning making, whereas the FDI measures an individual's increasingly adequate and complex abilities to address existential issues, regardless of their subjective assessment of their circumstances.

Other research investigating faith development theory has contributed to the establishment of a nomological net of associated constructs. In research that was incorporated into Fowler's (1981) primary work on faith development, Mischey (1976) found that college-aged adults were mostly at stages 3 and 4, as predicted by the theory. Furthermore, he observed a rough parallel between faith development and moral development; however, he notes that faith development tended to precede the parallel stage of moral development. Mischey evaluated the students' identity statuses as well, but unfortunately does not report the relationship between their identity status and their stage of faith. Nevertheless, he does report that all of those who scored higher on moral development than on faith development were identified as Identity Diffusions (i.e. uncommitted to any particular belief system and not actively seeking out any

such commitment). In the same study, affectivity and communal activity were important elements in discriminating between divergent stages of faith development.

Correlates of faith development include age, intelligence, socioeconomic status, and church affiliation. Das and Harries (1996) found partial support for the development of faith as a function of age. As predicted, the majority of college-aged men were at stage 4. However, the majority of women were at stage 3, apparently "lagging behind", indicating a possible gender bias inherent in the theory. Intelligence, education and verbal ability have been identified as correlates of faith development (Backlund, 1990; Barnes, Doyle, & Johnson, 1989; Chia & Torney-Purta, 1993), as has socio-economic status (Chia & Torney-Purta, 1993). Whereas White (1985, as cited in Pitts, 1991), found a significant negative relationship between church affiliation and stage score, Mischey (1981) reported that the faith scores of "believers" were significantly higher than the faith scores of "nonbelievers".

Personality characteristics have not been associated with faith development. Faith was not found to be related to any of the Myers-Briggs personality types (Bradley, 1983; as cited in Backlund, 1990).

Fowler (1981) suggests that crisis can precipitate a transition from one stage to another. Backlund (1990) found that there was no relationship between change in HIV status and faith stage transition when assessed using Fowler's scoring method which emphasizes structural changes. However, when a content analysis was employed, a significant association was observed between HIV+ status and faith. Backlund notes that the transition may be either a progression or a regression along the stage continuum.

Tentative concurrent validity has been established. Barnes, Doyle, & Johnson (1989) created a pencil and paper measure meant to be a parallel measure to the FDI. Although the measure has not been officially sanctioned by Fowler, Barnes et. al. (1989) report that the characteristics of each stage, as described by Fowler, were observed to cluster together. Furthermore, each style of faith was observed to correlate as predicted with a measure of the degree to which a person interprets his/her religious beliefs literally or symbolically.

### ***Operationalizing the Vision (establishing construct validity)***

Faith development theory has provoked considerable theoretical discussion and some research. Preliminary construct validation studies suggest that faith development is indeed a construct that is related to, but distinct from, other lines of psychological development. However, for the theory to have lasting value to the field of psychology, it must be much more extensively validated. The main focus of psychological critique of the theory is its looseness with regards to the operational definition of faith development, and the lack of construct validation research in general.

Construct validation is a research methodology that was created to help to determine the significance of a construct. As such, it is intended to give an empirically-based account for variance observed in test performance (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). The process, as originally defined by Cronbach and Meehl, involves establishing the structural wholeness of the measure, the nomological network of concepts that are related to the construct, and the evaluation of the generalizability of the construct (Marcia, 1993). Structural wholeness is a term used to describe the degree of internal coherence of a measure. If an

instrument has structural wholeness it has been determined to consistently measure the construct in question, across all questions and subscales. Faith development theory is based on a complex combination of four established lines, or "aspects", of psychological development (i.e., Cognitive Development, Perspective Taking, Moral Development, Locus of Authority), as well as four novel aspects of development (i.e., Bounds of Social Awareness, Sense of World Coherence, Symbolic Function). In order for structural wholeness to be established for faith development theory, these seven aspects must all be strongly correlated and must all load on a single factor; furthermore, the measure of faith development must be found to be internally consistent inter- and intra-individually.

After establishing that the Faith Development Interview does in fact measure a single unitary construct, the next step is to determine what that construct is by investigating the nomological network of related constructs. If the FDI actually measures the development of faith, then it should be related to a similarly defined measure of development, and it should be related to a similar definition of faith. The validity and generalizability of the construct to a variety of populations must also be established in order for the construct to have construct validity.

### **Structural Wholeness**

Structural wholeness is established via statistical assessment of the internal consistency of a measure from a variety of angles. To determine the structural wholeness of the Faith Development Interview, the FDI will be evaluated for internal consistency across items and across aspects. The aspect

scores will be factor analyzed to determine the degree to which the variability of responses can be accounted for by a single factor. Finally, aspect scores will be evaluated intraindividually to determine the degree of within-subject variability.

### **Adding Ego Development to the Nomological Network**

Like Fowler, Jane Loevinger provides a variety of definitions for her theory of ego development. Unlike Fowler, her constructs are empirically, not theoretically, derived, validated, and revised. In her major work on ego development; Loevinger defines it development as "the master trait", and identifies the search for coherent meanings in experience as the essence of the ego's function (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970, p. xi). Ego development is also defined as the development of self or character development (Loevinger, 1985), as a person's "outlook" (Loevinger, 1994), and as some broad aspect of personality including motivation, moral judgement, cognitive complexity, interpersonal integration, and ways of perceiving self and others. However, given Loevinger's faith in empiricism, and given her clinical operational definition, ultimately ego development is "whatever is measured by the Washington University Sentence Completion Test" (Loevinger, 1983) in its variety of forms.

There are ten levels of ego development that are evaluated using criteria from four "styles": 1) Impulse control, moral style, 2) Interpersonal Style, 3) Conscious Preoccupations, and 4) Cognitive Style. The levels of ego development are strikingly similar to the stages of faith. Faith development Stage 1 "Intuitive-Projective Faith", incorporates the characteristics described in the ego development level I-1, "Presocial" and "Symbiotic". Faith development Stage 2 "Mythic-Literal Faith", corresponds with the ego development levels I-2



"Impulsive", Delta "Self-Protective", and Delta/3 "Transition from Self-Protective to Conformist". Stage 3 "Synthetic-Conventional Faith", can be understood as a parallel to levels I-3 "Conformist" and I-3/4 "Transition from Conformist to Conscientious; Self-Consciousness". Stage 4 "Individuative-Reflective" Faith is consistent with levels I-4 "Conscientious" and I-4/5 "Transition from Conscientious to Autonomous". Stage 5 "Conjunctive Faith", corresponds with level I-5 "Autonomous", and finally, Stage 6 "Universalizing Faith" parallels level I-6 "Integrated".

The following descriptions of the levels of ego development are taken from Hauser (1976). At I-1, "Presocial", the infant is described as interpersonally autistic, and consciously preoccupied with self vs. nonself. Similarly, at I-1, "Symbiotic", the infant is described as being interpersonally symbiotic, and consciously preoccupied with self vs. nonself.

At level I-2, "Impulsive", morality is fear-based and actions are impulsive. Interpersonally, someone at I-2 is primarily receptive, dependent, and exploitative. Conscious preoccupations are bodily feelings, particularly those that are sexual and aggressive. Cognitively, a person at level I-2 is given to stereotypy and experiences conceptual confusion.

At level I-Delta, "Self-Protective", there is fear of being caught for moral transgressions, and tendencies to be opportunistic and to externalize blame. Interpersonally, the I-Delta level is characterized by wary, manipulative, and exploitative behavior. Conscious preoccupations are self-protection, wishes, material things, advantages, and control.

I-Delta/3, "Transition from Self-Protective to Conformist", focuses morally on obedience and conformity to social norms that have simple and absolute

rules. Interpersonally, I-Delta/3 tends to be both manipulative and obedient. The conscious preoccupations of this level focus on the concrete aspects of traditional sex roles, and physical, as opposed to psychological, causation. Cognitively, this level is typified by conceptual simplicity and stereotypes.

The I-3, "Conformist", level of ego development has a moral emphasis on conformity to external rules, with accompanying shame, and guilt for breaking rules. Interpersonally, the focus is on belonging, helping, and superficial niceness. The conscious preoccupations at this level are appearance, social acceptability, and banal feelings and behavior. Cognitively, this level tends towards conceptual simplicity, stereotypes, and clichés.

At I-3/4, "Transition from Conformist to Conscientious; Self-Consciousness", there is the beginning of the development of moral standards, and understanding of contingencies, as well as self-criticism. Interpersonally, there is the desire to be helpful, coupled with a deepened interest in interpersonal relations. The conscious preoccupations at this level include the awareness of the self as separate from the group and the recognition of psychological causation. Cognitively, there is an awareness of individual differences in attitudes, interests, and abilities, and this awareness is mentioned in global and broad terms.

At I-4, "Conscientious", moral standards are self-evaluated and involve self-criticism. The interpersonal style tends to be intensive, responsible, mutual, and concerned about communication. Conscious preoccupations involve differentiated feelings, motives, self-respect, achievements, traits, and self-expression. Cognitively, there is conceptual complexity and the idea of patterning.

At I-4/5, "Transition from Conscientious to Autonomous", the moral focus is on individuality and coping with inner conflicts. Interpersonally, the person at I-4/5 cherishes interpersonal relations. Their conscious preoccupations involve the communication and expression of ideas and feelings, process and change. Cognitively, there is the development of tolerance for paradox and contradiction.

At I-5, "Autonomous", the moral focus continues to be on individuality, and coping with inner conflict, as well as coping with conflicting inner needs. Interpersonally, relationships are cherished and autonomy is respected. conscious preoccupations are vividly conveyed feelings, integration of physiological and psychological causation of behavior, role relationships and role conception, self-fulfillment, and the self in social context. At I-5, there is increased cognitive conceptual complexity, tolerance for ambiguity, and objectivity.

At I-6, "Integrated", the moral focus is on the reconciliation of inner conflicts, and the renunciation of the unattainable, as well as on individuality, and coping with inner conflicts and conflicting inner needs. Interpersonally, in addition to cherishing interpersonal relationships, and respecting autonomy, the individual at I-6 is said to cherish individuality. The conscious preoccupations of someone at the I-6 level of ego development include the issue of identity, in addition to those concerns experienced at I-5 (i.e., vividly conveyed feelings, integration of physiological and psychological causation of behavior, role relationships and role conception, self-fulfillment, and the self in social context.

Ego development, as defined by Loevinger, appears to have a great deal in common with faith development. Both theories are based on the work of Piaget and Kohlberg, and both evaluate a person's cognitive, moral, and

interpersonal maturity. However, Loevinger includes the psychological "conscious preoccupations" as the fourth and final arena in which to assess ego development (Hauser, 1976). In contrast, Fowler focuses on the more philosophical "form of world coherence" and "symbolic function" as the remaining influences on development. Hence, faith development appears to have a different focal point of assessment. Loevinger's theory of ego development is focused interpersonally, on the individual in relation to self and others. Fowler's theory of faith development concentrates on the relationship between self and others in terms of a shared center of values. In this way, faith development theory is concerned with that which transcends the self and the relationship between the self and other, and provides meaning for the self in the context of an ultimate environment (Fowler, 1981).

This study evaluates the extent of overlap there is between faith development and ego development by means of correlations and factor analysis. It also seeks to determine whether or not qualitative differences exist between those who score higher on faith development than on ego development, and those who score higher on ego development than on faith development.

### **Adding Religious Orientation to the Nomological Network.**

Gordon Allport's (1950) theory of religious orientation derived from his conception of faith as a developmental construct that has three phases: raw or primitive credulity, doubt, and mature faith. Raw credulity, the first stage, was described as being unquestioning, authoritarian, and irrational. The second stage of development was described as belief testing, a necessary condition for

the establishment of any sort of independent conviction. Mature faith was said to grow "painfully out of the alternating doubts and affirmations that characterize productive thinking" (p.122). Allport refined these definitions and designed the Religious Orientation Scale (ROS; Allport & Ross, 1967). Raw credulity became extrinsic religious orientation and mature faith became intrinsic religious orientation. The doubting stage was dropped from the continuum.

The Extrinsic subscale of the ROS is "an excellent measure of the sort of religion that gives religion a bad name" (Donahue, 1985, p.415). Extrinsic religious orientation is characterized by instrumental and utilitarian motivation. From this orientation religion is used to provide "security and solace, sociability and distraction, status and self-justification" (Allport & Ross, 1967, p. 434). The person who holds an extrinsic religious orientation tends to be immature, prejudiced, self-involved, and insecure (Allport, 1960). In contrast, the Intrinsic subscale of the ROS is a measure of religious commitment as distinct from religious belief, church membership, theological orientation, etc. (Donahue, 1985). Intrinsic religious orientation characterizes the individual who looks to religion to find meaning in life. This person tends to have a sense of basic trust and to feel secure in himself (Allport, 1960). He/she "embraces the creed, internalizes it, and lives it" (Allport & Ross, 1967, p. 434). Intrinsic religious orientation is "a hard won process of maturity" (Hood, 1985). The development of faith, as defined by Fowler, appears to be similar to the development of religious orientation, from extrinsic to intrinsic. Whereas faith development appears to be comparable to ego development with regard to the psychological parameters involved in the development of meaning, religious orientation appears to be comparable to faith development with regard to the focal point

around which meaning is developed. Persons with a predominantly extrinsic orientation are anticipated to be in the lower stages of faith in which the transcendent is defined in terms of the self. Persons who hold a more intrinsic orientation are likely to be in the upper stages of faith in which self is defined using the transcendent as the central point of reference.

This study evaluates whether faith development relates more closely to religious orientation than does ego development. Religious orientation is theoretically a developmental construct, and consequently it is proposed that it will be related to both faith development and ego development. The explicitly religious content of the ROS is similar to some of the explicitly religious content of the FDI, thus they should be more closely associated than the ROS and the WUSCT.

### **Generalizing to an HIV/AIDS population.**

In order to establish the generalizability of faith development theory it is necessary to evaluate it within a variety of populations. The theory of faith development has been investigated primarily with white, middle-class, church-affiliated, Judeo-Christian samples (Snarey, 1991). This study proposes to evaluate faith development in people living with HIV/AIDS, a population that is demographically-varied in terms of race, class, and church-affiliation, is actively involved in facing the existential challenge of a premature death, and might derive benefit from the clinical nature of the interview. Backlund (1990) and Fowler (1981) both point out the subjective appreciation that was expressed by interviewees for being given the opportunity to discuss the issues raised in the FDI. Backlund (1990) recognizes that those who are HIV+ tend to be

disaffiliated from the church and thus do not feel that they can avail themselves of the pastoral care that they might find helpful in working through the diagnosis of being HIV+ which is commonly misunderstood as foretelling immanent death.

### ***Research Questions***

The following research questions are addressed in this study:

1. Are the stages of faith development structural wholes in this population?
2. How closely related is faith development to ego development?
3. Are there qualitative differences between those who score higher on faith development than on ego development, and those who score higher on ego development than on faith development?
4. Does faith development relate to religious orientation, and does it relate more closely to religious orientation than does ego development?

## METHOD

### *Participants*

The sample consisted of 71 (67 men; 4 women) people who have been diagnosed as having the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV+). Participants were informed that they would be asked questions regarding their values, beliefs, and life experiences. The majority were recruited via an advertisement in the PWA newsletter, which has a province-wide membership, as well as several local area newspapers within Vancouver. Pamphlets advertising the study were also placed at AIDS Vancouver, the PWA Society, St. Paul's Hospital, Vancouver Native Health Society, and doctors' offices. Interested people were asked to contact the principal investigator by phone to set up a brief initial interview in which they were informed that their participation would consist of an optional life review exercise (to be completed prior to the interview as a "primer"), an audiotaped interview, and two questionnaires. They were further informed that their participation would involve approximately two and one half hours. As an incentive for participation, interview participants were invited to take part in a 5-week open support group intended to provide a forum for further discussion regarding spirituality and issues related to meaning-seeking. The majority of respondents were male, despite efforts made to directly solicit more females through an organization that specifically serves HIV+ women. Each group was open to a potential pool of approximately 25 participants. The first support group was held at the Vancouver Gay and Lesbian Center, the second was held at Friends For Life, and the third and final group was held at Vancouver Native



Health Society.

Participants ranged in age from 23 to 53 (for females and males combined,  $M = 37.9$ ,  $SD = 6.8$ ; for females,  $M = 37.5$ ,  $SD = 5.45$ ; for males,  $M = 37.8$ ,  $SD = 6.8$ ). Seventy-three percent were Caucasian, 18% Native, 1% Asian, 1% African-American, 1% Latin, and 1% Jewish. Thirty-one percent had a university degree; 9% had a college diploma; 6% had a trade certificate; 33% had their high school diploma; 21% had not completed high school. The average number of years that participants had spent in post-secondary educational settings was 2.9 yrs ( $SD = 2.6$ ). Most of the participants (74.6%) reported that they had no affiliation with any religious/spiritual group. Of those that did report an affiliation, 33.3% belonged to Christian groups, 26.7% belonged to Buddhist groups, 13.3% practiced Native spirituality, 6.7% belonged to the Living Love church, 6.7% practiced Kundalini Yoga, and 13.3% did not identify their group affiliation. Participants reported that they had been diagnosed as being HIV+ for 1-15 years ( $M = 7.3$ ,  $SD = 3.9$ ). According to the Centers for Disease Control (MMWR, 1993), the number of CD4+ T-lymphocyte cells defines the progression of AIDS. A CD4+ T-lymphocyte cell count of less than 200 has been used to define the patient as having "full-blown AIDS". The CD4+ T-lymphocyte cell count for the participants in this study ranged from 10-1030 ( $M = 294$ ,  $SD = 259$ ). According to this index, 52% of this sample had AIDS. Thirty-two percent of the sample reported that they had been diagnosed with AIDS. Fifty-six percent of the sample had not yet experienced an "AIDS-related" illness (e.g., pneumocystis carinii pneumonia, shingles, thrush, etc.); 36% had been diagnosed with 1-3 AIDS-related illnesses, 8% had experienced 4 or more AIDS-related illnesses. Those diagnosed with AIDS had been carrying

this diagnosis for 1/2-13 years ( $M = 3.6$ ,  $SD = 2.8$ ).

## **Measures**

### **Faith Development Interview.**

Fowler has designed a semi-structured interview protocol, the Faith Development Interview, (DeNicola, 1993) which is used to determine a person's faith development stage. There are six stages of faith: 1) Intuitive-Projective Faith, 2) Mythic-Literal Faith, 3) Synthetic-Conventional Faith, 4) Intuitive-Reflective Faith, 5) Conjunctive Faith, and 6) Universalizing Faith.

A general description of the stages is provided in Table 1. Each stage of faith is assessed with reference to seven aspects of faith: 1) Form of Logic, 2) Social Perspective Taking, 3) Form of Moral Judgement, 4) Bounds of Social Awareness, 5) Locus of Authority, 6) Form of World Coherence, 7) Symbolic Function. The seven aspects are described by stage in Tables 2-8.

The FDI is a semi-structured interview made up of 20 questions, which takes 1 to 2 hours to administer. All participants were interviewed by the principal investigator. The interview includes questions pertaining to life review, crises and peak experiences, relationships, present values and commitments, and religion.

The interview begins with questions regarding the major events in the respondent's life, as they have outlined them using the "Life Tapestry Exercise" (DeNicola, 1993). The next area of discussion asks questions to determine how significant relationships have shaped the respondent's values. The respondent is then asked how s/he currently finds meaning in life, how this affects his/her view of the future, and how s/he makes decisions. Finally, the interview then

**Table 1**

**Stages of Faith (DeNicola, 1993)**

Stage	Description
1) Intuitive - Projective	Ego-centric thought; blends fantasy with reality; self and other are not clearly separated; primary attachment to principal caretakers; thought is fluid and episodic; authority is externalized.
2) Mythic-Literal	Concrete thought; very concerned with distinguishing between fantasy and reality; consistency, orthodoxy, & the perceived fit between values and attitudes of significant others are important; authority figures include friends and socially-recognized roles, as well as family; authority is externalized.
3) Synthetic-Conventional	Combines perspective taking skills and early formal operational thought to “synthesize” meanings that are primarily based on a felt sense of the attitudes and opinions of others; interpersonal relationships of primary importance; conventional compared to peer-group; concerned about meeting the expectations of others; authority is externalized.

( table continues )

Table 1 ctd.	Description
Stage	
4) Individuative-Reflective	Formal operational thought that allows for critical distancing from others and the sense of an executive ego that allows self to reflect on self and make choices independent of others; analytic and focused on being logical and reasonable; self-focused; authority is internalized.
5) Conjunctive	Dialogical thought that embraces paradox, multiple meanings and perspectives, maintaining the tension of opposites without reductionism; appreciative of ambiguity and mystery; open to the experiences of others; authority is internalized.
6) Universalizing	Synthetic thought; egoic concerns are transcended; the unity which underlies paradox is apprehended; there is loyalty to the principle of being; authority is internalized and transcendent.

turns to questions regarding religion (i.e. whether human life has purpose, the extent to which the respondent considers him/herself to be religious, or spiritual, and which symbols are important to him/her).

Each interview was coded using the Manual for Faith Development Research (DeNicola, 1993). The first 25 interviews were scored from transcripts, following standard scoring procedures. Due to limited resources, the remaining 40 interviews were scored directly from the audiotapes of the interview. When scoring from the audiotapes, the coders first simply listened to the tape, noting the counter number indicating where each of the interview questions occurred on the tape. During a second listening of the tape, the coders scored the responses. Each question in the interview has been pre-assigned to an aspect of faith and was given a stage score ranging from 1-6. The overall average score assigned was the mean of the equally weighted aspect scores. Inter-rater reliabilities have been reported to range from 70 to 90% agreement between two raters (DeNicola, 1993). To establish inter-rater reliability in the present study, 30 tapes rated by the principal investigator were randomly selected and rated independently by a research assistant.

Selected responses from this study illustrate some of the different stages on each aspect. The following represent a Stage 3 and a Stage 5 response on the Form of Logic aspect (see Table 2):

Q -- When you have a tough decision to make, how do you go about making it?

Stage 3 Response -- I pretty much make my own decisions, but before I commit to anything I'll check with 1 or 2 of my close friends, or even my father.

The respondent appears able to think things through for himself, yet he still relies

**Table 2**

**Aspect A: Form of Logic (Piaget)**

Stage	Description
1	Preoperational
2	Concrete Operational
3	Early Formal Operations
4	Formal Operations (Dichotomizing)
5	Formal Operations (Dialectical)
6	Formal Operations (Synthetic)

\*Tables 2-8 are adapted from Fowler, 1980.

on the advice of both family and friends for confirmation of his own process. There is no reflection in this Synthetic-Conventional response regarding his own process involved in this answer which indicates that he uses early formal operational thought.

Stage 5 Response -- I keep things to myself, but after I've formulated my ideas I'll run it by a friend. If he disagrees then I reapproach the subject -- not necessarily at the same time. I figure that if I respect him enough to ask his opinion, I owe it to him to think about it, and to reformulate it before I completely discount his opinion.

This respondent uses dialectical formal operational thought, the main feature of the Conjunctive style of logic, thinking first for himself, then conferring with a trusted friend, and then re-evaluating his own opinions before continuing the dialogue.

On the Perspective Taking aspect, the following examples illustrate a Stage 2 and a Stage 4 response (see Table 3):

Q -- Are there any current relationships that are important to you now?

Stage 2 Response -- ... My sister never remembers my birthday, and that burns me up so much. She knows I was born before her, like, in the month, in the calendar, but she can't remember. Is that hard to remember? She never could. Never.

This Mythic-Literal response shows simple perspective taking in which the speaker is aware of others, but gives no consideration to their perspective.

Stage 4 Response -- ...So it's like there's this relationship that's going on in my life right now that's interrupting my life, and my lifestyle. I said to him (and it was the truth!), "Why are you so bitchy and negative all of the time?" And he really is. All of a sudden he got totally defensive, and started accusing *me*. You know, and I'm thinking, "I don't need this".

**Table 3**

**Aspect B: Perspective Taking (Selman)**

Stage	Description
1	Rudimentary empathy (egocentric)
2	Simple perspective taking
3	Mutual interpersonal
4	Mutual, with self-selected group or class--(societal)
5	Mutual with groups, classes and traditions "other" than one's own
6	Mutual, with the commonwealth of being



This response shows an ability to conceive of a mutually supportive and sharing relationship, however, as is typical of the Individuative-Reflective stage on all aspects, there is a need to feel in control of relationships and to self-select those to whom one is close.

The following responses illustrate Stages 1, 2, and 3 on the Moral Development aspect (see Table 4):

Q -- What is sin to your understanding?

Stage 1 Response -- ...Crime, I guess...Um, hmm...I would think that sin would be anything that gets punished for being a crime, especially if you get caught.

This person's response defines morality purely in terms of the consequences of their actions, thus receiving an Intuitive-Projective stage score..

Stage 2 Response -- I think you should treat people the way they treat you. If they hurt you, you can hurt them back and it's not a sin because they deserve it.

Typical of the Mythic-Literal stage, this response emphasizes a morality based on reciprocal fairness in which "tit-for-tat" provides the over-riding determinant of behavior.

Stage 3 Response -- Anything that goes against the 10 Commandments. You shouldn't lie, cheat, or steal, and you should try to live in harmony with other people.

This response reflects the Synthetic-Conventional approach to morality in which society provides the rules and the expectations that emphasize interpersonal harmony and concordance.

The aspect entitled Bounds of Social Awareness is illustrated by the

**Table 4**

**Aspect C: Form of Moral Judgment (Kohlberg)**

Stage	Description
1	Punishment-Reward
2	Instrumental hedonism (Reciprocal Fairness)
3	Interpersonal expectations and concordance
4	Societal perspective; Reflective relativism or class-biased universalism
5	Prior to society; Principled higher law (universal and critical)
6	Loyalty to being

**Table 5**

**Aspect D: Bounds of Social Awareness**

Stage	Description
1	Family, primal others
2	"Those like us" (in familial, ethnic, racial, class and religious terms)
3	Composite of groups in which one has interpersonal relationships
4	Ideologically compatible communities with congruence to self-chosen norms and insights
5	Extends beyond class norms and interests. Disciplined ideological vulnerability to "truths" and "claims" of outgroups and other traditions
6	Identification with the species. Transnarcissistic love of being

following responses which were scored to be Stage 1 and 3 (See Table 5):

Stage 1 Response -- When I got married. When I had a son. When my brother died.

This response is scored at the Intuitive-Projective Stage of faith because the bounds of this man's social awareness are limited to his immediate family. This response also shows how one can regress to an earlier faith stage as a result of current life situations. In this case, the man's depression has severely limited his emotional connections to the world around him.

Stage 3 Response -- Definitely when my mother and I moved to Canada. Definitely when she remarried and had my brothers and sisters. Getting married. Getting divorced. And the 4 long-term relationships I've had with men.

The focus of this man's Synthetic-Conventional response indicates that his bounds of social awareness center around the interpersonal relationships he has had in his life.

On the Locus of Authority aspect, the following responses illustrate Stages 4 and 6 (see Table 6):

Q -- Does your life have meaning at present?

Stage 4 Response -- ...Are you familiar with Stephen Levine?... One of the things which he said, or mentioned in the course of one of the books that I read is that the meaning of life is in the experience. Which takes it out of something, out of the realm of something I don't understand as an abstract notion that's out there that I'm having trouble grasping. It takes it

away from that, something out there, and it puts it right back inside again where I'm the architect of my experience. And of my meaning. And it's for me to decide what the meaning of life is. This response was given an Individuative-

**Table 6**

**Aspect E: Locus of Authority**

---

Stage	Description
1	Attachment/dependence relationships. Size, power, visible symbols of authority
2	Incumbents of authority roles, salience increased by personal relatedness
3	Consensus of valued groups and in personally worthy representatives of belief-value traditions
4	One's own judgment as informed by a self-ratified ideological perspective. Authorities and norms must be congruent with this.
5	Dialectical joining of judgment-experience processes with reflective claims of others and of various expressions of cumulative human wisdom.
6	In a personal judgment informed by the experiences and truths of previous stages, purified of egoic striving, and linked be disciplined intuition to the principle of being

---

Reflective stage 4 score because the respondent chooses an authority figure that reflects his own self-ratified ideology in which he is his own ultimate authority.

Stage 6 Response -- Oh. Enormous... It's just the joy of living. I mean even if I had no strength, and I could do nothing all day, but lie and read a book, just being in a lovely place. Just being in our home, and being fortunate enough to not have to worry about food or shelter. Most of all for me, just um...(tears) living Christ where I go...being Christ to the poor...You know, I have a sense that I've made a difference in a lot of people's lives.

This response was given a Universalizing stage 6 score because it makes reference to one ultimate authority and is purified of egoic striving, linking his own internal authority with a transcendent authority.

The following represent a Stage 4 and a Stage 6 response on the Form of World Coherence aspect (see Table 7):

Q -- What does death mean to you? What happens to us when we die?

Stage 4 Response -- Well, I really hope that I'm right about the whole Christian thing (laughs). If I'm not, you know, then that puts me in Hell! But then I don't consider myself to be a hellish type of person. There's this whole Buddhist thing about being reborn or reincarnated. I don't know if I give that much meaning. I just think that when I die, I just die.

This man has rejected traditional ideas about death, in favor of establishing his own, self-ratified, explicit and conceptually consistent understanding, making it an Individuative-Reflective response.

Stage 6 Response -- It's a mystery. Nobody, anybody who speculates on that is full of shit. A lot of religions are full of shit. It's pure imagery. And as much as you develop your sense of experiencing eternity now, the most you can, it is still a mystery.

**Table 7**

**Aspect F: Form of World Coherence**

Stage	Description
1	Episodic
2	Narrative-Dramatic
3	Tacit system, felt meanings symbolically mediated, globally held
4	Explicit system, conceptually mediated, clarity about boundaries and inner connections
5	Multisystemic symbolic and conceptual mediation
6	Unitive actuality felt and participated unity of "One beyond the many"

recognition of the inherently ephemeral nature of life and death. The complexity of this response and this man's acceptance of mystery make this a Universalizing response. And finally, on the Symbolic Functioning aspect, the following responses illustrate Stages 3 and 5 (see Table 8):

Q -- What is your image of God?

Stage 3 Response -- God is ... what I can see, I can believe in, and what I can feel, I can take with me. I don't have to go to church every Sunday to understand where life is coming from or what it means to me. I see it every day in my garden watching the plants grow.

This response reflects the precritical awareness of symbols that typifies the Synthetical-Conventional stage. (This man does not report ever having analyzed the meaning underlying the symbols, otherwise this simple response that is so accepting of life on life's terms would be scored at Universalizing stage 6.)

Stage 5 Response -- I think over the years, my concept of God has become something which, it's not religious, it's not secular. It's that thing about beyond, that my perception of myself, on this little planet, with all these people, with all the stuff that's out there. At the same time looking into a microscope and realizing that at every level there's a whole world. And each of these worlds has a whole world. The interconnectedness of it moves me. And I think that my concept of God has to do with that vastness. It's that personified. It keeps growing actually, that notion, keeps becoming more apparent to me. It's very awesome.

This man's response is filled with the postcritical rejoining of the ideational meaning of the concrete and the irreducible symbolic power the abstract that define the Conjunctive approach to Symbolic Functioning.



**Table 8**

**Aspect G: Symbolic Function**

Stage	Description
1	Magical-Numinous
2	One-dimensional; literal
3	Symbols multidimensional; evocative power inheres in symbol
4	Symbols separated from symbolized. Translated (reduced) to ideations. Evocative power inheres in <i>meaning</i> conveyed by symbols
5	Postcritical rejoining of irreducible symbolic power and ideational meaning. Evocative power inherent in the reality in and beyond symbol <i>and</i> in the power of unconscious processes in the self
6	Evocative power of symbols actualized through unification of reality mediated by symbols and the self

## **Washington University Sentence Completion Test - Form 81.**

The Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT; Loevinger, 1985; Hauser, 1976) was used as a measure of ego development. It consists of 18 incomplete sentence stems that are completed by the participant. It is presumed that each person has a core level of ego development which is reflected in his/her responses. All responses to each item were pooled together for scoring. Table 9 itemizes the milestones of ego development across the levels.

Participants' responses to each item were individually assigned to one of nine levels of ego development. (The first stage of ego development is pre-verbal and is thus untestable with the WUSCT.) Once the items were scored, they were reassembled into the individual participants' protocols. The participant's overall score was derived using the "automatic" total protocol rating, matching the cumulative frequency distribution of the participant's scores with the "automatic ogive rules" prescribed by Loevinger and Wessler (1970). All tests were scored by a rater who was blind to the participants' FDI protocols and scores. Following the standard procedure for establishing reliability suggested by Loevinger (1979), a second rater scored all of the protocols. Hauser (1976) reported that median inter-rater reliabilities have ranged from .76 to .92 and that internal consistency coefficients have ranged between .80 and .89.

Selected responses from this study illustrate the increasing cognitive complexity of the different levels of ego development. The scoring manual lists

**Table 9**

**Milestones of Ego Development**

Level	Impulse Control, "Moral" Style	Interpersonal Style	Conscious Preoccupations	Cognitive Style
Presocial		Autistic	Self vs. nonself	
Symbiotic (I-1)		Symbiotic	Self vs. nonself	
Impulsive (I-2)	Impulsive, fear	Receiving, dependent, exploitive	Bodily feelings, especially sexual and aggressive	Stereotypy, conceptual confusion
47 Self-Protective (Delta)	Fear of being caught, externalizing blame, opportunistic	Wary, manipulative, exploitative	Self-protection, wishes, things, advantages, control	

(table continues)

	Impulse Control,	Interpersonal	Conscious Preoccupations	Cognitive Style
	"Moral" Style	Style		
Transition form	Obedience and	Manipulative,	Concrete aspects of	Conceptual simplicity,
self-protective to	conformity to social	obedient	traditional sex roles,	stereotypes
conformist	norms are simple		physical causation as	
(Delta/3)	and absolute rules		opposed to psychological	
			causation	
Conformist	Conformity to	Belonging,	Appearance, social	Conceptual simplicity,
(1-3)	external rules,	helping,	acceptability, banal feelings,	stereotypes, clichés
	shame, guilt for	superficial	behavior	
	breaking rules	niceness		

(table continues)

Level	Impulse Control,	Interpersonal	Conscious Preoccupations	Cognitive Style
	"Moral" Style	Style		
Transition from	Dawning realization	Being helpful,	Consciousness of the self	Awareness of individual
conformist to	of standards,	deepened	as separate from the group,	differences in attitudes,
conscientious;	contingencies, self-	interest in	recognition of psychological	interests and abilities;
self-	criticism	interpersonal	causation	mentioned in global and broad
consciousness		relations		terms
(1-3/4)				
Conscientious	Self-evaluated	Intensive,	Differentiated feelings,	Conceptual complexity, idea of
(1-4)	standards, self-	responsible,	motives for behavior, self-	patterning
	criticism	mutual, concern	respect, achievement, traits,	
		for	expression	
		communication		

Level	Impulse Control,	Interpersonal	Conscious Preoccupations	Cognitive Style
	"Moral" Style	Style		
Transition from	Individuality, coping	Cherishing of	Communicating, expressing	Toleration for paradox and
conscientious to	with inner conflict	interpersonal	ideas and feelings, process	contradiction
autonomous		relations	and change	
Autonomous	Add: Coping with	Add: Respect	Vividly conveyed feelings,	Increased conceptual
(1-5)	conflicting inner	for autonomy	integration of physiological	complexity; complex patterns
	needs <sup>b</sup>		and psychological causation	of toleration for ambiguity,
			of behavior, development,	broad scope, objectivity
			role conception, self-	
			fulfillment, self in social	
			context	

(table continues)

Level	Impulse Control,	Interpersonal	Conscious Preoccupations	Cognitive Style
	"Moral" Style	Style		
Integrated (1-6)	Add: Reconciling inner conflicts, renunciation of unattainable <sup>b</sup>	Add: Cherishing of individuality	Add: Identity	

<sup>b</sup>From Loevinger & Wessler, 1970; Hoppe, 1972; cited in Hauser, 1976.

hundreds of the responses that were used to empirically derive the progression of I-levels that define ego development. These pre-coded responses, along with an accompanying theoretical rationale, are used to code responses. The following represent responses scored at I-2, I-Delta, and I-Delta/3:

Sentence Stem -- Rules are ...

I-2 Response -- ... rules.

I-2 is typified by a failure to generalize. The manual specifically states that repetition of this stem is to be coded at I-2.

I-Delta Response -- ... boring.

The dominance-submission view of authority that is seen at the I-Delta level of ego development is exemplified here. Demeaning of rules with a deprecatory comment is a way of rebelling against the control of others.

I-Delta/3 Response -- ... made to be broken.

Popular or common responses tend to be scored empirically as I-3 (the norm). The above response is reportedly sufficiently common on protocols that are scored below I-3 overall that it receives the compromise rating of I-Delta/3. (If the response had been qualified, the additional part would have been used to assess the response.)

The following responses illustrate I-levels 3, 3/4, and 4.

Sentence Stem -- Raising a family...

I-3 Response -- ... is a tough task.

This response involves a simple superficial negative response, however it is not negative enough to be classed at a lower level.



I-3/4 Response -- ... is a lot of work and dedication.

This response involves a consideration of the respondent's inner experience that is not seen at lower I-levels.

I-4 Response -- ... can be a very hard and challenging task; but it can also be the most rewarding.

This response involves contrasting ideas that also reflect on the respondent's inner experience.

The following represent responses scored at I-4/5, I-5, and I-6:

Sentence Stem -- When people are helpless ...

I-4/5 Response -- ... they are misunderstood, which makes them fearful of getting help.

On this stem, an I-4/5 response is identified by complex notions of causation, coupled with a respect for a person's dignity and independence.

I-5 Response -- ... I empathize but will not tolerate them if they are not doing things that will help them cope better with the situation that made them feel helpless.

This complex response contains contrasting elements of the respondent's inner experience and emphasizes the need for self-help.

I-6 Response -- ... they perceive less choice. I prefer to be powerful. Fact is they aren't helpless, it's a state of mind.

This response combines several ideas that would individually be scored as high level responses that refer to both possible internal cause and solution.

### **Religious Orientation Scale .**

The Religious Orientation Scale (ROS; Allport & Ross, 1967) was used to assess extrinsic and intrinsic religious orientation. The extrinsic subscale contains 11 items, and the intrinsic subscale contains 9 items. Respondents are asked to endorse the degree to which they agree or disagree with a given statement using a four-point scale (1--strongly disagree, 2--disagree, 4--agree, 5--strongly agree). Respondents were given the additional instructions that they should consider the questions as referring to their personal belief system, whatever that might be. Given that many respondents were uncomfortable with the explicitly Christian terminology used to describe religious orientation, respondents were encouraged to substitute non-Christian terms to make the questions most relevant to their own belief systems. An example of an Intrinsic item is: "My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life. a) this is definitely not so -- 1, b) probably not so -- 2, c) probably so -- 4, d) definitely so -- 5." An example of an Extrinsic item is: "What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike. a) I definitely disagree -- 1, b) I tend to disagree -- 2, c) I tend to agree -- 4, d) I definitely agree -- 5." Donahue (1985) reports Cronbach alpha reliabilities ranging from .67 to .93 for the two scales.

## ***Procedure***

### **Interview and scale administration.**

Participants contacted the researcher by telephone to express their interest in taking part in the study. Each participant was seen twice. During the first meeting, the purpose and procedure of the study was further described, research participants were given a written description of the research, and were asked to fill out a separate form if they were interested in receiving a summary of the results upon completion of the study (Appendix A). They were provided with a statement regarding how the data would be kept confidential (Appendix B). Interested participants were then given an informed consent form (Appendix C), and the Unfolding Tapestry of My Life (Appendix D) was given for completion at home before the next meeting. In the second meeting, participants received the Faith Development Interview (Appendix E). The interviews were conducted by the principal investigator and were audiotaped for coding purposes. Following the interview, participants completed the WUSCT (Appendix F), then the ROS (Appendix G), and finally a demographic sheet (Appendix H). Participants were presented with the option of remaining anonymous, or being linked to their data by numeric code for follow-up research. Eighty-three percent of the participants indicated their willingness to be a part of future research. Participants were provided with a summary of the research findings upon request.

## **Scoring.**

The Faith Development Interview measure was administered and scored by the principal investigator and a research assistant using the 1993 Manual for Faith Development (DeNicola, 1993). The research assistant began learning about Faith Development theory in an upper-division undergraduate directed readings course about the theory under the principal investigator. She was further familiarized with the content of the measure by transcribing 20 of the interviews. Due to the often challenging nature of the content of these interviews, the principal investigator debriefed with the research assistant after each transcription. Finally, the research assistant studied the faith development manual (DeNicola, 1993) and practise-scored 5 transcribed interviews and 2 taped interviews, before beginning to score tapes for the purposes of establishing inter-rater reliability. The total training period, including the directed readings course, lasted for 1 1/2 years. Thirty of the 70 interviews were randomly selected for rating by the research assistant. Discrepancies of more than 1/2 stage were resolved by taking the average of the 2 scores.

The Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT) protocols were scored by the principal investigator using the standard procedures prescribed for each measure. A second research assistant scored the WUSCT protocols in order to establish inter-rater reliability. Disagreements were resolved by applying the Borderline Rules (Loevinger, 1979) for scoring. In the 6% of the cases in which these rules did not resolve the differences, the midpoint between the two scores was assigned. If the discrepant scores were

within 1/2 stage and thus could not be assigned a midpoint stage score, the principal investigator's score was used.

The Religious Orientation Index protocols were scored according to the method described by Allport and Ross (1967). The items on the Extrinsic Scale were summed directly, whereas the items on the Intrinsic Scale were reverse-scored and then summed to provide the two scale scores. The two scales were not combined to establish categories, but rather were treated as two separate dimensions (Hilty, Morgan, and Hartman, 1985; McClelland and Judd, 1993).

## RESULTS

There were four research questions proposed for examination in this study: 1) Are the stages of faith structural wholes in this population? 2) How closely related is faith development to ego development? 3) Does faith development relate more closely to religious orientation than does ego development? and 4) Are there qualitative differences between those who score higher on faith development than on ego development, and those who score higher on ego development than on faith development?

### *Inter-rater Reliabilities*

On the Faith Development Interview, inter-rater reliability was evaluated using the percent agreement between raters on a subset of the sample, kappa, and the intraclass correlation. The method described in the FDI manual (DeNicola, 1993) evaluates reliability by assessing the number of interviews that are assigned the same stage or one-half stage higher or lower in a subset of the sample. Using this criterion, DeNicola reports reliabilities ranging from 77% to 93%, depending on the level of experience of the raters in scoring the interview. Agreement is considered "good" (DeNicola, 1993) if it is equal to, or greater than, 70%. According to this measure of reliability, inter-rater reliability in this study, found to be 77%, was "good". In this study, 30/70 interviews were scored by two

raters. Thirty-seven percent of the subset of interviews were assigned the same stage score; an additional 40% were assigned stage scores within one-half stage. The second method used to evaluate inter-rater reliability is the kappa statistic. Kappa is a measure of the degree of agreement between raters, taking into account the level of agreement that would be expected just by chance. Values greater than .75 indicate strong agreement, values between .40 and .75 represent fair to good agreement, and values less than .40 indicate poor agreement (Fleiss, 1981). Kappa in this study was a poor .18. However, when kappa was modified to allow for +/- 1/2 stage variance in ratings, the value of kappa jumped to .55. The third measure of inter-rater reliability is the intraclass correlation. The intraclass correlation is a widely used measure of inter-rater reliability for quantitative ratings (Fleiss, 1981). This method of establishing reliability is based on evaluating the variance and covariance of the (in this case) two sets of ratings. The intraclass correlation is essentially a measure of the extent to which the observations of one rater are similar to the observations of a second rater (Winer, Brown, & Michels, 1991). The intraclass correlation was in this study was .61, indicating weak-moderate agreement between raters. Taking the three measures of reliability together, it appears that satisfactory inter-rater reliability was established for research purposes.

On the Washington Sentence Completion Test, the established method of determining inter-rater reliability is also to determine the percentage agreement between two independent raters on the total sample (Loevinger, 1979). Inter-

rater reliability was established to be 73.5% for complete agreement; 91.2% for agreement within one-half stage, comparing favorably with the previously reported levels of inter-rater reliability ranging from .76 to .92 (Hauser, 1976). Kappa for this measure was .58 for exact agreement between raters, and was .75 for agreement within 1/2 stage. It is not surprising that the FDI manual (DeNicola, 1993) does not incorporate the most rigorous psychological method of reliability, given that it was not created by a psychologist. However, it is surprising that Loevinger, who prides herself on her empirical rigour, continues to use the percent agreement method in favor of the more exacting kappa statistic..

### ***Research Question 1: Structural Wholeness of Faith Development***

The Faith Development Interview was designed to assess a single construct. Structural wholeness was assessed in this study using a variety of approaches, as suggested by Snarey (1990). Firstly, the correlations of the seven aspect scores that combine to give the global faith development stage score were examined. Secondly, the internal consistency of the items was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Thirdly, a principal components factor analysis was used to determine the degree to which the variability of responses could be accounted for by a single factor. Finally, the range of stage usage by each subject was evaluated to determine the degree of within-subject variability. The quantitative characteristics of the sample on the FDI are presented in Appendix I. Some examples of the qualitative range of responses to the FDI are



presented in Appendix J.

A correlation matrix for all aspects is presented in Table 10. Consistent with the assumption of structural wholeness, the correlations are all positive, strong and highly significant.

The internal consistency of the faith development interview was determined using Cronbach's alpha. The reliability of the measure was estimated to be .97, thus providing more strong support for the contention of structural wholeness.

The degree to which one theoretical concept could be said to be accounting for the variability in the data was evaluated using a principal components factor analysis. Indeed, only a single factor emerged from the analysis, accounting for 83.6% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 5.85. The second factor's eigenvalue was less than one. Without exception, all of the aspects of faith loaded onto the first factor, thus providing further evidence for the structural wholeness of the Faith Development Interview.

Finally, the degree of structural wholeness was assessed by evaluating the extent to which the scores across aspects, within a given individual, were consistent. Within the 66 interviews, the average difference between the aspect with the lowest score and the aspect with the highest score was 1.11 stages (SD = .46). Eleven percent of the sample had aspect scores that ranged within 1/2 stage across all aspects; 33% of the participants had aspect scores that were within one stage; 41% of the sample had aspect scores within a range of 1 1/2

**Table 10**

**Correlations Between the Aspects of Faith**

Aspects		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Form of Logic	A	--						
Social Perspective Taking	B	.79	--					
Moral Reasoning	C	.80	.71	--				
Bounds of Social Awareness	D	.85	.82	.79	--			
Locus of Authority	E	.85	.79	.79	.85	--		
Sense of World Coherence	F	.84	.77	.77	.83	.88	--	
Symbolic Function	G	.79	.75	.78	.78	.84	.85	--

\*All correlations are significant at  $p < .002$  (.05/21), accounting for multiple comparisons.

stages; 14% of the participants had aspect scores within 2 stages; and 2% of the sample had aspect scores that ranged across more than 2 stages. The majority of respondents (85%) gave responses that yielded aspect scores within the range of 1 1/2 stages. This consistency across aspects shows that the FDI is a reliable measure both overall and at the aspect level of analysis.

Overall, the results of these four analyses clearly support the hypothesis that there is a single underlying concept that is being measured by the Faith Development Interview that is not aspect-specific.

### ***Relationships Among Faith Development, Ego Development, and Religious Orientation.***

On the WUSCT, responses ranged from I-2 to I-6. Appendix K provides some sample responses from the data set along with the scoring criteria provided by Loevinger (1970). Appendix L provides the quantitative characteristics of the sample.

Table 11 shows the normative distributions across stages for both the FDI (Fowler, 1981) and the WUSCT (Loevinger, 1985), contrasted with the results of the present study.

The Religious Orientation Scale was divided into two subscales, Extrinsic and Intrinsic. On the Extrinsic subscale scores ranged from 12 - 55 (M = 29.15; SD = 8.6; Mdn = 28). The Intrinsic subscale scores ranged from 10 - 45 (M = 29.4; SD = 8.83; Mdn = 30). The internal consistency of the ROS was

**Table 11**

**FDI and WUSCT Distributions Across Stages in Percentages**

	FDI	FDI	WUSCT	WUSCT	
	N = 249	N = 65	N = 68	N = 804	
	(Fowler, 1981)	(Present Study)	(Present Study)	(Loevinger, 1985)	
FDI					WUSCT
Stages					Levels
Stage 1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	I-1
Stage 1.5	0.0	0.0			
Stage 2	2.0	3.0	0.0	0.5	I-2
Stage 2.5	1.0	1.5	2.9	2.0	Delta
			4.4	2.6	Delta/3
Stage 3	25.0	27.3	1.5	6.8	I-3
Stage 3.5	11.0	16.7	25.0	26.1	I-3/4
Stage 4	34.0	21.2	38.2	40.9	I-4
Stage 4.5	13.0	15.4	25.0	14.1	I-4/5
Stage 5	14.0	15.4	2.9	4.9	I-5
Stage 5.5	0.0	0.0			
Stage 6	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.4</u>	I-6
	100	100	100	100	

determined using Cronbach's alpha. The reliability of the overall measure was estimated to be .75. The reliability of the Intrinsic subscale was estimated to be .84, and the reliability of the Extrinsic subscale was estimated to be .74. Allport & Ross (1967) suggest that the two subscales be further split at their respective medians in order to establish a 2 x 2 typology based on the hi/lo splits. There has been substantial debate regarding the usefulness of this approach (Donahue, 1985; Kahoe, 1985), with no clear resolution. Furthermore, McClelland and Judd (1993) indicate that to use median splits to recode observations into fewer categories creates falsely extreme data and is "a *serious* mistake" (italics in the original). Consequently, the two scales are considered as continuous data in this analysis. No norms are available for these scales.

Table 12 presents the cross-tabulation of frequencies of faith stage and I-level membership. Faith stage assignment was based on the criteria suggested in the manual (DeNicola, 1993). Table 13 presents the cross-tabulation of rounded frequencies of faith stage and I-level membership. In Table 13, faith stage scores were rounded up to the next stage if they were greater than or equal to  $x.5$ . According to Table 12, there were 33 people in this sample whose ego development score was greater than their faith development score; whereas, there were 21 people whose faith development score exceeded their ego development score. According to Table 13, there were 24 people whose ego development score exceeded their faith development score, whereas there were 12 people whose faith development score exceeded their ego development

**Table 12**

**Crosstabulation of Frequencies of Stage/Level membership on FDI and WUSCT.**

		FDI Stages									Row
		2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5	5.5	6	Totals
WUSCT Levels	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	D	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
	D/3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	3/4	1	0	2	0	3	3	3	0	0	12
	4	0	0	8	4	6	3	1	0	0	22
	4/5	0	0	4	5	3	3	4	0	0	19
	5	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Column		2	1	19	10	13	10	9	0	0	64
Totals											

**Table 13**

**Crosstabulation of Rounded Frequencies of Stage/Level membership on  
FDI and WUSCT.**

		FDI Stages			Row Totals
		<3 Pre- Conventional	3 Conventional	4+ Post- Conventional	
WUSCT Levels	< I-3 Pre Confor mist	2	2	1	5
	I-3 & I-3/4 Confor mist	1	4	9	14
	I-4+ Post- Confor mist	0	23	22	45
Column Totals		3	29	32	64

score.

The overall correlation matrix including faith development (FDI), ego development (WUSCT), extrinsic religious orientation (ROSExt), intrinsic orientation (ROSInt), age, education (as measured by the number of years of post-secondary education), and socioeconomic status (as measured by pre-diagnosis income) can be seen in Table 14. No significant relationships were observed between the three measures and either age or income. Of all the relationships examined in Table 14, the strongest was between the FDI and education ( $r = .48, p < .05$ ). This relationship was anticipated insofar as Snarey (1991) observed that the FDI was related to educational background as well.

The relationships among faith development, ego development, and religious orientation were also assessed, partialling out the effects of age, education, and socioeconomic status. The partial correlation coefficients can be seen in Table 15. It is notable that partialling out the effects of the SES variables did not affect the relationships between the FDI and the WUSCT, nor the relationships between intrinsic religious orientation and the FDI, nor intrinsic religious orientation and the WUSCT.

***Research Question 2: Degree of relationship between faith development and ego development.***

It was queried whether there might be a relationship between faith development and ego development. Faith development was anticipated to be a



distinct, but related, developmental construct from ego development. To fulfill these criteria, a small to moderate relationship was expected between the two measures. As can be seen from Tables 14 and 15, there was a small but significant relationship between the FDI and the WUSCT (Table 14,  $r = .31$ ,  $p < .05$ ), which was unaffected by partialling out the SES variables (Table 15,  $r = .31$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Research Question 3: Are there qualitative differences between response patterns on faith development and ego development?

The third research question addressed whether there were qualitative differences between those who scored higher on faith development than ego development and those who scored higher on ego development than on faith development. Eleven percent of the sample had faith development scores that exceeded their ego development scores by one or more stages; whereas, 20 percent of the sample had ego development scores that were greater than their faith development scores by one or more stages. There were no respondents whose scores on the two measures differed by more two or more stages.

There were no systematic demographic patterns differences between the two groups, however there were systematic differences in their psychological profiles and presentations. Respondents who scored at least one stage higher on the FDI than on the WUSCT tended to have faith development scores at Stage 4.5 and tended to report a more positive appreciation of life. Their ego

**Table 14**

**Correlations Between FDI, WUSCT, ROS, and SES Variables (N=61)**

		i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii
FDI	i	---						
WUSCT	ii	.31*	---					
ROSExt <sup>a</sup>	iii	-.26*	.01	---				
ROSIInt <sup>b</sup>	iv	.38**	.12	.00	---			
SES:								
Age	v	.14	.05	.17	.07	---		
Education	vi	.48***	.03	-.30	.12	.29	---	
Income	vii	.21	.13	-.16	.02	.28	.24	---

\*p<.05

\*\*p<.005

\*\*\*Initial critical p-value set at p<.003 (.05/15), correcting for multiple comparisons involving the SES variables.

<sup>a</sup> Religious Orientation - Extrinsic subscale

<sup>b</sup> Religious Orientation - Intrinsic subscale

**Table 15**

**Partial Correlations: Controlling for Age, Education, and Income**

		I	ii	iii	iv
FDI	i	---			
WUSCT	ii	.31*	---		
ROSExt <sup>a</sup>	iii	-.16	.04	---	
ROSIInt <sup>b</sup>	iv	.38**	.17	.00	---

\*p<.05

\*\*p<.005

<sup>a</sup> Religious Orientation - Extrinsic subscale

<sup>b</sup> Religious Orientation - Intrinsic subscale

development scores ranged from I-Delta to I-4 , but were mostly at I-3/4. In contrast, respondents who scored at least one stage higher on the WUSCT than on the FDI tended to have ego development scores at I-4, and faith development scores ranging from Stage 2 to Stage 3. Thus, while ego development scores remained quite consistent (varying on average only 1/2 stage), there was a 2 1/2 stage variation of faith development scores.

Respondents who scored higher on the FDI gave many indications of having emotionally stable lives and appeared to be focusing their energies on experiencing life to its fullest, complete with paradox and mystery. Their style of personal presentation tended to be mentally energetic, thoughtful, and caring. They appeared to engage fully in the interview process, confident in themselves, typical of Stage 4. In general, they were comfortable expressing themselves verbally, engaging in the interview with vigor and using the dialectical thought typical of Stage 5. And finally, they were at times able to appreciate life with a peaceful simplicity, as described by Stage 6. The following are excerpts from the interviews of three of these respondents:

Interviewer: What makes life meaningful for you?

Respondent #132: I'm here... If you're alive, your life has meaning. You just have to figure out what the hell it is.... It's not going to be handed to you on a silver platter... Well, I mean, think about this. I mean think about it! (Interviewer laughs) I mean, come on, think about this one here, okay? I mean... Joe Blow comes into the room, "My life isn't worth living. It has no meaning." Well, are you alive? Yes. It has meaning. It's there. Just stop, you know, get out of the negative. Stop casting dispersions (sic) and blame that way, and start looking this way and saying, well what responsibility do I have for the way my life is, and why it has no meaning.

It does. Just find it. **(Stage 4)**

Interviewer: What makes life meaningful for you?

Respondent #114: Um...silly things, you know. Flowers, uh, plants growing, the essence of being alive is more important to me than I realized. You know, the little things from day to day. One book describes this illness as feeling like being hit by a Mac truck every morning before you get up, eh? You know, cause it's like being a whale, and you're beached, and you gotta "muh!", flop yourself and get going. And, uh, so I've found more meaning in just very simple things, feeding myself, getting around, taking the dog out. You know, kick starting. I've also found that ... the desire to live, my desire to live, is greater than I thought or imagined.

I had thought when I became ill that well, this is the end, I'll accept that, and more or less try to sleep it off. And I found myself aggravated, and upset that I wasn't doing anything. Just driving anxiety. And so I started doing things. And so it's made me happy to be productive, get back to my leather work and that type of thing. Gives me some sense of purpose. And like talking to you. You know, for whatever the reason I decided to help you, was that if my experiences could be of any good to your research or to anyone else, then you know, so be it. I feel good about that. **(Stage 5)**

Interviewer: What makes life meaningful for you?

Respondent #104: The joy of waking up in the morning... being able to contribute... being able to live in the moment... just allowing things to be the way they are, accepting them. **(Stage 6)**

In contrast to their sometimes lengthy interview responses, these same respondents gave responses on the WUSCT that tended to be short and to the point, sometimes with a defensive flavor. They did not appear to be as comfortable in expressing themselves on this paper and pencil task, thus providing answers that received total protocol scores that did not exceed 1-4 in cognitive complexity. Some examples of their responses follow:

Sentence Stem #2: Raising a family ...

Respondent #132: ... can be hazardous to your health. **(I-Delta)**

Sentence Stem #4: A man's job ...

Respondent #104: ... is no different from a woman's job. **(I-3/4)**

Sentence Stem #9: Education ...

Respondent #114: ... should be available to all. **(I-4)**

Respondents who scored at least one stage higher on the WUSCT than on the FDI tended to report having some degree of emotional instability in their lives, whether as a result of their current life situation, or as a result of unresolved issues from some form of abuse or neglect in their past. These unresolved issues appear to have inhibited their development, particularly with regard to their ability to develop relationships beyond their family of origin, as is typical of Stage 2. Furthermore, these respondents often presented themselves as being somewhat isolated and/or depressed, providing the limited and concrete responses typical of Stage 2. Below are some examples of the responses from these respondents:

Interviewer: Do you recall any changes in relationships that made a significant impact on how you are as a person or how you think about life?

Respondent #108: No. See? It's quiet. This is the way I like it. I don't like too many people around me.

Interviewer: Do you ever wonder why that is?

Respondent #108: Well, I was doing this tapestry there (taps it). I was going back to when I was young, and I was trying to remember the first memory I have of my mother. And it was, I was, what, 6 years old when I began to go to school. There was no daycare, nothing, it was pretty small. And I remember the morning I left for school, I went to see her. But she was just coming out, getting out of the hospital. So I went to give her a kiss, and she was laying down on the bed, and she pushed me and turned herself to face the wall, whatever. But this is a, I think that since

then, at this time I realized that I had to be on my own, and do everything on my own. **(Stage 2)**

Interviewer: Do you recall any changes in relationships that have had a significant impact on how you think about life?

Respondent #122: Mm, not really, no.

Interviewer: So people, or relationships really haven't had much of an impact on how you view things.

Respondent #122: No. **(Stage 2)**

However, these same respondents were able to respond to questions on the WUSCT in a cognitively complex level of ego development. Some examples follow:

Sentence Stem #16: I feel sorry ...

Respondent #108: ... for the self-destruction of our society. **(I-4)**

Sentence Stem #12: A good father ...

Respondent #122: ... is someone who understands and will listen. **(I-3/4)**

Sentence Stem #9: Education ...

Respondent #126: ... is important and ongoing. **(I-4)**

The majority of the sample (69%) had faith development and ego development scores that were within +/- 1.00 stage. For the 31% of the sample whose scores differed by more than 1.00 stages, the above examples show differences were based on their faith development scores, not their ego development scores. The differences in the content of their faith development scores suggest that the FDI is influenced more by emotional process issues than by cognitive complexity, while the WUSCT is essentially unaffected by emotional

process issues.

***Research Question 4: Does faith development relate to religious orientation and does it relate more closely to religious orientation than does ego development?***

The final research question queried whether faith development would be related to religious orientation, and that this relationship would be stronger than the relationship between religious orientation and ego development. This hypothesis received partial support. Faith development was significantly related to intrinsic religious orientation (Table 14,  $r = .38$ ,  $p < .005$ ). This relationship remained unchanged when the effects of the SES variables were partialled out (Table 15,  $r = .38$ ,  $p < .005$ ). In contrast, the relationship between faith development and extrinsic religious orientation was affected by the SES variables. As can be seen in Table 14, faith development and extrinsic religious orientation were significantly negatively related ( $r = -.26$ ,  $p < .05$ ). However, after accounting for the effects of the SES variables, the relationship diminished and was no longer significant (Table 15;  $r = -.16$ ,  $p > .05$ ). There was no significant relationship observed between religious orientation and ego development. Although intrinsic religious orientation was significantly related to faith development but not to ego development, there was no significant difference between these correlations ( $t(58) = 1.60$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Furthermore, there was no significant difference between the correlations between extrinsic religious



orientation and faith development, and extrinsic religious orientation and ego development ( $t(58) = -1.45, p > .05$ ).

The relationship between the measures of faith development, ego development, religious orientation and the SES variables was also assessed using a principal components factor analysis (Table 16), both unrotated and rotated. Both analyses yielded three factor solutions. In the unrotated solution, the first factor accounted for 30.1% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 2.10. Faith development and education defined the first factor, along with income. Extrinsic religious orientation and age combined to characterize the second factor, accounting for 18.2% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 1.27. The third factor accounted for an additional 16.9% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 1.18. Age and income loaded positively, whereas ego development and intrinsic religious orientation loaded negatively on the third factor.

Varimax rotation was used to assist in the interpretation of the principal components factor analysis. The rotated factor matrix (Table 17) shows a pattern of results that very closely mirrors the suggested relationships between the variables. Using varimax rotation, the first factor was defined by the SES variables of age, income, and education. The second factor comprised of the “thoughtful” variables of intrinsic religious orientation, faith development, and ego development. Finally, the third factor, “self-serving”, was composed of Extrinsic religious orientation which loaded positively, and faith development and income loaded negatively.

**Table 16**

**Principal Components Factor Matrix of Faith Development, Ego Development, Religious Orientation, & SES variables**

Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
FDI	.80	-.06	-.31
WUSCT	.32	.30	-.49
ROSE <sup>a</sup>	-.38	.80	.07
ROSI <sup>b</sup>	.46	.38	-.49
Age	.42	.59	.54
Education	.73	-.22	.22
Income	.54	-.02	.51
Eigenvalue	2.11	1.27	1.18
Percent of variance	30.1	18.2	16.9

<sup>a</sup> Religious Orientation - Extrinsic subscale

<sup>b</sup> Religious Orientation - Intrinsic subscale

**Table 17**

**Rotated Factor Matrix**

Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
FDI	.28	.65	-.50
WUSCT	-.05	.65	.04
ROSE <sup>a</sup>	.05	.07	.88
ROSI <sup>b</sup>	.07	.77	.03
Age	.83	.12	.34
Education	.55	.16	-.54
Income	.70	-.06	-.24
Variance	1.57	1.50	1.49

<sup>a</sup> Religious Orientation - Extrinsic subscale

<sup>b</sup> Religious Orientation - Intrinsic subscale

## DISCUSSION

### ***Structural Wholeness of Faith Development***

The first research question addressed in this study asks whether the stages of faith are structural wholes in this population. In this sample, the results provide strong support of the FDI as a measure of a unitary construct. The seven aspects of faith that combine to form the overall faith development stage score were highly correlated. The measure was also found to be highly internally consistent. A principal components factor analysis of the seven aspects yielded a single factor accounting for 84% of the variance among the aspect scores. Finally, the degree of structural wholeness was assessed on an intraindividual basis. The majority of respondents gave responses that provided aspect scores within the range of 1 1/2 stages. This consistency across aspects shows that the FDI is an internally coherent measure both overall and at the aspect level of analysis. The sum of these results is very positive support for the faith development measure as a measure of a single construct with structural unity. The results of this study combine with the similar findings of other researchers (Pitts et al., 1992; Snarey, 1991) in unequivocal support of the structural integrity of faith development theory.

### ***Faith Development and Ego Development***

The second issue addressed was the degree of relationship between faith development and ego development. It has been suggested that faith development is reducible to ego development (Fernhout, 1986; Power, 1991).

The results of this study give evidence that faith development is related to, but distinct from, ego development. Faith development and ego development were found to correlate to a small but significant degree. In a principal components factor analysis faith development and ego development loaded on separate factors in the unrotated solution, and on the same factor in the rotated solution. These results provide evidence that the two constructs, as expected, measure overlapping domains. The results of this study echo the findings of Snarey (1991) who also found a moderate relationship between faith development and ego development. Thus, it appears that faith development is a distinct construct that is not simply reducible to ego development. Nevertheless, given that faith development is measured using an interview format, as opposed to the sentence completion task that is used to assess ego development, it is difficult to know how much of the variance between the two concepts is a result of the different measurement techniques. Comparing ego development with a pencil and paper measure of faith development would help to determine whether there is a stronger relationship between faith development and ego development than is apparent from this research.

### ***Qualitative Differences in Faith Development and Ego Development***

The third research question addressed by this study asks whether there are qualitative differences between those who score higher on faith development than on ego development, and those who score higher on ego development than on faith development. The results indicate that there were both quantitative and qualitative differences between the two groups.

Quantitatively, the groups did not differ in their levels of ego development; they differed in their faith development scores. That is to say, those who were in

the group whose faith development score exceeded their ego development score tended to have a faith development score in the range of stage 4 to stage 5.

Those who were in the group whose ego development score exceeded their faith development score tended to have a faith development score in the range of stage 2 to stage 3.

Qualitatively, those whose faith development score exceeded their ego development score gave many indications of having emotionally stable lives. Their style of personal presentation tended to be mentally energetic, thoughtful, and caring. They gave responses that were often characterized by dialectical thought processes, and often expressed an ability to appreciate a peaceful simplicity in life. In contrast, the respondents who scored higher on the measure of ego development than on the measure of faith development tended to report having some degree of emotional instability in their lives, either as a result of their current life situation or as a result of past abuse. They presented themselves as being somewhat isolated and/or depressed, and they tended to provide responses that were quite limited in scope and concrete in logic.

These qualitative and quantitative differences give further evidence that faith development and ego development measure distinctly different constructs. Critics have expressed concerns that faith development theory is too cognitive to be able to account for emotional process issues (Parks, 1991; Schneider, 1986). The current study gives evidence that the faith development interview is sensitive to affective, as well as cognitive, content and style.

### ***Faith Development, Ego Development, and Religious Orientation***

The final research question in this study asked whether faith development relates more closely to religious orientation than does ego development. Both

faith development and religious orientation measures include questions that focus on the relationship between self and the Transcendent, whereas the ego development measure is devoid of any religious content. Thus it was expected that faith development would be more closely related to religious orientation than would ego development. This hypothesis received partial support in this sample. Faith development was found to be significantly correlated with intrinsic religious orientation, but not with extrinsic religious orientation. No significant correlations were observed between ego development and either intrinsic or extrinsic religious orientations.

Using principal components factor analysis, the relationships among faith development, ego development, and religious orientation were difficult to interpret, except to say that extrinsic religious orientation is generally unrelated to faith development and ego development. However using varimax rotation, faith development, ego development, and intrinsic religious orientation clearly loaded on what might be considered a "thoughtfulness" factor. In this analysis extrinsic religious orientation was observed to be negatively related to faith development and unrelated to ego development and intrinsic religious orientation. Consequently there is some evidence that intrinsic religious orientation has something in common with ego development, although it is not a direct enough relationship for there to be a correlation between the two concepts. Whereas faith development both correlates and loads on the same factor with intrinsic religious orientation, thus it can be said that faith development relates more closely to intrinsic religious orientation than does ego development.

Fowler's work has been criticized for there being a lack of connection

between his definitions of faith and his operational definition of faith development (Broughton, 1986; Fernhout, 1986; Power, 1991). Fowler, himself, has indicated that the aspects of faith that he has chosen to define faith development neither exclusively nor precisely operationalize faith (Fowler, 1986b). Faith is defined as meaning-making (Fowler, 1981), and thus faith development should measure the development of meaning-making. Intrinsic religious orientation is described as an "excellent" (Donahue, 1985) measure of religious commitment and the degree to which an individual looks to religion to provide a sense of meaning in life. Extrinsic religious orientation appears to have little to do with meaning-making, measuring the degree to which an individual uses religion to serve his own needs (Allport & Ross, 1967). Thus finding faith development to be significantly related to intrinsic religious orientation, but not to extrinsic religious orientation, provides some much needed support for the criterion validity of faith development as an effective operationalization of Fowler's definition of faith.

### ***Limitations of the study***

There are several limitations that should be kept in mind while interpreting the results. Firstly, the sample represented a limited section of the population in general, and of the HIV+ population, specifically. Although the study was open to all people who are HIV+ in the Lower Mainland of BC, in actuality the sample was comprised of predominantly middle-class gay men and lower-class male IV drug users. These groups tend to encounter rejection from society in general and often from mainstream religion, and many of the men in the sample reported having personal histories involving physical, emotional, and sexual abuse. Given that such rejection and abuse assault the ability to establish and maintain a



sense of Basic Trust, the faith and meaning-making adopted by these men is likely to be different from people who have not experienced such abuse. Furthermore, there were not enough women in the sample to determine if there are gender issues related to faith development.

Secondly, the results give evidence indicating that faith is a function of education, socioeconomic status and income (SES). Previous research has also observed a strong relationship between SES and faith (Chia & Torney-Purta, 1993). Socioeconomic status is commonly found to be a significant predictor within developmental research (Snarey, 1991). Fernhout (1986) is critical of faith development for being unable to separate faith from SES, and in an ideal world, the development of faith would not be affected by SES. However, SES issues do affect us, researchers and respondents, alike. As Allport & Ross (1967) point out, "it is a common error for investigators to 'control for' demographic variables without considering the danger involved in doing so... they are often obscuring and not illuminating the functional (i.e., psychological) relationships" (p.435). Thus, the best we can do is to continue to include SES variables in our research in an effort to understand their influence on the psychological constructs that "really" interest us.

A third source of limitation to the results of this study involves the actual scoring of the faith development interview. The faith development manual is very detailed in its theoretical descriptions of both the stages and the aspects, however the descriptions do not make reference to the specific questions asked in the faith development interview, and are thus often hard to apply. As well, the scoring method involves the averaging of individual responses and then the averaging of aspect scores in order to obtain the overall faith development stage

score. This averaging process appears to be justified by the assumption stated in the manual (DeNicola, 1993) that responses generally range across only three stages. However, in the current study, 47% of respondents gave responses that ranged across more than 3 stages; 3% gave responses that ranged across all six stages. The averaging process resulted in these respondents receiving overall faith development scores that were numeric averages but hardly prototypic attitudinal representations.

The following examples show how the process of averaging the scores of an individual's answers provides a stage score that does not necessarily reflect the character of their faith. Respondent #159 received an averaged score that placed him at stage 3, however his responses to questions ranged from stage 1 to stage 6. This man was unkempt and a bit scary-looking. At the time of the interview he was sleeping on the streets, and tended to be drunk on rice wine more often than not (although he made an effort to be sober at the time of the interview). He had been severely abused as a child, had gone on to become a thief and a pimp. He had subsequently made the decision to stop hurting other people, and his current "job" entailed retrieving pop cans from garbage bins for refund. This man responded in complex ways to questions of morality and spoke of questioning God in ways reminiscent of St. Paul and the character of Reb Tevye in "Fiddler on the Roof". He valued relationships and was very much aware of his connection with God. Yet, his responses to questions regarding his connection to society were often simplistic and concrete. This man appeared to have a deep faith that he had been unable to translate into actions. The faith development interview tapped into this man's faith, however the averaged score of stage 3 that he received hardly reflects his general approach to issues of faith.

In contrast, respondent #122 was prototypically stage 3. He presented as a person with conventional beliefs in all areas. He did not have a dramatic story to tell about himself for the purposes of the interview. He dressed a bit conservatively, lived in a well-appointed apartment and respected socially conventional behaviors. He was not philosophical in responses and received stage 3 scores across all aspects of faith -- a prototypic stage 3 personality. Following the interview, after the tape recorder had been turned off, he handed the interviewer a written account of his many varied sexual exploits overseas that had occurred when he was a much younger man. This information could not be incorporated into the interview, nor could he be probed regarding this notably unconventional account of his way of making meaning in the world. This man obviously valued his presentation of conventionality and had not wanted to officially expose his past, although he apparently did want to titillate the interviewer. As thorough as the faith development interview is, because it is based on self-report, it is limited by the willingness of the interviewee to tell his story of faith in full.

Respondent #105 received a stage 4 score as the result of averaging; however, he was hardly representative of stage 4. His responses ranged between stages 3 and 6, with only seven out of the total of 22 scored responses receiving a stage 4 score. He had an incredibly calm presence, and a general sense of equanimity with his world, assisted in part by the pain medication he was taking. He valued his friends more than anything else, more typical of stage 3 than stage 4, yet he also gave relativistic responses showing a stage 5 style of appreciation of the plurality of beliefs.

Respondent # 132 was much more typical of stage 4 as described in the

Faith Development Manual. This man was self-absorbed, verbal, and intellectualized in his analysis of the world. His locus of authority was internalized to the exclusion of all other authorities. He was very aware of his own process issues, analyzing them pragmatically, without giving much thought to the existence of other possible interpretations, except to point out their failings.

Respondent #140 is another person whose overall faith development score gives a characterization of faith that is not the best characterization of the individual. In the faith development manual (DeNicola, 1993), stage 5 is characterized by the awareness of plurality and the holding of opposites in tension. There was little tension in this man's peaceful home and presentation, nor apparently in his perception of the world. In fact, the interviewer noted that his face "shone". He tended to view relationships and morality from a pragmatic stage 4 perspective. Yet with regard to more existential issues, his responses were more characteristic of stage 6. He appeared to have incorporated his Buddhist beliefs into all aspects of his life.

In contrast, respondent #118 presented as a prototypic stage 5 personality: someone who embraces opposites in many areas of his life. This individual was openly gay, an evangelical Christian, and married to a female Pentecostal minister. This vibrant person was eager to share his story about his journey of faith; eager to be helpful to others who were HIV+ like himself. He was open to the plurality of the world and enjoyed dialectical discourse.

The preceding character sketches are intended to show the wide variety of people who became involved with this research, and to show how the stages of faith may manifest themselves very differently in different people. The scoring

manual does not recognize the way in which the averaging procedure obscures individual differences. The adoption of a scoring procedure similar to Loevinger's ogive curve (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970) might help to assign stage scores that better reflect an individual's faith. The ogive curve scoring method is based on counting the number of responses that are given at each stage and then comparing the individual's distribution with a normal distribution for the purposes of stage score assignment. This procedure gives more weight to extreme scores and does not throw away as much information as does the averaging procedure.

A fourth limitation to this research is that stage 6 continues to be lacking in empirical validation. There was no one in this study who received a stage 6 faith development score. Given that the overall score is based on averaging all responses, a respondent must score at stage 6 on every question in order to receive an overall score of stage 6. The attainment of this sort of "perfect score" is obviously elusive, since only one respondent has ever been reported to have received a stage 6 score (Fowler, 1981). If Fowler were to adopt a method of stage score assignment similar to Loevinger's ogive curve (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970), it might be more likely for stage 6 to be scored without having to change or lower the standards of the scoring criteria.

Fifth, any measure based upon subjective scoring is potentially biased by the interpretation of scoring criteria. In this study, both the Faith Development Interview and the Washington Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT) were subjectively scored. The high level of inter-rater reliability on the WUSCT suggests that bias was minimal on this measure. However, the level of inter-rater reliability on the FDI was not as strong, raising the question of bias with

regards to this measure. Although the inter-rater reliability was considered "good" according to the faith development manual, it was only adequate by the standards of psychological research. There were two main sources of bias. First, the interviewer was also the principal rater. The faith development interview is a powerful experience for the interviewer and the interviewee, alike. A bond of understanding between interviewer and interviewee is established that allows for the interviewee to explore the very personal questions involved in the interview. Although the stages of faith development are not intended to be seen as an achievement scale, it is difficult not to see them as such, given their hierarchical nature. Consequently, there was a carryover from the interview to the rating process that undoubtedly unsystematically biased the results. As noted, it would have been preferable to score the responses to each question separately (e.g., to score the responses to question 1 from all participants at once). Such a procedure would have helped to eliminate bias from the coding procedure based on the coder's knowledge of the interviewee, either from having interviewed the respondent, or from having already coded previous responses given by the respondent. Again, due to limitations in resources, this was not feasible in this study. Secondly, there was a marked difference in amount of clinical experience held by the two raters. The principal rater had eight years of training and experience as a therapist, whereas the second rater did not have any formal clinical training. Consequently, the two raters brought different skills in listening to the interviews when scoring the interview tapes. In future research, the inter-rater reliability likely be improved by having raters with comparable clinical skills.

Sixth, the instructions for the Religious Orientation Scale were varied

religious commitment.

In line with the findings of past research, faith development was found to be strongly associated with education and socioeconomic status in this study. Future research should continue to include education and socioeconomic status variables as covariates, given that these variables appear to be consistently related to this measure of psychological development.

The results of this study are limited in their generalizability because the sample was drawn specifically from a North American HIV+ population. Future research might continue to evaluate the relationships among faith development, ego development, and religious orientation in different populations in order to determine the generalizability of these results.

There were some difficulties encountered in scoring the faith development interview. The scoring manual needs to have guidelines that relate more explicitly to the actual questions in the interview rather than simply describe the general ways of responding characteristic of each stage. Furthermore it is suggested that method of deriving the overall faith development score as a function of averages be discarded in favor of a method similar to the frequencies and ogive curve used by Loevinger (Loevinger and Wessler, 1970). This method would have two sources of benefit. Firstly, it would be more sensitive to the actual pattern of responses given by an individual, better maintaining individual differences. Secondly, it would pay attention to extreme scores, increasing the possibility of observing and thus being able to empirically validate stage 6.

Within this study, although the level of inter-rater reliability was deemed "good" by faith development standards, it was considered merely adequate by the standards set in the field of psychology. Future researchers should make every

effort to use raters who did not take part in the interviewing procedure, and to ensure that these raters are comparably trained.

With regards to the applicability of this measure to non-Christian samples, it was found in this study that participants were put off by any explicitly Christian terminology. Even the term "religion" itself was rejected in favor of "spirituality". It seems that the term religion is equated with dogmatic Christianity, of which many of the participants in this study wanted no part. Future researchers in faith development with non-Christian samples would likely benefit by removing and specifically Christian terminology from their research and should be vigilant in their removal of any and by using the term "spirituality" in favor of "religion".

\*\*\*

All of these research considerations aside, the experience of first studying faith development, then partaking of the interview with 71 people as they shared their journeys of faith with me, has truly been a life changing process in my own journey of faith. I was often moved by people's success in making meaning in their lives, often in spite of histories of abuse. For some people being diagnosed with HIV was their wake-up call to start appreciating life, for others it was just one more problem to add to their pile. Most of the people I interviewed were not yet physically affected by HIV at the time of the interview, so it remained more of a sociopolitical and psychological issue, as opposed to a health issue. Since that time, I know of three participants who have died, and I am sure there are more. Some have gotten sicker, some have experienced an the almost miraculous remission of symptoms as a result of new drugs now available in Canada.

If I were to do this research again, I think I would ask more questions regarding their health and the impact of HIV on their daily life, for it seems to me



now that it is in the ability to make it through the daily ups and downs of living with this unpredictable disease that their faith is most truly found.

## REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1950). The individual and his religion. New York: MacMillan.
- Allport, G. W. (1960). Personality and social encounter. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Allport, G. W. & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5(4), 432-443.
- Backlund, M. A. (1990). Faith and AIDS: Life crisis as a stimulus to faith stage transition. Doctoral dissertation, Pacific Graduate School of Psychology. University Microfilms No. AAD90-24621.
- Barnes, M., Doyle, D., & Johnson, B. (1989). The formulation of a Fowler scale: An empirical assessment among Catholics. Review of Religious Research, 30(4), 412-420.
- Broughton, J. M. (1986). The political psychology of faith development theory. In C. Dykstra & S. Parks (Eds.), Faith development and Fowler (pp. 90-114). Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (1992). 1993 revised classification system for HIV infection and expanded surveillance case definition for AIDS among adolescents and adults. MMWR, 41(RR-17), 1-19.
- Chia, E. K. & Torney-Purta, J. (1993, July). Cultural examination of measures of faith development. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological

tests. Psychological Bulletin, 52(4), 281-301.

Das, Ajit & Harries, B. (1996). Validating Fowler's theory of faith development with college students. Psychological Reports, 78, 675-679.

DeNicola, K. B. (1993). 1993 Manual for faith development research (Rev. ed.). Atlanta: Candler School of Theology.

Donahue, M. J. (1985). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48(2), 400-419.

Dykstra C. & Parks, S. (Eds.). (1986). Faith development and Fowler. Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.

Fernhout, J. H. (1986). Where is faith?: Searching for the core of the cube. In C. Dykstra & S. Parks (Eds.), Faith development and Fowler (pp. 65-89). Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.

Fleiss, J. L. (1981). Statistical methods for rates and proportions (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Fowler, J. (1981). Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Fowler, J. (1986a). Faith and the structure of meaning. In C. Dykstra & S. Parks (Eds.), Faith development and Fowler (pp. 15-42). Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.

Fowler, J. (1986b). Dialogue toward a future in faith development studies. In C. Dykstra & S. Parks (Eds.), Faith development and Fowler (pp. 275-301). Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.

Fowler, J. (1991). The vocation of faith development theory. In J. W. Fowler,

K. E. Nipkow, & F. Schweitzer (Eds.), Stages of faith and religious development: Implications for church, education, and society (pp.19-36), New York: Crossroad.

Fowler, J. W., Nipkow, K. E., & Schweitzer, F. (1991). Stages of faith and religious development: Implications for church, education, and society. New York: Crossroad.

Hauser, S. T. (1976). Loevinger's model and measure of ego development: A critical review. Psychological Bulletin, 83(5), 928-955.

Hilty, D. M., Morgan, R., & Hartman, W. (1985). Structural equation modeling analysis of the means, end, and quest dimensions. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24(4), 424-436.

Hood, R. W. (1985). The conceptualization of religious purity in Allport's typology. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24(4), 413-417.

Kahoe, R. D. (1985). The development of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24(4), 408-412.

Loevinger, J. (1979). Construct validity of the sentence completion test. Applied Psychological Measurement, 3(3), 281-311.

Loevinger, J. (1985). Revision of the sentence completion test for ego development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48(2), 420-427.

Loevinger, J. (1994). Has psychology lost its conscience? Journal of Personality Assessment, 62(1), 2-8.

Loevinger, J. & Knoll, E. (1983). Personality: Stages, traits, and the self. Annual Review of Psychology, 34, 195-222.

Loevinger, J. & Wessler, R. (1970). Measuring ego development I: Construction and use of a sentence completion test. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Marcia, J. E., Waterman, A. S., Matteson, D. R., Archer, S. L., & Orlofsky, J. L. (1993). Ego identity: A handbook for psychosocial research. New York: Springer-Verlag.

McClelland, G. H. & Judd, C. M. (1993). Statistical difficulties of detecting interactions and moderator effects. Psychological Bulletin, 114(2), 376-390.

Mischev, E. J. (1976). Faith development and its relationship to moral reasoning and identity status in young adults (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39/07-A.

Parks, S. D. (1991). The North American critique of James Fowler's theory of faith development. In J. W. Fowler, K. E. Nipkow, & F. Schweitzer (Eds.), Stages of faith and religious development: Implications for church, education, and society (pp.101-115). New York: Crossroad.

Pitts, R. C. (1991). Fowler's faith development theory: A review. Unpublished manuscript.

Pitts, R. C., Walker, L. J., Chandler, M. J., & Lehman, A. J., (1992, November). Faith or fiction? A construct validity study of Fowler's faith development theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Moral Education, Toronto.

Power, F. C. (1991). Hard versus soft stages of faith and religious development. In J. W. Fowler, K. E. Nipkow, & F. Schweitzer (Eds.), Stages of faith and religious development: Implications for church, education, and society (pp.116-129). New York: Crossroad.

Snarey, J. (1991). Faith development, moral development, and nontheistic Judaism: A construct validity study. In W. Kurtines and J. Gerwitz (Eds.) Handbook of moral behavior and development: Vol. 2: Research. (pp. 279-305). Hillsdale, NJ:

Erblaum.

Winer, B. J., Brown, D. R., & Michels, K. M. (1991). Statistical principles in experimental design (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

## **Appendix A:**

### **Values, Belief Systems, and Life Experiences in Persons With HIV/AIDS**

In this project, I would like to learn about the way in which you have developed your belief system and sense of values, and which life experiences have been important to you along the way. I see this as an opportunity for you to talk about whether or not your search for meaning in life is being affected by the AIDS epidemic.

Your interview will take approximately two hours. You will sign a consent form that indicates that you are voluntarily willing to participate in the project. The project itself involves an interview and 2 short questionnaires. The interview will be strictly confidential (please see "Confidentiality of Records"). You will be asked questions about your values, beliefs, and relationships that have been important to you. During the interview, you can always refuse to answer any particular question, or even stop altogether.

Approximately one week before your interview, you will be provided with a worksheet that is designed to help you prepare for your interview. You are free to

spend as little or as much time as you like on this exercise. You do not need to complete it to do the interview.

After your interview, I will be available to talk with you about the project in more detail. I welcome any comments that you may have about the project. If you are interested in continuing discussion of these issues, following completion of the interview, you are welcome to take part in a support/discussion group that will be made up of others who have participated in this research.

After publication, the results of this study will be available to you. These results will not have anything to say about YOUR interview specifically. Should you want a copy of the results, please fill in the bottom of this form. If you wish, you may send it to me later.

Thank you for your interest and your participation in the project

Sue Driedger, M.A.

Dept. of Psychology

Simon Fraser University

Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6

(You need not use YOUR name and address; you could have it sent to your physician or a friend, for example, who could in turn get it to you.)



I would like a copy of the Driedger Research Project results.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City/Postal Code \_\_\_\_\_

## **Appendix B:**

### **Confidentiality of Records**

Given the state of our culture, persons with HIV/AIDS have had to be extraordinarily careful about revealing information regarding their HIV+ status. Consequently, psychological investigators are determined that under no circumstances will any data be made public which could identify participants without their consent.

This research team is committed to the utmost confidentiality of your participation. In order to ensure this, several safeguards are being built into this project for your protection:

- \*Your interview will be audio-recorded. The tapes will be kept in the secure possession of Ms. Driedger and her associates. After transcription by Ms. Driedger or one of her associates, the tapes will be erased.

- \*The transcripts of your interview and the demographic information sheet will have no directly personally identifying information whatsoever. Your code number will be used on the tape itself.

- \*Your consent form, on which your name appears, will be kept by Ms. Driedger only until the publication of the results, or two years from the date of the interview, whichever comes first.

- \*Should you decide to ask for a copy of the results of the study, your name and address form will be destroyed upon mailing the results.

\*The transcripts and demographics themselves may be maintained in one of two ways, depending on YOUR choice:

**\*\* 1. They may be kept by Ms. Driedger as data for future researchers.**

**\*\* 2. They may be destroyed.**

Since there will be no way to identify a particular transcript after the interview is over, you will be asked how you would like this handled at the conclusion of your interview.

\*You are invited to suggest other ways in which you will feel more protected.

**Appendix C:**  
**Informed Consent Form**

The University and those conducting this project subscribe to the ethical conduct of research and to the protection at all times of the interests, comfort, and safety of participants. Your signature on this form will signify that you understand the procedure involved and that your agreement to participate in the study is completely voluntary.

"I have volunteered to participate in a research project under the direction of Sue Driedger, a Ph.D. student in the Department of Psychology at Simon Fraser University. I understand that I will be interviewed about my life history, relationships, and present values and commitments, particularly as they relate to my values and beliefs. I consent to the audio recording and transcription of the interview as long as the recording remains confidential. I also agree to complete a written questionnaire concerning the same issues.

I am aware that some of the questions I will be asked will be of a personal nature. I take part in this study with the understanding that I may omit any questions that I prefer not to answer and that I may withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that the responses I provide are completely anonymous, and that there will be no use of individual participant names in reference to the interview tape, transcription of the tape, or the written questionnaires, which will be identified

by code number only. Information that may identify the participants by name will not be available to the co-investigators who will read the transcribed interviews, nor will they appear in the completed research. I also understand that the information I provide is completely confidential. Once the research is finished, completed questionnaires and interview materials will be held confidential by the principal investigator. I also understand that I may register any complaint I might have about the experiment with the primary researcher or with Dr. Chris Webster, Chair of the Dept. of Psychology at SFU. I may obtain a summary of the general results of this study upon its completion from Sue Driedger, Dept. of Psychology, SFU, Burnaby, BC, V5A 1S6."

**NAME** (please print):

**ADDRESS** :

**SIGNATURE** : \_\_\_\_\_

**WITNESS** : \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE** : \_\_\_\_\_

A copy of this consent form will be provided to you.

## **Appendix D:**

### **Information about the Life Tapestry Exercise**

The Life Tapestry exercise is designed to help you prepare for your interview, but you do not need to complete it to do the interview. You might choose to simply look over the Life Tapestry grid in order to know what type of questions will be asked during the interview. On the other hand, you might find it to be a useful exercise to enrich your experience of the interview. Please feel free to go into as little, or as much, depth as you feel comfortable with.

If you choose to complete the grid, please bring it with you to the interview, as it may be useful to help you to remember the important events and relationships in your life while we are talking. However, the grid is yours to keep, or dispose of as you see fit.

**Please Note:** This research project is being conducted independent of any religious institution and is not intended to promote any specific belief system.

Sue Driedger, M.A.  
Dept. of Psychology  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6

## **Appendix E:**

### **Faith Development Interview**

#### **LIFE TAPESTRY/LIFE REVIEW**

- Reflecting on your life, identify its major chapters.
  - What marker events stand out as especially important?
- Are there past relationships that have been important to your development as a person?
- Do you recall any changes in relationships that have had a significant impact on your life or your way of thinking about things?
- How has your image of God and relation to God changed across your life's chapters?
- Who or what is God to you now?
- Have you ever had moments of intense joy or breakthrough experiences that have affirmed or changed your sense of life's meaning?
- Have you experienced times of crisis or suffering in your life, or times when you felt profound disillusionment, or that life had no meaning?
  - What happened to you at these times?
  - How have these experiences affected you?

## **RELATIONSHIPS**

-- Focusing now on the present, how would you describe your parents and your current relationship to them?

-- Have there been any changes in your perceptions of your parents over the years?

-- If so, what caused the change?

-- Are there any other current relationships that seem important to you?

-- What groups, institutions, or causes, do you identify with?

-- Why do you think that these are important to you?

## **PRESENT VALUES AND COMMITMENTS**

-- Do you feel that your life has meaning at present?

-- What makes life meaningful to you?

-- If you could change one thing about yourself or your life, what would you most want to change?

-- Are there any beliefs, values, or commitments that seem important to your life right now?

-- When or where do you find yourself most in communion or harmony with God or the universe?

-- What is your image or model (an idea or a person) of mature faith?

-- When you have an important decision to make, how do you generally go about making it?

-- Can you give me an example?



-- If you have a very difficult problem to solve, to whom or what would you look for guidance?

-- Do you think that actions can be right or wrong?

-- If so, what makes an action right in your opinion?

-- Are there certain actions or types of actions that are always right under any circumstances?

-- Are there certain moral opinions that you think that everyone should agree on?

## **SPIRITUALITY**

-- Do you think that human life has a purpose?

-- If so, what do you think it is?

-- Is there a plan for our lives, or are we affected by a power or powers beyond our control?

-- What does death mean to you?

-- What happens to us when we die?

-- Do you consider yourself a spiritual or religious person?

-- What does this mean to you?

-- Are there any religious ideas, symbols or rituals that are important to you, or have been important to you?

-- If so, what are these and why are they important?

-- Do you pray, meditate, or perform any other spiritual discipline?

-- What is sin, to your understanding?

-- How do you explain the presence of evil in our world?

-- If people disagree about a spiritual issue, how can such spiritual conflicts be resolved?

-- Has your spirituality been affected by your having been diagnosed with HIV/AIDS?

--If so, how?

**Appendix F:**

**Washington University Sentence Completion Test**

Please complete the following sentences:

- 1) When a child will not join in group activities
- 2) Raising a family
- 3) When I am criticized
- 4) A man's job
- 5) Being with other people
- 6) The thing I like about myself is
- 7) My mother and I
- 8) What gets me in trouble is
- 9) Education

- 10) When people are helpless
- 11) Women are lucky because
- 12) A good father
- 13) A girl has a right to
- 14) When they talked about sex, I
- 15) A wife should
- 16) I feel sorry
- 17) A man feels good when
- 18) Rules are

## Appendix G:

### Religious Orientation Scale

**Possible responses: 1 – I definitely disagree**

**2 – I tend to disagree**

**4 – I tend to agree**

**5 – I definitely agree.**

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

\_\_\_\_\_ 2. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.

\_\_\_\_\_ 3. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.

\_\_\_\_\_ 4. The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships.

\_\_\_\_\_ 5. What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike.

\_\_\_\_\_ 6. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.

\_\_\_\_\_ 7. Although I am a religious person, I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.

\_\_\_\_\_ 8. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial activity.

\_\_\_\_\_ 9. Occasionally, I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.

\_\_\_\_\_ 10. One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.

\_\_\_\_\_ 11. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.

\_\_\_\_\_ 12. It is important for me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.

\_\_\_\_\_ 13. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church.

\_\_\_\_\_ 14. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.

\_\_\_\_\_ 15. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services.

\_\_\_\_\_ 16. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being.

\_\_\_\_\_ 17. I read literature about my faith (or church).

\_\_\_\_\_ 18. If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join a Bible study group rather than a social fellowship.

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

\_\_\_\_\_ 20. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.

**Appendix H:**

**Demographic Information**

The following information will be used to help understand some of the similarities and differences found between participants in this study. As with all of the information that you have given during the interview, this information will remain confidential.

Birthdate (mm/dd.yy): \_\_\_\_\_ Age: \_\_\_\_\_ Sex: \_\_\_\_\_

Race/Ethnic Background: \_\_\_\_\_ Place of Birth: \_\_\_\_\_

Highest Grade Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

Further Education? yes no

Number of Years Completed Post-High School: \_\_\_\_\_

Diploma/Degree Obtained (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_

Have you had to change jobs or stop working as a result of your diagnosis?

Yes/No

What was your income prior to diagnosis?(Check one)

\$0 - 20,000 \_\_\_\_\_ \$50,000 - 69,000 \_\_\_\_\_

\$20,000 - 39,000 \_\_\_\_\_ \$70,000 - + \_\_\_\_\_

\$40,000 - 59,000 \_\_\_\_\_

Has your income changed substantially as a result of your diagnosis? Yes/No

Please comment:

How long have you known that you are HIV+? \_\_\_\_\_

Specific AIDS-related illnesses you have had:

What was your latest CD4 count?(check one) \_\_\_\_\_ >400; \_\_\_\_\_ 200-400;  
\_\_\_\_\_ 100-200; \_\_\_\_\_ <100

Are you active in a formal spiritual or religious group? Yes/No

If so, what is the group's religious affiliation/denomination?

\_\_\_\_\_

Approximately when were you diagnosed with HIV? \_\_\_\_\_(mm/yy)

If applicable, when were you diagnosed with AIDS? \_\_\_\_\_(mm/yy)

Would you like to be contacted to join a support group to continue discussion based  
on this interview? \_\_\_\_ (y/n)

May I use your data for future research? \_\_\_\_ (y/n)



## Appendix I:

### Faith Development: Sample characteristics-quantitative.

Total faith stage scores ranged from 1.97 to 5.26 ( $M = 3.76$ ;  $SD = .782$ ).

Percentages at each stage were as follows: 3% Stage 2 (Mythic Literal Faith); 1.5% Transitional Stage 2/3; 27.3% Stage 3 (Synthetic-Conventional Faith); 16.7% Transitional Stage 3/4; 21.2% Stage 4 (Individuative-Reflective); 15.2% Transitional Stage 4/5; and 15.2% Stage 5 (Conjunctive).

The distribution of stages in Fowler's first series of studies (Fowler, 1981) is presented in Table 11. Fowler clearly states that his original sample ( $N = 249$ ) was not randomly selected and is thus not appropriate as a normative base.

Nevertheless, since there have as yet been no norms established, the original data are being presented for purposes of comparison. There are no significant differences between the two distributions (Chi-square = 6.01,  $df = 4$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

However, the modal stage in the original sample is Stage 4 (Individuative-Reflective), whereas the modal stage in the current study is Stage 3 (Synthetic-Conventional Faith).

## Appendix J:

### Faith Development: Sample characteristics-qualitative.

On the FDI, responses ranged from Stage 1 to Stage 6. The following examples are given to convey the flavor of the responses, to show the range of responses given, and to show how the scoring criteria are applied to individual responses.

#### Stage 1:

Q: What do you think makes an action a right action?

R#102: Resolution. If your action resolves the problem. If you were making a decision and your action resolves the problem... you've resolved it, then it was the right decision. (Stage 1)

This person's response defines morality in terms of the consequences of their actions, thus receiving an Intuitive-Projective stage score.

Q: Do you think that human life has a purpose?

R#122: No. I mean, that's another thing I've never really dwelt on reasons why...I'm always thinking about different things, but I don't dwell on them. I think about them and then they're gone. (Stage 1)

This person's response is scored at the Intuitive-Projective level of faith because his sense of world coherence is episodic in nature.

#### Stage 2:

Q: If people disagree about a spiritual issue, or have a spiritual conflict, how should it be resolved?

R#108: They can disagree, but they have to respect the other view, what

they are thinking... Like Vietnamese people keep the ashes of their dead in their house. And they have a little shrine and everything. Because they really believe that this person is still with them. I don't really agree with that, but this is their way of living and they believe in that. And that's fine. It's not bothering me. As long as they will respect the way I am living, I can respect the way they are living. (Stage 2)

This Mythic-Literal response begins with an rather sophisticated tolerance for other cultures, but ends with an emphasis that the tolerance is based purely on reciprocity.

Q: What does death mean to you? What happens to us when we die?

R#123: Well, I don't believe in reincarnation. I believe that, that in time, um, oh, how do I explain this one, um... I believe that there is something greater than this that will happen, you know, um, I can't really answer this one, you know? Like I have my own beliefs on it, yeah, the Lord is gonna come back, and when he does that it is going to be totally different than what we live in today, with all the hardships people are going through and the millions that are dying over in the third world, and stuff like that, that's going to be something better coming, or, you know, that is gonna happen? Yeah. (Stage 2)

Typical of the Mythic-Literal stage, this response incorporates a narrative story that is taken literally and is based on the teachings of trusted authorities.

### **Stage 3.**

Q: Which beliefs and values are most important to you right now?

R#107: My beliefs...sigh...What's most important to me now? My friends. My family. My mother. Um... my well-being. The help I've been receiving lately. (Stage 3)

This response reflects the Synthetic-Conventional Bounds of Social Awareness that include both friends and family, and emphasize interpersonal harmony, feeling happy and healthy.

Q: Are there any groups, institutions, or causes that you identify with?

R#117: Carrying the message to [high school students] so that they don't end up with what I have. You know, hopefully something I say to them will you know, hopefully trigger them, and that, you know, if they were ever to have unsafe sex, or to sit down and to use intravenous drugs, you know, they'll remember me, and remember what I said maybe enough that they'd say no and change their mind, which would cure somebody from contacting any kind of fatal disease or infectious disease. Which is what my whole purpose of why I'm here. (Stage 3)

This man's response indicates that his bounds of social awareness extend towards others whom he might be able to help, fantasizing the role he might play in someone else's life in a somewhat grandiose fashion, typical of the Synthetic-Conventional stage.

**Stage 4:**

Q: Do you pray, or meditate, or perform any other kind of spiritual discipline?

R#101: I do meditate, from time to time. And the distinction that I would make between meditation and prayer, as a for instance. Prayer implies for me that it's got, that there's intent. There's a certain goal or desire that one wants to have fulfilled. In meditation, more often than not for me, it's just relaxation. There's a lot of stuff rattling around in my mind, and I just want to blow off some steam. Not blow it off. I mean, let it flutter off (smiles). (Stage 4)

This response was given an Individuative-Reflective stage 4 score because the respondent analytically defines the potentially symbolic actions of prayer and meditation, focusing on the definition rather than the power of the symbolism.

Q: Looking back over your life, were you able to sort it into chapters?

R#113: To a great part, yeah, I was ... certain patterns ...um ... if a change occurred. And it seemed as though I'd fallen into a cycle. There were major steps in, in the changes that occurred. Whether it's an incident, or just the

fact that ... I've been thinking about a lot of things for a long time. It's like, an awareness hit. And it kind of changed the direction of life, and yeah, I noticed that ... I think a lot of the things that happened, in some respects, were related around death. (Stage 4)

This man's approach to this question is to first analyze his own process to find a way in which he can systematically understand his experience, making it an Individuative-Reflective response.

**Stage 5:**

Q: What does death mean to you? What happens to us when we die?

R#121: I am so eager to find this out! (laughs) I just, I really want to know, you know. Even if I roast in Hell for eternity, I mean like, I'm just so eager to find out if that's really true. Because I've been fed so many stories over my life, all these different things, and then I sort of think, okay, there's this part of me that goes, "what's scientific and most likely?" Well we have all these people having after-death experiences, and they all come back with these similar stories, except that the story always fits their culture.... And I know that my grandmother smiled when she died. So obviously dying itself is not particularly horrible. It's probably quite nice. So it'll be interesting. However, I'm gay, and lots and lots of religions say I'm in real deep shit.... So that's kind of in the back of my mind. The Muslims say that, the Christians say that, Mr. Emerson says that... and then we have the Buddhist ideas...(Stage 5)

This respondent is open to the truth claims of many traditions other than his own, holding them in tension without using reductionism to ease the tension. This type of openness is the trademark of the way Conjunctive faith establishes a sense of world coherence.

Q: How do you explain the presence of evil in the world?

R#105: Well, I think it's to balance. You have to have a balance, so the world's by no means perfect, and I don't think... If the world was perfect, there would be less reason to be here because there'd be nothing to change or do. Then again, what is perfection? What's perfect to one isn't perfect to another. Like one sees, the other doesn't. (Stage 5)

This man uses dialectical logic to establish an approach to morality that is based on a principle that is "prior to society" and a higher law than those established by society, making this a Conjunctive response.

**Stage 6:**

Q: Do you think that human life has a purpose?

R#106: Yes. For me, it's to experience. From my point of view, it's the experience that we're all here for ... we are intimately a part of creating at any point in time. (Stage 6)

This response was given a Universalizing stage 6 score because it reflects this man's felt sense of participation and loyalty to being.

Q: What do you think caused the change in your relationship with your father?

R#114: Um, practicality. Looking at death. You know, I would say that's one place that my illness has, uh, helped me release myself from any negative tension in my life. Um, I realize that I've got a short fuse, there's you know, um, living on, in a sense, borrowed time, so why belabor any negative feelings, or you know worry about injustices or any of that type of stuff. You know, I've essentially forgiven everybody everything, is the way I look at my position in life right now. And amazingly enough, I've found myself to be much more -- well it doesn't have anything to do too much with religion -- but much more, um, other words, oh, resourceful, stable, comfortable with myself, um than I imagined possible. (Stage 6)

This man has a sense of peace that allows him to transcend negativity and to reconcile his relationships, letting go of the struggle in order to accept self and others. This sense of mutuality with all people typifies the Universalizing approach to perspective taking.

Appendix K:

Ego Development -- Examples and scoring criteria.

WUSCT Question	Response	Criterion response	I-level
Q.17 A man feels good when...	R#157...he has done it.	Direct reference to sexual gratification e.g., "he has it".....	Impulsive I-2
Q. 2 Raising a family...	R#123: is a hard job today to do	Self-centered, self-interested attitudes e.g., "it can be a very hard job sometimes."	Self-Protective I-Delta
Q. 9 Education...	R#165...I didn't get very much.	Education is a thing one gets e.g. "something I never got"	Transition I-Delta /3
Q.10 When people are helpless...	R#171....I jump in.	As a rule, one should help e.g., "I try my best to help."	Conformist I-3 (table continues)

**Appendix K *ctd.***

WUSCT Question	Response	Criterion response	I-level
Q. 3 When I am criticized...	R#122....I listen then express my feelings.	Typical I-3 reactions, such as "I listenp, are elaborated. e.g., "I listen and check my premises and my temper."	Transition I-3/4
Q. 6 The thing I like about myself is...	R#140....that I think that I am open-minded, conscientious of others.	Morality involves one's own philosophy and virtues. e.g., "my inner moral standards."	Conscientious I-4
Q.12 A good father...	R#101....provides a secure environment in which his family can explore their talents and abilities.	The ability to meet the needs of the family are stated more complexly than at lower levels. e.g., "satisfies the needs of his family & where he can't, know how to have those needs met elsewhere."	Transition I-4/5



**Appendix K cont.**

WUSCT Question	Response	Criterion response	I-level
Q. 1 When a child will not join in group activities...	R#109:....It is either lonely in life or content.	This level involves both favorable and unfavorable constructions. e.g., "it may be a healthy thing or not."	Autonomous I-5
Q.16 I feel sorry...	R#137:....for the pain I've caused and the missed opportunities to cause pain.	Responses classed here contain an unusual degree of distance from self. e.g., "if I see someone in pain or trouble or have to discipline the children. Nevertheless I do so."	Integrated I-6

## Appendix L:

### Ego development – Quantitative characteristics.

Ego development total protocol rating scores ranged from 2.5 to 5 ( $M = 3.97$ ;  $SD = .65$ ). The percentages in each stage category were as follows: 2.9% Stage Delta (Self-Protective); 4.4% Stage Delta/3 (Transitional from Self-Protective to Conformist); 1.5% Stage 3 (Conformist); 25.0% Stage 3.5 (Transitional from Conformist to Conscientious); 38.2% Stage 4 (Conscientious); 25.0% Stage 4.5 (Transitional from Conscientious to Autonomous); 2.9% Stage 5 (Autonomous). This distribution is presented in Table 11, along with the normative distribution of ego development stages established by Loevinger (1985). There are no significant differences between the distribution in the current sample compared with the normative distribution (Chi-square = 7.42,  $df = 7$ ,  $p > .05$ ).