

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES AMONG CALGARY YOUTH:
TAXONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONTEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS

by

Charles R. McCombs

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

April, 1975

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES AMONG CALGARY YOUTH:
TAXONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONTEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS

by

CHARLES R. McCOMBS

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1975

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this dissertation, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
dissertation and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this dissertation.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.



ABSTRACT

This study is concerned with the nature of religious experiences. It involves an analysis of two substantive issues. First, it explores three taxonomic relationships which are based on Rodney Stark's "A Taxonomy of Religious Experience" (Glock and Stark 1965:39). These relationships are: (1) Do religious experiences vary according to the frequency of their occurrence? (2) Are religious experiences progressive in nature, (e.g. will a lower order experience have occurred before a higher order experience will occur?) (3) Can religious experiences be ranked according to their salience for an individual in a specified manner?

The second substantive concern arises from the adoption of the view that religious experiences are not solely an individual phenomenon, but will have social contexts and correlates related to their occurrence. The relationships of eight social variables to the occurrence of religious experiences were examined.

The analysis was based on the responses of a city wide sample of 708 youth, ages 15-24, in Calgary, Alberta, to a questionnaire concerning religious and social attitudes and behaviour in 1971. Percentage, scalogram and correlation analysis were employed in the analysis of the data.

The results of these procedures indicated that religious experiences do vary in the frequency of their occurrence, although not as specifically expected by Stark's taxonomy. They were also found to be, in general, progressive in nature. However, there could be no taxonomic ranking for the saliency of these experiences. But, as a result of the analysis a Guttman scale of five experiences was found which served as the basis for the analysis of the social context of religious experiences. It should be noted that this scale was composed of only positive religious experiences as the negative experiences were found to constitute a separate dimension of religious experiences.

Further, religious experiences were found to have definite social contexts and correlates. In particular, four social variables (religious beliefs, the present importance of religion, the regularity of prayer, and the frequency of attendance at religious services) were found to explain fifty percent of the variation in the occurrence of religious experiences.

The conclusions indicate a need for further and more precise research concerning the nature and the social contexts associated with the occurrence of religious experiences. Additionally, there is an indication for the beginnings of a new model of religiosity which would have ideological commitment at the center. The remainder of an individual's religiosity would then be seen as a manifestation of this basic commitment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | iv |
| LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS | vi |
| CHAPTER | |
| I. OVERVIEW OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES | 1 |
| Preliminary Statement of Subject and Plan of Study | 1 |
| Taxonomy of Religious Experience | 5 |
| Social Context of Religious Experiences | 12 |
| Focus and Scope of the Present Study | 19 |
| The Hypotheses | 20 |
| II. METHODOLOGY | 22 |
| The Data | 22 |
| Sampling Procedures | 23 |
| Presentation Format of the Analysis and Findings | 24 |
| III. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS | 25 |
| Discussion of Issues Raised in the Taxonomic Analysis | 38 |
| Statistical Specification of Previous Findings | 58 |
| IV. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH ... | 65 |
| A Taxonomy of Religious Experiences Revisited | 65 |
| The Social Context of Religious Experiences ... | 71 |
| APPENDICES | 101 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 119 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Comparison of Total City Population for Age Specific Groups 15-19, 20-24, by Sex, with 15 Percent Enumeration Area Sample for Age Specific Groups 15-19, 20-24 by Sex, for Calgary, 1966, with Population Surveyed, 1971, with Total Population 1971 | 77 |
| 2. Reported Incidence of Religious Experiences By Type of Experience | 78 |
| 3. Percentage of Persons Who Have Reported Higher-Order Experiences Who Have Also Reported a Confirming Experience | 79 |
| 4. Percents of Persons Who Have Reported Higher-Order Experiences Who Have Also Reported an Ecstatic Experience | 80 |
| 5. Percents of Persons Who Have Reported Revelational Experiences Who Have Also Reported A Fearful Experience | 81 |
| 6. Percents of Persons Who Have Reported Revelational Experiences Who Have Also Reported a Responsive Sanctioning Experience | 82 |
| 7. Percents of Persons Who Have Reported Revelational Experiences Who Have Also Reported a Responsive Miraculous Experience | 83 |
| 8. Percents of Persons Who Have Reported Revelational Experiences Who Have Also Reported a Responsive Salvational Experience | 84 |
| 9. Percent of Persons Who Have Reported a Responsive Salvational Experience Who Have Also Reported a Revelational Enlightenment Experience | 85 |
| 10. Percentage of Salient Experiences by Type of Experience and Surity of Response | 86 |
| 11. Percent of Each Denominational Category According to Their Rank on the Experiential Scale | 87 |

| TABLE | Page |
|--|------|
| 12. Percentage Scoring Five on the Experiential Scale for the Denominations Compared to Their Percentage of the Total Population | 88 |
| 13. Percentage of Each Denomination Who Reported the Responsive Sanctioning Experience | 88 |
| 14. Relationship Between Number of Close Friends In Local Congregation and the Incidence of Religious Experiences | 89 |
| 15. Relationship Between Religious Beliefs and The Occurrence of Religious Experiences | 90 |
| 16. Relationship Between Attendance at Religious Services and the Occurrence of Religious Experiences | 91 |
| 17. Relationship Between Prayer and the Occurrence of Religious Experiences | 92 |
| 18. Relationship Between Sex and the Occurrence of Religious Experiences | 93 |
| 19. Relationship Between Religious Climate in the Home When Growing Up and the Occurrence of Religious Experiences | 94 |
| 20. Relationship Between Religious Climate in the Home When Growing Up and the Present Importance of Religion | 95 |
| 21. Relationship Between the Present Importance of Religion and the Occurrence of Religious Experiences | 96 |
| 22. Zero-Order Correlation Matrix for Variables In Study | 97 |
| 23. First-Order Partial Correlation Coefficients With the Experiential Scale | 98 |
| 24. Second-Order Partial Correlation Coefficients With the Experiential Scale | 99 |
| 25. Third-Order Partial Correlation Coefficients With the Experiential Scale | 100 |

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

| CHART | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Expected and Actual Ranks of the Types of Religious Experiences | 28 |
| 2. Frequency Rank By Guttman Experiential Scale Score | 41 |

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES

Preliminary Statement of Subject and Plan of Study

The empirical study of religious experiences is an area of inquiry in which surprisingly little research has been done. The initial attempts at scientific inquiry into this phenomenon occurred around the turn of the century. The classical approach to this subject was psychological. It is not surprising to find the classical writers considering the occurrence of religious experiences to be an individual phenomenon. Two of the most influential writers of this time were William James and James Leuba. Both approached the study of religious experiences from a qualitative perspective. James (1902) attempted a classification of religious experiences using broad, existing religious categories, e.g. conversion and mysticism. Moreover, in his discussion of the experiences which fell into these categories, he dwelt heavily on in depth descriptions of various individual experiences. The experiences he described were of various magnitudes ranging from an individual feeling the presence of God to raptuous visions.

Leuba (1925), on the other hand, was solely interested in the raptuous experiences and not those of the common man. The bulk of his work was concerned with the experiences

of various saintly types of individuals whose experiences were particularly vivid and out of the ordinary. Leuba, himself, addressed this point when he stated, "These mystics, it may be said, are not the most worthy of admiration. They are rather extravagant instances, all or most of whom suffered from some form of nervous instability, if not hysteria" (Leuba 1925:56). In addition, Leuba also gave some consideration to the physical means of producing some forms of ecstasy or religious experience, e.g. the ingestion of various drugs, isolation, deprivation of food, etc.

In addition to the psychological approach, early sociologists (e.g. Durkheim, 1957; Troeltsch, 1960; and Weber, 1963) were also concerned with religious experiences. However, in their studies religious experiences were treated on a much more general level as a part of a general theory of religion. It was not until the early 1960's that sociologists became concerned with the quantification of religious experiences. This first took the form of Charles Glock's work "On the Study of Religious Commitment" (Glock and Stark 1965:18) in which he proposed that the study of religiosity could be separated into five dimensions. One of the five dimensions he proposed was called the experiential which was described by him as follows:

. . . all of those feelings, perceptions, and sensations which are experienced by an actor or defined by a religious group as involving some communication, however slight, with a divine essence, i.e. with God, with ultimate reality, with transcendental authority. (1965:20)

While many researchers have entered into the discussion as to the multidimensionality of religiosity and thus were tangentially concerned with religious experiences, few researchers have attempted any research dealing precisely with these phenomena. However, one researcher in particular has considered religious experiences to be worthy of scientific inquiry sui generis. This person is Rodney Stark, who has been closely associated with the work of Glock. Stark (Glock and Stark 1965:39) adopted the definition of religious experience set forth above. Then on the basis of this definition he posited a taxonomy, or classification, of religious experience. He suggested four types which were distinguished from each other by differing degrees of communication with the divine .

It should be noted that Stark's adoption of the above definition of religious experience is consistent with the classical writers mentioned above. Both Leuba and James considered some form of contact or communication with the divine as essential for a religious experience to occur. Leuba, for example, defined mystical (a term which can be taken, for the purposes at hand, to be synonymous with religious experience) as ". . . any experience taken by the experiencer to be a contact or union of the self with a larger-than-self, be it called the World-Spirit, God the Absolute or otherwise." (Leuba 1925:1)

However, the commonality of the classical approach and the approach of Stark is basically limited to the

definitional realm. Stark (Glock and Stark 1965:151), in a study subsequent to his taxonomy, drastically deviated from the classical approach. Rather than viewing the occurrence of religious experiences as an individual phenomenon, Stark viewed such experiences as often normative and socially supported types of behaviour. To realize the relevance of such an approach to the study of religious experience, one only has to attend a fundamentalist revival service where there is not only social support for the occurrence of religious experiences, but the expectation that such experiences will occur. From this position, Stark then proceeded to specify some social variables which were found to be associated with the occurrence of religious experiences.

Stark's view concerning the social qualities of religious experiences has been followed by other researchers. Bourque and Back (1968) and Bourque (1969) were interested in the differences between religious and aesthetic experiences. They were concerned with such social variables as differing social backgrounds, differing personality characteristics, differing values and differing situations in which the experiences occurred.

Following from these previous works, Raymond Currie (1973) did a survey of the religious and social attitudes and behaviour of young people (ages 15-24) in Calgary, Alberta. Currie's operationalization of religious experiences was a direct extension of Stark's classification scheme. The data regarding such experiences and other variables

which will be considered have been made available to this author for analysis.

The present study follows from the above mentioned works and will primarily be concerned with two substantive issues. First, attention will be directed to Stark's taxonomy to see if it is a valid representation of the types of experiences and their interrelationships. The second concern is an attempt to specify some meaningful social variables which are related to the occurrence of religious experiences. In doing this, Stark's work will not only be replicated, but extended in several areas. Other variables, which are not discussed by previous researchers will also be considered.

Specification of Relevant Literature and Implications for Analysis

A. Taxonomy of Religious Experience

Since the present study draws heavily on Stark's work, and Currie's operationalization of the experiential variable was also based on Stark, the logical starting place for a review of the relevant literature is with Stark's taxonomy. As noted previously, Stark stated there are four basic types of religious experiences. He outlined these as follows:

1. The confirming experience--the human actor simply notes (feels, senses, etc.) the existence or presence of the divine actor.
2. The responsive experience--mutual presence is acknowledged, the divine is perceived as noting the presence of the human actor.

3. The ecstatic experience--the awareness of mutual presence is replaced by an affective relationship akin to love or friendship.
4. The revelational experience--the human actor perceives himself as a confidant or a fellow participant in action with the divine actor. (Glock and Stark 1965:43)

In addition, Stark indicated that each of these four types of experiences could be divided into various sub-dimensions. It should be noted that Stark, in his "Social Contexts of Religious Experience" (1965:151), did not attempt to operationalize all types or subdimensions of experiences in this study. He only operationalized the following types; the confirming and the responsive, the latter being subdivided into two items, one dealing with a sense of being saved in Christ and the other concerning being punished by God. He stated his reasons for this as follows:

One reason for these omissions (the ecstatic and revelational types), aside from the fact that a lack of a clear conceptual scheme at the time made the choice somewhat fortuitous, was that it was little imagined how frequently modern Christians would report religious experiences. Items aimed at the more complex and intimate types of religious encounters seemed, then, as too extreme to be credible. (Glock and Stark 1965:157)

However, as will be seen, religious experiences did not appear as esoteric as supposed by Stark. From this perspective, Currie (1973) attempted to operationalize other types of experiences based on Stark's taxonomy. Measures are available for three subdimensions of the responsive type experience and for two subdimensions of the revelational. In addition, the ecstatic experience was also operationalized.

The subdimensions of the responsive and revelational types may be outlined as follows:

The responsive experience

- A. salvational - a feeling that one has been saved.
- B. miraculous - a sense that God has miraculously helped the person.
- C. sanctioning - a feeling of being punished by God for something done.

The revelational experience

- A. enlightenment - a feeling that God has shared some sort of information with the human actor.
- B. commission - a feeling that God has told the human actor to do something for him.

In addition, one other type of religious experience was operationalized by Currie. This was a fear of God. This item was included by Currie partially on the basis of Otto (1966) who indicated that "awe" of the divine played a significant role in the development of most religions. Otto's position was that this sense of "awe" survives along with the benevolent view of the divine. He stated,

Even when the worship of 'daemons' has long since reached the higher level of worship of 'gods,' these gods still retain as numina something of the 'ghost' in the impress they make on the feelings of the worshipper, viz. the peculiar quality of the 'uncanny' and 'aweful,' which survives with the quality of exaltedness and sublimity or is symbolized by means of it. (1966:17)

While not specified in Stark's taxonomy, this item is relevant for this study as it is similar to a category of classification used by Bourque (1969) which was based on Glock's

(Glock and Stark 1965:18) discussion of the experiential dimensions of religiosity. In this author's opinion this item should resemble either a confirming or a responsive experience on the grounds that such an encounter is not likely to entail intimate communication.

In brief, this study will be concerned with measuring the following types and subtypes of religious experiences:

- (1) the confirming
- (2) the revelational
 - a. salvational
 - b. miraculous
 - c. sanctioning
- (3) the fearful
- (4) the ecstatic
- (5) the revelational
 - a. enlightenment
 - b. commission

Now that the types of religious experiences which will be considered in this study have been delineated and realizing that one of the basic concerns of this study is with the validity of Stark's taxonomy, it will be useful to look at two of the specifications made by Stark regarding his taxonomy. First, there should be variations in the relative frequencies of different types of religious experiences. And, second, religious experiences should be a progressive phenomenon, i.e. one would have a lower order religious experience before having a higher order experience.

Stark's ordering of the types of religious experiences was proposed as a continuum analagous to various degrees of personal interaction. For example, he suggests that behaviour may range from simple greetings, to a feeling of affection, to intimate communication. A person will have more friends he will simply greet than he will have friends with whom he shares intimate communication.

Likewise, even among friends with whom he shares intimate communication, most of the interaction will take place at the lower level of intimacy; not at the higher. Further, initial communication should begin at the less intimate and may or may not move to a higher intimacy level. Viewed in this light, one would expect that in regards to frequency, the four basic types could be ordered from most frequent to least frequent in the following manner: confirming, responsive, ecstatic, revelational. Also, if religious experiences are a progressive phenomenon, a person reporting an experience which assumes intimate communication (e.g. an ecstatic experience) should also have had a lower, less intimate, experience (e.g. a confirming experience). Stark's discussion concerning frequency and progression, it should be noted, was limited to the basic types of religious experiences. The possible interrelationships of the subtypes were not specified.

Stark (Glock and Stark 1965:151) attempted to discern if the two above assumptions were verifiable. This was done on the basis of responses to a survey questionnaire admini-

stered to a sample of church members in southern California. He found that the lower order experience, the confirming, had in fact occurred more frequently than the higher types.¹ More respondents were either "sure" or "thought" they had the confirming experience (73% of the Protestants and 66% of the Roman Catholics) than were either "sure" or "thought" they had either subdimension of the responsive experience (salvational: 59% of the Protestants and 49% of the Roman Catholics; sanctioning: 41% of the Protestants and 53% of the Roman Catholics).

However, Stark was not only postulating that the lower order experiences would occur more frequently, but, also that religious experiences were a progressive phenomenon. To test this assumption, Stark crosstabulated the occurrence of the confirming and the responsive salvational types of experiences. Of those respondents who were "sure" they had the responsive salvational experience, i.e. the higher order one, 81 percent were also "sure" they had the confirming experience. An additional 15 percent indicated they "thought" they had the confirming experience. In all 96 percent of those who were "sure" they had the salvational experience reported the confirming experience. Apparently then, Stark's assumption that religious experiences would be

¹It should be remembered that Stark only operationalized the confirming, the responsive salvational and the responsive sanctioning types of experiences. This, of course must be considered when looking at this and subsequent findings.

progressive in nature was supported.

Stark's taxonomy also gains support from other research. Bourque (1969) asked her respondents if they had ever had a religious experience and, if so, they were asked to describe their experience(s). It is important to note that 70 percent of the descriptions of various experiences were classifiable under categories contained in Stark's taxonomy. However, at the same time, there is an indication of a possible problem with the proposed frequency ordering of the experiences. More responses were coded into a category of "revelation of some truth" than in a category of "power, presence of supernatural." This, of course, is contrary to Stark's taxonomy where the revelational type of experience should be the least frequent experience. But, since Bourque does not report the specific coding instructions, it would be premature to make any decision concerning the validity of Stark's taxonomy on this basis.

In addition to looking at the two taxonomic relationships regarding frequency and progression, the present study will undertake a logical extension of Stark's taxonomy. This will be to propose a rank-ordering of the major types of experiences in terms of their saliency. While religious experiences requiring a lesser degree of intimacy between the human actor and the divine are likely to be the most frequent, those types which stress more intimate communication (e.g. the ecstatic and revelational) should be the most salient. Utilizing the friendship analogy again, it

is most likely that a person will consider intimate communication or love between himself and the other actor as being more important than simple greetings with the individual. Therefore, one would expect the rank-ordering of the types of religious experiences in terms of saliency to be in the reverse order from that stipulated for frequency. That is, the revelational should be the most salient and the confirming the least salient. The available data allows this assumption to be tested.

The importance of this approach to religious experiences, in this author's opinion, lies in the fact that there is little likelihood that religious experiences would have a substantial impact on the attitudes and behaviour of the respondents who report such experiences if they are not considered to be important.

Social Context of Religious Experiences

The present study is not solely concerned with Stark's taxonomy. The second major concern is the identification of social variables associated with the occurrence of religious experiences. The identification of such variables is important since this study adopts Stark's view of religious experiences as not being solely an individual phenomenon, but a phenomenon that also has a social context. From this perspective, a review of the relevant literature would be beneficial in indicating some important variables associated with religious experiences.

Following Stark's analysis of the data relating to his taxonomy, he examined the relationship between denominational affiliation and the occurrence of religious experiences. By forming a simple index from the responses to his three experiential items,² he found that wide differences existed among some of the denominations. For example, the Southern Baptists in his sample had 97 percent scoring high on his experience index. This was in contrast to the Presbyterians who had 52 percent scoring high. According to this there does exist some relationship between denominational affiliation and the occurrence of religious experiences.

However, Stark continued by stating:

One important way in which these denominations differ is the degree to which they constitute quasi-primary groups. The more liberal bodies resemble occasional audiences or focused crowds, while the more conservative groups tend to resemble moral communities in the Durkheimian sense of the word. That is, the conservative respondents not only attach great importance to their church membership, as indeed the liberals do too, but their congregation serves as a primary source of informal social relations. (Italics in the original) (Glock and Stark 1965:163).

From this, Stark explored the relationship between informal social ties, denominational affiliation and the incidence of religious experiences. He controlled for the number of one's best friends who were also members of the

²Formed by assigning two points for a "sure" response; one point for a "I think I have" response; and no points for a "No" response.

respondent's local congregation in the previously reported relationship. Analysis of the results of this procedure indicated a reduction of some of the previous differences among the denominations. For example, 100 percent of those Southern Baptists who had four or five of their closest friends in their congregation scored high on the experiential index, while the Presbyterians meeting the same criteria had 78 percent score high. Informal social ties thus reduced some of the initial differences among the denominations.

Stark further noted that perhaps a more significant result of this analysis was the fact that within some of the more liberal churches, (e.g. Methodist, Protestant Episcopal, etc.) there existed social groupings which resembled those found among fundamentalists. They were much more likely to have reported the occurrence of religious experiences than were their fellow members who did not share this primary type of bond with others in their congregation.

However, there still existed considerable variation between many of the denominations. Stark felt that this could be explained, in part, by the differing theological orientations of the various denominations. To test this assumption, he compared the relationship between denominational affiliation and religious experiences controlling for religious beliefs³ to the zero-order relationship between

³Measured by the Index of Religious Orthodoxy as developed by Glock and Stark. It is based on four questions concerning belief in God, the Devil, the divinity of Jesus and Biblical miracles. (Glock and Stark 1965:166)

denominational affiliation and the occurrence of religious experiences. The results of this procedure indicated that there was a relationship between the incidence of religious experiences and religious orthodoxy. In fact, even within the liberal denominations, the majority of those scoring high or medium on the index of religious orthodoxy also scored high on the religious experience index.

While Stark's research has the greatest impact on the present study, other research is important in the identification of other social variables which are related to the occurrence of religious experiences. Bourque and Back (1968) were concerned with value and personality differences between individuals who reported having religious experiences and aesthetic experiences. Their questions concerning religious experiences were taken from Glock and Stark (1965) (two of these items were the same as used by Stark; items 139 and 140 in the questionnaire, Appendix A). Of their various findings, one is relevant to the present study. They found gender to be associated with the occurrence of religious experiences. It should be noted that Stark also found this but only mentions it in passing without reporting any figures. This relationship should not come as a surprise as practically all research, of which this author is aware, has found females to be "more religious" than males. It is possible that some would question the relevance of this finding to the present study as some consider gender to be an individual status and this study is seeking out social

in this paper.⁴ However, this literature becomes relevant when one considers that the above research has consistently found positive correlations between all dimensions, including the experiential (e.g. Faulkner and De Jong, 1966; Clayton, 1968; etc.) Furthermore, since Stark has demonstrated that religious experiences were associated with religious orthodoxy (which corresponds to Glock's ideological dimension), the assumption can be made that components of other dimensions should also be related to the occurrence of religious experiences.

It is possible with the present data to consider two forms of ritual behaviour,⁵ namely, the frequency of attendance at religious services and the regularity of prayer. However, the decision to include these variables in the present study is not only a result of the literature dealing with the multidimensionality of religiosity. Bourque's (1969) findings are also relevant. She was not only interested in the occurrence and types of religious and aesthetic experiences, but also in the "triggering mechanism"

⁴Most of these studies used scales developed by Faulkner and De Jong (1966). Their experiential scale was based on Glock's original description of the experiential dimension and not Stark's. One of their items (and most fit this type) asked, "Would you say that one's religious commitment gives life a certain purpose which it could not otherwise have?" Clearly, such items are not concerned with any type of communication between human and divine as is necessary within the framework of the present study.

⁵Measures are not available for the intellectual and consequential dimensions.

or situation in which the experience occurred. Sixty-seven percent of those respondents reporting one or more religious experiences indicated that these experiences had occurred during either a "Church Service, Prayer or Dream." This then indicates that one should find a fairly strong relationship between these forms of ritual participation and the occurrence of religious experiences. Further, prayer should be related to the occurrence of religious experiences, as they are defined in this paper, because the key to the definition of religious experiences is "some form of communication, however slight, with a divine essence . . ." and this is exactly what one is attempting through the act of prayer. This of course opens the possibility that prayer's relationship to the occurrence of religious experiences could be attributable not to the fact that it is a form of ritual behaviour, but because it, by definition, happens to be, if communication is achieved, a religious experience.

The final area of inquiry which this study undertakes extends the social context of religious experiences to the youth's socialization process. Stark (Glock and Stark 1965: 151) found that the majority of his respondents adopted, i.e. were socialized, into the pattern of their denominations both in regards to the occurrence of religious experiences and the strength of their religious orthodoxy. Given that the sample is composed of young people (15-24) and the question regarding religious experiences for this study ask the respondents to report their religious experiences since the

age of twelve, it is likely that some of the early socialization influences should be relevant for this study. Of course, one of the primary socialization influences is the family. With the data at hand it is possible to examine this socializing agent. The present study will consider the strength of the religious climate in the home when growing up as an indication of the family's socialization influence. It is expected that as the strength of the religious climate in the home increases so will the reported incidence of religious experiences. This is so because the younger respondents in the sample have just completed the time period in their lives when the nuclear family's influence in the socialization process has reached its peak. Also, since the respondents were asked to report their religious experiences since the age of twelve, even those respondents for whom the family has probably lost a great deal of its influence could still have reported their earlier religious experiences.

Focus and Scope of the Present Study

To recapitulate the previous discussion, this study will attempt to operationalize eight religious experiences. These include the four major types delineated by Stark as well as certain subtypes and a fearful experience which was not discussed by Stark. Further, this study is concerned with two substantive issues; a taxonomy of religious experiences and the social context of religious experiences. Regarding the taxonomy, there are three points which will be investigated. First, do religious experiences vary in

frequency? Second, are religious experiences progressive? Third, can religious experiences, on the basis of the taxonomy, be ranked according to their saliency?

The second issue concerns the social context of religious experiences. The association between denominational affiliation, number of friends in the local congregation, religious beliefs, prayer, attendance at religious services, sex, and religious climate in the home when growing up and the occurrence of religious experiences will be examined.

The specific expectations concerning the above relationships follow in the next section which states the precise hypotheses for this study.

The Hypotheses

With the completion of the foregoing discussion, a stage has been reached where the hypotheses for this study may be stated. However, prior to the presentation of the hypotheses, a comment is in order concerning the manner in which they will be stated. Several variables noted in the previous discussion were treated as control variables by other researchers. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, it would seem unwise to attempt to specify all possible relationships which could be found among the variables in the hypotheses. Also, this would yield an unwieldy number of hypotheses. With this in mind, all of the hypotheses have been stated at the zero-order level. However, after discussing each hypothesis the independent variables will

be utilized as control variables in an attempt to further specify the strength of certain zero-order relationships.

The zero-order hypotheses may be stated as follows:

I. Taxonomic Related Hypotheses

1. Lower order religious experiences will be reported more frequently than higher order religious experiences.
2. Respondents reporting a higher order experience will have also reported a lower order experience.
3. The higher the order of a religious experience the greater the likelihood that this experience is still important to the respondent.

II. Social Context Related Hypotheses

4. As membership becomes more sectarian in nature the reported incidence of religious experiences will increase.
5. As the number of friends in the local congregation increases the reported incidence of religious experiences will increase.
6. The stronger the religious beliefs the greater the incidence of religious experiences.
7. The greater the frequency of attendance at religious services the greater the likelihood of reporting religious experiences.
8. Those who pray regularly will be more likely than those who do not pray regularly to report the occurrence of religious experiences.
9. Females will be more likely than males to report religious experiences.
10. As the strength of the religious climate in the home when growing up increases the incidence of religious experiences will increase.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The Data

The data for this study were made available by Dr. Raymond Currie, Department of Sociology, University of Manitoba, and are drawn from a much more comprehensive study concerning Calgary youth's religious beliefs, practices and experiences as well as their viewpoints on social issues and certain types of social behaviour. However, this is the first analysis of the section of the data concerning religious experiences.

The fact that this is an analysis of an existing data base has definitely had a large impact on the organization and direction of this present inquiry. For example, this author did not have any input into the construction of the questionnaire. Because the operationalization of the experiential items was based on Stark's taxonomy, this author had little choice but to adopt the definition of religious experiences presented by Stark. However, it is this author's opinion that the existing data base concerning religious experiences is not only sufficient to discern the correctness of the relationships stated in the hypotheses, but is also sufficient to be worthy of an in depth analysis in its own right.

Sampling Procedures

The sample for this study consisted of a stratified random sample of youth (ages 15-24) in Calgary, Alberta. A goal of 750 cases was set to participate in the original study on the basis of the anticipated minimum cell sizes for crosstabulation analysis. Seventy-six enumeration areas (fifteen percent of the total) were randomly selected as the sample base. A weighting procedure utilizing the number of youth in an enumeration area percentaged against the total number of youth in the seventy-six enumeration areas was used to determine what percent of the desired 750 cases would come from a given enumeration area.

The random selection of youth continued at three other levels; the block where the respondent lived, the household where the respondent resided, and which youth would be selected in any given household. A detailed description of this procedure may be found in Currie (1973), Appendix III.

The completed interviews¹ (which included both interview items and personal responses) resulted in a 95.7 percent response rate, or 708 cases. An analysis by Currie of the forty-two non-responses concluded that there was no indication of a biasing of the sample on this account.

Table 1 represents the correspondence between the actual sample, and the 1971 census for Calgary. The sample

¹A copy of the questionnaire and the instructions given to the interviewers may be found in Appendix A. Additional elaboration concerning the procedures the interviewers were to follow may be found in Currie (1973).

deviates slightly from the actual population figures for 1971. However, this is not believed to be a result of sampling error. Rather it is a result of the sample being selected according to the 1966 census figures, the most recent which was available at the time of data collection. There is a close correspondence between the sample and the 1966 census figures. Therefore, the differences in present sample and the 1971 figures are most likely a result of migration in the city.

Presentation Format of the Analysis and Findings

As previously indicated, the hypotheses have been stated at the zero-order level. Because of this, the analysis of the data and the presentation of the findings will be in several stages. First, the variables entering into each hypothesis will be operationalized as the particular hypothesis is discussed. Secondly, simple statistical significance will be employed. This analysis should indicate whether or not there is support for the hypothesized relationship. It should also indicate if the relationship is of a sufficient magnitude to warrant further consideration. After consideration of all of the hypotheses, various correlation procedures will be utilized to specify some of the zero-order relationships.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The first three hypotheses are concerned solely with the taxonomic relationships of religious experiences. Therefore, attention will be initially directed to the operationalization of the various types of religious experiences; then the relationships specified in these hypotheses will be tested.

The following is a listing of the questions utilized to measure the occurrence of religious experiences. Those designated by a single asterisk were developed and utilized by Stark (Glock and Stark 1965:151). The questions designated by a double asterisk were developed by Currie (1973) as an attempt to measure the occurrence of the other types of religious experiences delineated by Stark (1965:39) in his taxonomy but which were not subsequently operationalized by him. In addition, as noted previously, the item concerning a fearful experience was based on Otto (1966). Following each question is an indication of the type of experience being measured.

- *1. "A feeling that you were somehow in the presence of God."¹ (confirming)

¹The response categories for these questions were: "Yes, I'm sure I have.", "Yes, I think I have.", and "No, I have not."

- *2. "A sense of being saved in Christ." (responsive salvational)
- **3. "A sense of being miraculously helped by God." (responsive miraculous)
- **4. "A feeling of being afraid of God." (not specified in a taxonomy, but should resemble a confirming or a responsive experience)
- *5. "A feeling of being punished by God for something you had done." (responsive sanctioning)
- **6. "A sense of warm and close union with God." (ecstatic)
- **7. A sense of having been enlightened by God." (revelational enlightenment)
- **8. "A feeling that God has asked you to do something for him." (revelational commission)

The present author is aware of some of the problems associated with using simple and especially single indicators to measure a phenomenon as complex as a religious experience. For example, it is conceivable that there could be an extreme range of experiences which would fall under a category such as "having been enlightened by God." With only a single item such as this, some respondents may not have thought a particular experience they had had would fall under this item although if the researcher had a description of the experience, it would be classified as an enlightening experience. It is also possible that the wording of the item may have been too limited to trigger the memory of such an experience.

On the other hand, it would be impossible, for example, to ask respondents every imaginable type of revelational enlightenment experience. Open-ended items also have

their drawbacks. Stark (1965:151) used both structured and open-ended items concerning religious experiences. He had this to say about the usefulness of his qualitative data:

In examining the questionnaires, many instances were discovered when experiences acknowledged in the structured items were not mentioned in the free response. Indeed, unless respondents had been attempting to be definitive (and also shared our definition of what should be considered a religious experience), there is no reason to expect the open-end responses to provide adequate data. For these reasons, the open-end data seem best suited to provide qualitative materials on religious experience, and are of little use for quantitative purposes. (Glock and Stark 1965:156)

Following these comments concerning the quality of the data for the present study, it is time to examine the taxonomic related hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: Lower order religious experiences will be reported more frequently than higher order religious experiences.

Currie's questionnaire did not ask how many times a particular religious experience had occurred. It only asked if the respondent had a particular experience at some point in time. Therefore, this hypothesis is concerned with the number of respondents who reported a given religious experience. Furthermore, Stark (1965:39) specified a ranking scheme which only utilized the four basic types of religious experiences; nothing was said about the frequency of the more specific subdimensions. But the subdimensions frequencies should fit within the rank order of the major types of

experiences. Therefore, the expected frequency ordering of the eight religious experiences in this study should be in "more or less" the same order in which they are found in Chart 1, column 1.

Chart 1
Expected and Actual Ranks of the
Types of Religious Experiences

| Type of Experience | Rank | |
|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| | Expected | Actual ¹ |
| Confirming | 1 | 2 |
| Responsive | | |
| Salvational | 2a ² | 7 |
| Miraculous | 2b | 6 |
| Sanctioning | 2c | 4 |
| Fearful | 5 | 5 |
| Ecstatic | 6 | 1 |
| Revelational | | |
| Enlightenment | 7a ³ | 3 |
| Commission | 7b | 8 |

¹Includes both the response "Yes, I am sure" and "Yes, I think I have."

^{2 & 3}Since not specified in taxonomy, these sub-dimensions are considered as ties on the expected rank.

What are the results? One can see in the second column that the frequency ordering of the types of experiences does not conform to the expected ranking (for the frequency distribution from which the actual rankings were

derived, see Table 2). There are several divergences that merit attention. The first is the surprising number of respondents who indicated having had an ecstatic experience. As can be seen, this type of experience occurred most frequently although it was expected to rank sixth. In this author's opinion this is not so much a result of an error in Stark's theoretical statement as it is a result of a faulty operationalization of this type of religious experience. This can be seen if one compares the operationalization of this experience with Stark's discussion of it when he presented his taxonomy. Stark had a very strong emotional kind of experience in mind when speaking about the ecstatic experience, which is somewhat evident from the term itself. He stated:

. . . the prototype of this kind of religious encounter is a physical and psychological upheaval of intense proportions, similar to orgasm, intoxication, seizures--an overpowering of the senses by divine 'touch.' Into this category we may classify such occurrences as 'visitations of the Holy Spirit,' . . . (Glock and Stark 1965:53)

Clearly, in this author's opinion, asking someone if they had "A sense of warm and close union with God." does not get at the deep type of relationship to which Stark referred in his discussion. In addition, the ecstatic item is quite similar to the confirming experience; a generalized sense of sacredness and presence of God.

A second divergency relates to the almost perfect switch in the ranking of the responsive salvational and

the revelational enlightenment experiences. However, the discussion of this will be deferred until the following hypothesis which deals more precisely with the interrelationships between the various types of religious experiences.

It appears that only a few of the eight religious experiences in this study fall into their proposed order. But, realizing that Stark only specified a ranking for the four major types of religious experiences, could the subtypes of the responsive and revelational experiences' average occurrence meet the hypothesized relationship? The author, on the basis of the data in Table 2, calculated these averages. The results indicate that these two experiences fall into their proposed order, given the omission of the ecstatic experience. That is, 43 percent of the respondents reported a confirming experience, 35 percent reported a responsive experience and 31 percent reported a revelational experience. Additionally, the fearful experience falls between the confirming experience and the average for the responsive experiences. Thirty-nine percent of the respondents reported this experience. This is as anticipated since the fearful experience was thought to be similar to a lower-order type of religious experience.

This last paragraph indicates a modicum of support for the hypothesized relationship. However, this support must be qualified on two grounds. First, the percentage differences are not very large; only four percentage points between the average for the responsive and the revelational

experiences. This leads to the second point. Since this ranking excludes the ecstatic experience, had it been adequately measured there would be a very narrow range in which it could fall into its taxonomic location between the responsive and the revelational experiences. However, later analysis should shed further light upon the accuracy of this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: Respondents reporting a higher order experience will have also reported a lower order experience.

To explore the relationship proposed in this hypothesis Stark crosstabulated a higher order experience by a lower order experience. However, he considered this relationship supported by looking only at the number of respondents who reported a responsive salvational experience who had also reported a confirming experience. Therefore, two questions arise. First, do the data of this study conform to Stark's finding? Second, is his initial finding applicable to the other types of experiences as well? Table 3 shows what percent of the respondents who have reported a higher order religious experience have also reported a confirming experience.

It can be seen that Stark's finding concerning the relationship between the responsive salvational and the confirming experience is supported by the present data. Seventy-five percent of those respondents who were "sure" they had had the responsive salvational experience were also "sure" they had the confirming experience. However, the

percentage of persons reporting other higher order experiences who also reported a confirming (lower order) experience varies considerably among the experiences. For example, 78 percent of those who were "sure" they had had a revelational commission type of experience were also "sure" they had a confirming experience. In contrast, only 37 percent who reported they were "sure" of having had a responsive sanctioning experience have reported "surety" of the confirming experience.

Could these differences possibly be applicable to the nature of the item measuring the confirming experience? It is possible to see if this is the case by replacing the item dealing with the presence of God with the ecstatic item because it has been indicated that this item seems to tap what Stark described as a confirming experience. Table 4 shows that similar relationships emerge as when using the original confirming item. The mean Gammas for these two sets of tables evidences this similarity; .66 for the confirming item and .68 for the ecstatic item. These two tables specify that certain experiences are not as strongly related to the occurrence of a lower order experience as are others. They also add credibility to the assertion that in attempting to measure the ecstatic type experience, what was really measured was a confirming experience, especially since the average ecstatic Gamma is slightly higher than the confirming Gamma.

Upon closer examination of Tables 3 and 4 two

experiences, in particular, do not seem to meet the hypothesized relationship; fear and the responsive sanctioning experience (a sense of being punished by God). This is supported by the particular Gammas for these tables; all are between .42 and .46. These findings pose an interesting question. All of the items used to operationalize the other types of experiences are either "positive" or at least "neutral" in character. This opens the possibility that negative religious experiences constitute a separate dimension of religious experiences. Further, it causes this author to question why Stark did not report the relationship between the responsive salvational experience and the confirming experience in his study as he had the necessary information to do so. It is evident from the present analysis that the majority of those who were "sure" they had a responsive sanctioning experience were not "sure" they had a confirming experience. The possibilities of different dimensions of religious experiences warrants further consideration and will be returned to after the discussion of the next hypothesis.

Let us turn now to the relationship between the two revelational experiences and the other lower order experiences (e.g. the fearful and the three responsive experiences) found in Tables 5 to 8. Again, the negative experiences do not appear to be as highly associated with the occurrence of the revelational experiences as do the positive experiences, the only exception being the responsive salvational's

relationship to the revelational enlightenment experience. In all of the other cases, the majority who were "sure" they had revelational experience were "sure" they had a positive responsive experience. This lends additional support to the contention that the negative experiences constitute a separate dimension of religious experiences.

But why does the relationship between the revelational enlightenment experience and the responsive salvational experience not meet its expectations? Stark's taxonomy to the contrary, this relationship, where only 40 percent of those who indicate they have been enlightened by God also indicate surity of having been saved, is not completely surprising. It will be remembered that the revelational enlightenment experience was reported more frequently than the responsive salvational experience. This could possibly mean that the revelational enlightenment experience is operating on a lower level than the responsive salvational.

Table 9 indicates that this is in fact the case. Sixty-six percent who are "sure" they have been saved are also "sure" they have been enlightened. Not only is there statistical support for this relationship, but it is also theologically sound. For example, in attending a revival service where individuals are recounting their "salvational" experiences one will find that people will report the following; "God has spoken to me and said that I should follow him. Upon responding to his 'call' I knew that I was saved." Therefore, it appears logical that a person

would be enlightened by God prior to having a salvational experience. Of course, after having a salvational experience other enlightening experiences could follow, but most probably, the initial enlightening experience would precede the salvational experience.

In summation, it appears that this hypothesis is supported with qualification. The first qualification is that the two negative experiences appear to be operating on a different dimension than are the others. Also, there is need for some conceptual shuffling of the relationship between the revelational enlightenment experience and the responsive salvational experience. These points question the continued applicability of Stark's taxonomy. However, the discussion of this point will be deferred until the presentation of the next hypothesis which will complete the discussion which utilizes only taxonomic relationships between various religious experiences.

Hypothesis 3: The higher the order of a religious experience the greater the likelihood that this experience is still important to the respondent.

This hypothesis introduces a new dimension in the study of religious experiences, i.e. saliency. This dimension has not been studied by previous researchers, although it is based on Stark's discussion of his taxonomy. Two questions, which immediately followed the list of religious experiences, were used to operationalize this concept. The first question asked:

How important in your life do you consider these religious experiences to be?

- _____ I have not had any religious experiences
- _____ None were ever really important to me
- _____ One or some were quite important at the time but they are now now
- _____ One or some are still important in my life.

A second question followed:

If you answered 'one or some are still important,' would you please go back over the list (139-147) and simply put a check mark in front of those you consider still important experiences in your life.

It is interesting to note that 266 (38%) respondents reported at least one religious experience. Of these, 195 (73%) checked at least one experience as still being salient. To determine if the higher order experiences were most likely to still have been salient for these 195 respondents, the experiences checked as salient were percentaged against the total number of individuals reporting a given experience. This procedure was selected over the other possibility of seeing which experiences were the most frequently checked as salient. When a simple counting procedure was employed, those experiences which were the most frequently reported appeared to be the most salient. However, the percentaging procedure allowed the saliency rankings to be more or less independent of the reported frequency of each type of experience.

Table 10 gives the percentage of all responses checked as salient for all of the experiences. Several pieces of information are evident from this table. First, it is

clear that the respondents have been discriminant with their responses. As there should be, wide differences in the percentage of salient responses are evident for those who were "sure" they had had a particular experience as opposed to those who "thought" they had had the same experience.

Secondly, the two negative types of experiences were of much less importance to the respondents than were the positive or neutral experiences. With the exception of these two experiences, there does not exist wide variations among the remaining experiences. What variation there is does not match the proposed ordering based on the friendship analogy employed earlier, where it was predicted that the confirming experience would be the least salient and the revelational the most salient. Having the two types of revelational experiences rank lowest (excluding the two negative experiences) and the confirming and the ecstatic items rank fourth and second, respectfully, leaves little doubt that this hypothesis must be rejected. Qualitative distinctions appear to be operating within the types of religious experiences.

Stark (Glock and Stark 1965:39) indicated that there could be wide variations within each type of experience. For example, the revelational commission experience could range from the human actor feeling that God had told him to grow a beard, to a feeling that God had told him to give up his worldly possessions and become a missionary. It is most likely that there would be a wide discrepancy in terms of how important an individual would consider these experiences

to be.

In contrast to those types of experiences which have a wide range of salience, other experiences may be of such a nature that they will have a fairly consistent range. For example, it is not surprising that those who have reported a responsive salvational experience have designated it as the most salient type of experience. Throughout the Christian tradition, salvation is the most cherished of all things. Therefore, while the overt manifestations of such an experience could vary considerably, it is likely that most of those who feel that they have been saved would consider this experience as salient.

Some of the findings relating to the above hypotheses have cast some doubt on the possibility of a simple and straight forward discussion of the remaining hypotheses. In this light, some of the problems which have arisen warrant additional discussion.

Discussion of Issues Raised in the Taxonomic Analysis

From the preceding analysis it has become evident that there is a good chance the ecstatic experience was poorly operationalized resulting in what appears to be a type of confirming experience. Further, there was an indication that the two negative types of experiences may be operating on a different dimension than are the other experiences. Fortunately, there is a statistical procedure, which can be employed with the present data, allowing one to ascertain the

validity of both the proposition that the ecstatic item has tapped a confirming experience and that the two types of negative experiences may be operating on a different dimension. This procedure is scalogram analysis, or Guttman scaling, and allows one to see if a given set of items is cumulative and unidimensional at the same time.

The initial Guttman scale² computer run utilized all of the religious experiences which have been reported previously. A cutting point which specified that an individual must have been "sure" he had any given experience was utilized. The results of this analysis indicated that the scale was valid, (a coefficient of reproducibility of .88), but the most crucial finding was that the items would not scale. A coefficient of scalability of .60 or better is needed to indicate a scale that is unidimensional and cumulative and the coefficient for this run was a paltry .14.

However, in Guttman scaling different cutting points and different items can be utilized in an attempt to improve the scales. Following from this, another Guttman subprogram was run utilizing a cutting point which allowed an individual to pass an item if he was either "sure" the experience had occurred or if he "thought" it had. This resulted in improving the scalability, to .41, still far

²All Guttman scales were calculated by the Subprogram Guttman Scale in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. (Nie, Bent, and Hull 1970:196-207).

below the minimum .60. However, while improving the scalability, the validity decreased, as indicated by a coefficient of reproducibility of .79.

It was then decided to drop the two negative experiences as an examination of the output indicated a substantial proportion of the errors were a result of these two items. Returning to the original cutting point where one would have had to be "sure" he had the experience, the Guttman subprogram was again employed. The results again indicated a valid scale but the coefficient of scalability was below the required minimum. Changing the cutting point, to allow those who "thought" they had the experiences to be included with those who were "sure," resulted in a Guttman scale which narrowly met both the validity criterion as well as the scalability criterion, (e.g. a coefficient of reproducibility of .86 and of scalability of .62).

The analysis of this run indicated a substantial number of the remaining errors were due to the nature of the confirming and ecstatic items. On this basis, it was decided to perform two additional runs; one using the confirming item and the other the ecstatic item along with the remaining four experiences. The results indicated the scale that included the ecstatic item was more valid and scalable than the one using the confirming item. Therefore, the best scale is composed of the following experiences. They are listed from the lowest to the highest order. The experiences are: the ecstatic, revelational enlightenment, responsive

miraculous, responsive salvational and revelational commission. The following chart is a frequency distribution by scale rank:

Chart 2

Frequency Rank By Guttman Experiential Scale Score

| Scale Score | N |
|-------------|-----|
| 0 | 269 |
| 1 | 91 |
| 2 | 87 |
| 3 | 75 |
| 4 | 78 |
| 5 | 69 |

Coefficient of Reproducibility: .88

Coefficient of Scalability: .64.

How does this analysis shed light on the two problems it was designed to answer? First, the two types of negative experiences do, in fact, appear to be operating on a different dimension than the neutral or positive experiences. When these two experiences were included in the Guttman analysis, the coefficient of scalability was far below the required minimum. This means the scale was not truly cumulative and unidimensional. In relation to Stark's taxonomy, this indicates the need for a further conceptualization concerning a taxonomy of religious experiences. Perhaps what is needed is to devise another taxonomy for such

negative experiences, because it has been seen the negative experiences are not substantially related to the occurrence of other types of religious experiences.

Second, this analysis indicates further support for the assumption that the ecstatic item has in fact measured a confirming experience. The scale which utilized this experience, rather than the original confirming item, had the highest coefficient of scalability. The scale was not only unidimensional but was cumulative as well, indicating the ecstatically measured experience to be the lowest order religious experience. This indicates the need for a new conceptualization concerning the measurement of the ecstatic experience because it is evident the present study has failed to adequately measure this experience. A much stronger item is needed, in this author's opinion, to operationalize Stark's description of this experience.

There is a third result of the preceding analysis. This concerns the analysis of the relationships specified in the remaining hypotheses. The question becomes: what is the best way to proceed in light of the foregone discussion? It is this author's opinion that it would be wise to make use of the highest power Guttman scale in the analysis which lies ahead. This should simplify the format of presentation as well as making some of the relationships more specifiable. Information concerning individual experiences will also be used, but only as supplementary to the analysis employing the Guttman Scale.

Hypothesis 4: As membership becomes more sectarian in nature the reported incidence of religious experiences will increase.

Each of the denominations in the sample (excluding the Jewish and other non-Christians) was crosstabulated against each religious experience. By averaging the number of individuals responding in a positive manner to the experiential items, a continuous grouping pattern emerged. This grouping placed the reported Non-members at one extreme. They were followed by the more liberal denominations, (e.g. the Anglicans and the United).³ Next, a middle category consisting of the Roman Catholics, Ukrainian Catholics and the Lutherans. Finally, at the other extreme, were the primarily Sectarian groups, (e.g. the Baptists, Latter Day Saints, Pentecostals and other various sectarian groups which have only one or two members represented in the sample.)⁴ By combining denominational categories in this manner, it is possible to make some meaningful comparison in percentage differences which would not have been possible with some of

³A complete listing of each denomination which falls into each category may be found in Table 11.

⁴This finding is not an artifact solely produced by the relationship of denominational affiliation to religious experiences. The author has checked this grouping pattern for religious beliefs, church attendance, and frequency of prayer. In each of these cases a very similar pattern emerged. For a discussion of the position of the Roman Catholics on the Church-Sect continuum which is consistent with the present findings, see N. J. Demerath III, Social Class in American Protestantism, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965:187.

the extremely small "Ns" before combining categories.

With this four stage continuum, it is possible to crosstabulate denominational affiliation with the Guttman experiential scale. From Table 11, there appears to be a relationship between denominational affiliation and the occurrence of religious experiences in the hypothesized direction. A Gamma of .40 supports this contention. Non-members and Liberals report fewer experiences than the Moderates and Sectarians. Forty-four percent of the Sectarians score high and only 7 percent of the Liberals do the same.

Another procedure which tests the validity of this analysis is to compare the percentages of those who score high on the experiential scale, (e.g. row percentages) with the percentage of the total population which each type of denominational division contributes. Table 12 shows the results of this procedure. As can be seen, the Moderates and Sectarians contribute significantly more persons scoring high than their percentage of the population would predict (four percent more for the Moderates and 25 percent more for the Sectarians). This, then, supports the contention that there are socially defined contexts related to the occurrence of religious experiences.

While this discussion is support for the hypothesis, it should be noted that for particular experiences, this specific relationship might not hold. One reason for this could be differing theological orientations of various

denominations. For example, Stark noted that the Roman Catholics reported the responsive sanctioning experience more frequently than did members of the Protestant denominations (Glock and Stark 1965:159-160). He stated this was probably due to differing conceptualizations of God on the part of the Roman Catholics and Protestants, in that Roman Catholics tend to see God as one who punishes as well as one who rewards where the Protestants tend to stress the benevolence of God. This reasoning is substantiated by the present data (Table 13). Roman Catholics do report a responsive sanctioning experience more often than members of other denominations. The importance of this finding does not relate to its inconsistency with the present hypothesis. Rather, the importance lies in the fact that it is additional support for the substantive concern that religious experiences have a definite social context to their occurrence.

Hypothesis 5: As the number of friends in the local congregation increases the reported incidence of religious experiences will increase.

The measurement of the number of friends a respondent had in his local congregation was derived from the following two questions:

Do you consider yourself attached to a particular local congregation?

Yes
 No

(if the respondent answered 'No' he was instructed to skip the following question)

Thinking of your five closest friends how many are members of your local congregation or synagogue?

| | | | |
|-------|------|-------|-------|
| _____ | None | _____ | Three |
| _____ | One | _____ | Four |
| _____ | Two | _____ | Five |

Table 14 reports the relationship between the number of close friends one had in his local congregation and the occurrence of religious experiences. Looking at the percentages of the different groupings which score five on the experiential scale, there seems to be some support for the hypothesis. However, the largest difference is between those who do not consider themselves attached to a local congregation and those who are attached, but have no friends in the congregation. It should be noted that 473 youth do not consider themselves attached to a local congregation. This is, in fact, 73 percent of the cases in Table 14. Realizing the sensitivity of percentage analysis to the "N" with which one is operating, it may be useful to see what happens to the relationship if the experiential scale is dichotomized.

The following is a list of the percentages of those scoring in the upper half of the experiential scale (3, 4, 5) for each category: Not attached to a local congregation (25%); No Friends (41%); One Friend (64%); Two Friends (61%); Three Friends (63%); Four Friends (60%); and Five Friends (63%). It appears that as soon as an individual indicates he has a friend in the local congregation there is hardly any variation in the propensity to have religious

experiences as one increases the number of friends. In this light, the hypothesis, as stated, must be rejected.⁵

However, there are two interesting points which emerge from the analysis of this table. First, it appears to make a substantial difference whether or not one belongs to a local congregation or not. The second point is that there is another marked increase in the propensity to have religious experiences when one has some friends in the congregation as opposed to those who report having none of their friends in the local congregation. In this author's opinion, these findings share one very important commonality. With each increase in the level of social support the likelihood of an individual reporting religious experiences is also increased. In the first case, there is the support one receives from his local congregation which would most likely be of a more secondary nature. However, in the second instance, the individual is not only receiving the support of his congregation, but is, at the same time, obtaining support of a primary nature from his close friend(s) in the congregation.

⁵One could question why the friend categories were not also collapsed. This was done, but it resulted in an interpretation of the data which was solely an artifact of this procedure. This artifact was produced by the fact that those respondents who reported not having any friends in the local congregation were three times as many as those respondents reporting one friend. This resulted in indicating an increase in the occurrence of religious experiences when one had two or three friends versus one friend in the congregation. This is contrary to the actual data presented in Table 14 and discussed above.

From this last paragraph, total rejection of this hypothesis might be ill advised. What is needed is a re-orientation. The number of friends one has in the congregation appears to be of little importance. Therefore, the hypothesis should be stated in a corrected form as follows: Social support within the congregation will increase the likelihood of reporting religious experiences. The increase will occur at two stages. The first increase will occur when there is the secondary support from simply being attached to a congregation. A second increase will occur when the primary support of close friends is added to the secondary support of the congregation.

Hypothesis 6: The stronger the religious beliefs
the greater the incidence of
religious experiences.

The strength of the respondent's religious beliefs were operationalized by forming a scale from the responses to the following items.

Do you believe there is a God?

Do you believe in life after death?

Miracles, even if they did not happen exactly as they are reported, are true in the sense that they speak about God's love and action in the world.

Among all the great men in history Jesus Christ gives the best insight into God.⁶

⁶This scale is adopted from Currie (1973). The response categories ranged from "Definitely True" to "Definitely Not True" for the first two items and from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" for the last two. An individual was assigned two points for a strong positive response, one

Support for the hypothesized relationship is indicated by Table 15. Eighty-seven percent of those who scored zero on the religious belief scale also scored zero on the experiential scale. Contrastingly, 43 percent of those scoring eight on the belief scale scored five on the experiential scale and 80 percent scored in the upper half. In addition it is noteworthy that those individuals who score eight on the belief scale make up only 7.5 percent of the population, but they account for 32 percent of those scoring five on the experiential scale. Similarly, those who score seven on the belief scale make up only 5.8 percent of the population, but account for an additional 20 percent of those who score five on the experiential scale. In all, those who score seven or eight on the religious belief scale account for over 50 percent of those scoring five on the experiential scale. Further, the strength of the relationship between these two variables is evidenced by a Gamma of .63 for Table 15.

It is probable that there are some interactions between religious beliefs and denominational affiliation which could alter one or both of the reported relationships of these variables to the occurrence of religious experiences.

point for a positive response and no points for any other response. The scale thus has a range from 0-8. Currie found that the above scale allowed for a more viable statement concerning the beliefs of young people than did other belief scales. For further elaboration on this point see Currie (1973:59-62).

This will be considered after completing the discussion of the remaining hypotheses.

Hypothesis 7: The greater the frequency of attendance at religious services the greater the likelihood of reporting religious experiences.

The frequency of attendance at religious services was operationalized by the following question:

How often do you attend church or synagogue religious services?

- _____ Never or hardly ever
- _____ About every three months
- _____ About once a month
- _____ About twice a month
- _____ Almost every week
- _____ More than once a week

A substantial relationship between the frequency of attendance at religious services and the occurrence of religious services is apparent from Table 16. Fifty-four percent of those who never or hardly ever attend scored zero on the experiential scale and only 3 percent scored five. On the other hand, only 7 percent of those who attend every week or more score zero on the experiential scale and 36 percent score five. Further, only 20 percent of those who indicated they never attend religious services score in the upper half of the experiential scale. This is in contrast to the 72 percent who indicate attending at least once a week. Still further support is obtainable if one considers that those who attend religious services at least once a week make up only 16 percent of the cases in Table 16 but account for 54 percent of those who score five on the experiential scale. A Gamma of .60 also attests to the

relationship between these variables. It is then evident that the relationship between these two variables is sufficient to support the stated hypothesis.

Hypothesis 8: Those who pray regularly will be more likely than those who do not pray regularly to report the occurrence of religious experiences.

The following item was utilized to operationalize the prayer variable:

How often do you pray privately?

- I never pray at all
- I pray only at church services
- I pray once in a while, but not at regular intervals
- I pray regularly several times a week
- I pray regularly once a day or more

Table 17 presents the relationship between the frequency of prayer and the incidence of religious experiences. It can readily be seen that there is a significant relationship between these two variables. Seventy-eight percent of those who pray more than once a day score in the upper half of the experiential scale. In contrast only 7 percent of those who never pray score in the top half. And, as with attendance at religious services, the percentages scoring in the upper half of the experiential scale increases as the frequency of prayer increases. Further, those who pray more than once a day make up only 10 percent of the population but account for 38 percent of those scoring five on the experiential scale.

It is interesting to note the close correspondence

between this relationship and the relationship of attendance at religious services to the incidence of religious experiences. The only significant difference is in the first column of the two respective tables (16 and 17). Only 7 percent of those who never pray score in the upper half of the experiential scale. This is in contrast to those who never attend religious services where 20 percent score in the upper half. This indicates that there should be a somewhat stronger relationship between the frequency of prayer and religious experiences than between the frequency of attendance at religious services and religious experiences. A Gamma of .66 for the present hypothesized relationship versus .60 for the previous hypothesis indicates that this is in fact the case.

However, this increase in association points to the possibility that when an individual is praying he is, in essence, attempting communication with the divine. The act of communication, it will be remembered, is the key to the definition of religious experiences adopted for this study. This could explain a part of the strong relationship found by the present analysis; however, the data at hand do not allow for an indication of the situations in which religious experiences occurred. But there is no doubt that this present hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 9: Females will be more likely than males to report religious experiences.

Table 18 represents the relationship between the sex

of the respondents and the incidence of religious experiences. While the pattern which emerges in the table is in the direction hypothesized, there does not appear to be a strong relationship between these two variables. There are only two rows in the table where substantial differences appear. First, by looking at the top row, it appears that a substantial difference is evident for those who do not report any religious experiences; 47 percent of the males versus 33 percent of the females. The only other row which appears to have a substantial difference is row four, those scoring three on the experiential scale. In addition, by collapsing the table, 40 percent of the females score in the upper half of the scale as opposed to 27 percent of the males.

It appears then that females are somewhat more prone to have religious experiences than are males. However, it is evident from the above that the hypothesized relationship is not a strong one. This is supported by the low Gamma of .22 which resulted from the uncollapsed table.⁷

Hypothesis 10: As the strength of the religious climate in the home when growing up increases the incidence of religious experiences will increase.

It will be remembered that this hypothesis is original to the present study. The reason for including it was that it was anticipated, on the basis of Stark's work, that certain

⁷Gamma was also computed on the collapsed table and was slightly higher (.27) but still substantially lower than those found in some previous relationships.

socialization influences should be related to the occurrence of religious experiences. The strength of the religious climate in the home when growing up is taken, by this author, as an indication of one type of socialization which occurred for any given respondent. This variable was operationalized by a very straight forward question:

How strong was the religious climate in your home when you were growing up?

- _____ Very Strong
- _____ Quite Strong
- _____ Some
- _____ Slight
- _____ None

Table 19 represents the relationship between the strength of the religious climate in the home when growing up and the incidence of religious experiences. It is fairly evident from a Gamma of .36 that there is some relationship between these two variables. Fifty-seven percent of those reporting little or no religious climate in the home when growing up score zero on the experiential scale and only two percent score five. This is in contrast to those indicating a strong religious climate, in which case only 23 percent score zero and 18 percent score five.

However, it was thought that this relationship would be stronger than the analysis indicates. It is true that some of the respondents were of an age where they would be beyond the immediate socializing influence of their nuclear family. Yet, the question concerning religious experiences asked the respondents to report their religious experiences since the age of twelve. But, what would happen if most of

the respondents failed to report their earlier religious experiences and, instead, reported only the more recent?

It is unfortunate that the data at hand do not indicate whether or not individuals failed to report their earlier experiences. However, if one were to assume that this did occur, it is this author's opinion that the present influence of religion on the respondents' lives would be more highly associated with the occurrence of religious experiences than the religious climate in the home when growing up. This is because there would be a greater temporal connection between more recent religious experiences and religion's present influence than between the same experiences and the home climate when growing up. The present data allow for an exploration of this possibility; however, prior to exploring this possibility, the relationship between religion's present influence and the previous home climate should be examined to see if there is any linkage between these two items which would warrant further consideration between religion's present influence and the incidence of religious experiences.

Table 20 represents the relationship between the strength of the religious climate in the home and the influence religion now has on the lives of the respondents. Three things of importance can be seen from this table. First, slightly over half as many individuals score high on the present importance of religion as score high on home climate (139 versus 252). Next, the strength of the

religious climate in the home is not a very good predictor of religion's present importance. Only 34 percent of those reporting a strong religious climate say that religion is now important, which is one percent less than those who say religion is now unimportant. In contrast, of those who say that religion now has a strong influence on their lives, 62 percent indicated that they came from a home where the religious climate was strong. In addition, 20 percent came from homes where there was some religious climate. This then indicates the relationship between these two variables is stronger in one direction than the other. One cannot predict very well the present importance of religion by knowing the home climate, (e.g., he would be wrong as many times as he was right). On the other hand, given the fact that one now considers religion to have an influence on his life one can predict with a fair amount of certainty that the person came from a home where there was a strong religious climate. This then indicates that it would be worthwhile to investigate the relationship between religion's present influence and the incidence of religious experiences.

Table 21 reveals that the present influence of religion on the respondent's lives is a strong predictor of religious experiences. Seventy-six percent of those scoring high on religion's present influence also score in the upper half of the experiential scale. In contrast, Table 19 shows that only 48 percent of those scoring high on home climate do likewise on the experiential scale. This difference is

amplified by the Gammas of these two variables with the experiential scale; .66 for the present importance of religion versus .36 for home climate.

This to some extent supports the possibility that the respondents reported later experiences; however, this is at best a speculation which could only be discovered in a future study by asking individuals to date the occurrence of their experiences. However, an important finding in this analysis is the fact that a new variable which was not initially considered has been discovered. Its importance lies in the strength of the relationship. It ranks with prayer and religious beliefs as being most highly associated with the occurrence of religious experiences. In this light, this variable will enter into further analysis which will utilize more powerful statistical analysis.

This concludes the analysis of the simple hypothesized relationships. On the basis of this analysis it is possible to state that there are definite social contexts to the occurrence of religious experiences. All of the hypotheses were substantiated to an extent. Moreover, several variables emerged as being highly related to the occurrence of religious experiences. In particular religious beliefs, prayer, attendance at religious services and denominational affiliation appear to be substantially associated with the incidence of religious experiences. In addition, religion's present importance emerged as being highly associated.

It is now time to move to various correlation procedures in an attempt to specify some of these relationships

as it would indeed be surprising if some of the explanatory power of these variables did not overlap.

Statistical Specification of Previous Findings

As noted, this section will deal with possible interactions between the independent variables and the explanatory power of these variables as they relate to the occurrence of religious experiences. This discussion will be possible by employing the more powerful statistical procedures of simple, partial and multiple correlation.

The utilization of these more powerful statistics is made possible by several factors. First, religious experiences were found to be amenable to Guttman scaling. Therefore, the use of correlation analysis is, for this variable, a straight forward extension of the previous analysis because the Guttman scale represents interval type data. Second, denominational affiliation was found to be amenable to rank categorization, not only in its relationship to the dependent variable but to other religious variables as well. This then means that by categorizing denominational affiliation in the manner previously specified an ordinal scale has been achieved.

Recent research has indicated support for the use of parametric statistical procedures with ordinal data. This support has come from the fact that these procedures are rigorous enough that they do not lose much of their interpretive meaning when applied to ordinal rather than interval

data.⁸

The logical progression of correlation procedures, i.e. from simple to partial to multiple, will serve as an outline for the presentation format of this section. Initial consideration will be given to the zero-order correlation coefficients between the independent variables and the experiential scale. Also, the intercorrelations of the independent variables among themselves will be examined. Partial correlation will then be employed where the effects of some of the independent variables will be controlled both at the first and higher-order control levels. This procedure should specify certain key variables related to the occurrence of religious experiences. Finally, the utilization of multiple correlation will indicate the explanatory power of the key variables specified by the partial correlation analysis.

The rationale for selecting the correlation procedures over other high level statistical procedures is the fact that this research is at best exploratory. In this light, the present study is interested in the association between various variables and the occurrence of religious experiences and the predictive power of some of these variables. But, at the same time, it is not interested in presenting any type of causal model because some of the previously reported

⁸For elaboration concerning the use of parametric statistics with ordinal data, see Labovitz (1967) and (1970) and Morris (1970).

findings are open to future specification and/or modification. For example, it was noted that it was possible that prayer was associated so strongly with religious experiences because of the definition of religious experiences adopted in this study. Also, it was noted that the respondents may not have reported earlier religious experiences, thus accounting for the modest association between the religious climate in the home and the occurrence of religious experiences. On the basis of these findings and others which will be discussed in the next chapter, it would seem premature, in this author's opinion, to attempt any type of causal interpretation concerning the incidence of religious experiences on the basis of this study.

Prior to entering into the analysis itself, a comment is in order concerning the exclusion of one of the previously discussed independent variables; the number of close friends a respondent had in his local congregation. It will be remembered that the question utilized to operationalize this variable included two categories of responses; those who did not consider themselves attached to a local congregation and those who considered themselves attached. Within the latter category further categorization was made on the basis of the number of friends an individual had in his congregation. This means that, as stated, this item does not meet the minimum criteria for ordinal data. The exclusion of the category of "non-attachment" would transform this data into interval form. However, 72 percent of the

total sample fell into this category. This combined with the listwise deletion procedure, utilized to form a standard sample for the partial correlation procedures, would result in a working sample of less than one hundred cases. It would seem wiser to exclude this item from analysis rather than to have the working sample drastically limited.

Table 22 is a correlation matrix of Pearson's Product Moment correlation coefficients for all variables which will enter in the present analysis. It is evident that there is support for the previous discussion concerning the relationship between the independent variables and the occurrence of religious experiences. Religious beliefs emerge as the single best indicator of the occurrence of religious experiences (.63), although not substantially better than the present influence of religion (.61). Sex, on the other hand, is the weakest indicator. There is also support for the previous argument that the regularity of prayer would be a better predictor of the occurrence of religious experiences than attendance at religious services. A coefficient of .57 for prayer versus .48 for attendance bears out this proposition.

Not only is it possible to look at the relationship between the independent variables and the experiential scale, but, also it is possible to see how the various independent variables are related to each other. All of the variables are positively related. In particular, religious beliefs, religion's present importance, frequency of prayer

and frequency of attendance at religious services appear highly related. The following are the average correlations among these four variables: religious beliefs (.57), religion's present importance (.59), frequency of prayer (.57) and frequency of attendance at religious services (.51). These are relatively high intercorrelations. They indicate that there is probably a considerable amount of interaction between these variables. Therefore, the zero-order relationships between the independent variables and the experiential scale are likely to need additional specification.

Even at the first-order partial level substantial specifications of the relationships previously discussed emerge (Table 23). For example, if one squares the first-order partials of religious beliefs and religion's present importance, controlling for the other, they explain 16 percent and 12 percent of the variation, respectfully. This is in contrast to squaring their simple correlation coefficients (from Table 22) where it appears that they explain 40 and 37 percent of the variation in the occurrence of religious experiences. With the exception of the frequency of prayer, the highest remaining correlations, when controlling for either religious beliefs or religion's present importance, explain only 7 percent of the variation with the dependent variable. In addition, sex's relationship has virtually been removed by several of the variables as the magnitude of the coefficient is approaching zero and losing considerable

alpha significance.

Most of the higher-order partials (Tables 24 and 25) are consistent with the strength and direction of their previously perceived relationships. The only notable exception is sex. Many of the coefficients become negative when controlling for various other independent variables. This indicates that of those respondents who do not fall into the categories being controlled, males are more likely to have had religious experiences than are females. This statement, of course, must be qualified by the notation of the meager size and significance levels of these partialled relationships.

Given the fact that four key variables have emerged, what is the predictive power of these variables regarding the propensity to have religious experiences? This can be determined by the use of the multiple correlation procedure. For the computation of this statistic, the variables were labelled in the following manner: experiential scale = 1; religious beliefs = 2; religion's present influence = 3; frequency of prayer = 4 and frequency of attendance at religious services = 5. When one computes the multiple correlation coefficient treating the experiential scale as the dependent variable, one obtains a $R^2_{1.23}$ of .466. This means that 47 percent of the variation of the experiential scale is predicted by religious beliefs and religion's present influence. It is unlikely, due to the high inter-correlations of the remaining two variables that including them in the multiple correlation equation will substantially

increase the predictive power over the present two variables. This is in fact the case as a $R^2_{1.234}$ is equal to .4942 and $R^2_{1.2345}$ is equal to .500. The addition of the frequency of attendance at religious services variable increased the predictive power of the multiple correlation equation which used three independent variables by only .6 of one percent. It is virtually assured that the addition of one or all of the remaining variables would cause little if any increase in the predictive power of the multiple correlation equation. However, it is significant in survey research to be able to account for half of the total variation in the dependent variable.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the more important findings and contributions of the present study, and, from this, to specify implications for future research concerning religious experiences. The following discussion will be divided according to the two substantive concerns of this study; Stark's taxonomy of religious experiences, and the social context of religious experiences.

A Taxonomy of Religious Experiences Revisited

The first substantive concern of this study was with Stark's taxonomy. This study attempted to operationalize all of the major types of religious experiences specified by Stark plus some of their subtypes. Also, a fearful type experience was added as an additional lower order experience. With these operationalizations in hand, this study set out to see if religious experiences varied according to frequency of occurrence and if they were progressive as postulated by Stark. In addition, this study extended Stark's taxonomy by hypothesizing that religious experiences would also vary in terms of how salient they would be for individuals who reported such experiences. The analysis of the types of religious experiences and the proposed taxonomic relationships yielded several important findings.

It is clear that the present study failed to measure the ecstatic experience as described by Stark. Instead, the ecstatic item tapped another type of confirming experience. If this experience is to be measured in future research, a much stronger operationalization must be developed. The key, in this author's opinion, would be to capture the intense emotion which is reflected in Stark's description of this experience. Such an operationalization could possibly take the following form: "Have you ever had a feeling of a deep, close, and emotional union with God akin to love during courtship between people."

While it would have been desirable to have adequately operationalized the ecstatic experience, it was still possible to consider the three taxonomic relationships. Significant variations in the frequency of occurrence were found between different religious experiences. However, only in general did this frequency variation conform to taxonomic specifications. Individual subdimensions of the responsive and revelational experiences were considerably out of line with their taxonomic expectations. However, judgment of the taxonomic assumption of definite frequency variation cannot be made at the present time. This is because of the inability to say anything about the ecstatic experience. Without this item, the average occurrence of the types of experiences fell into their proposed order. But, the difference of the average occurrence between the responsive and the revelational types of experiences was only four percentage points which

would make it somewhat difficult for the "true" ecstatic experience to take its place between these two types of experiences. The question of frequency variation, then, can only be answered by subsequent research.

Regarding the proposition that religious experiences should be a progressive phenomenon, the present study found that most higher-order experiences, according to the taxonomy, were associated with the occurrence of a lower-order experience. However, the progression failed to hold for the relationship between the revelational enlightenment and the responsive salvational experiences. This finding concerning the revelational enlightenment and the responsive salvational experiences, it will be remembered, was not totally unanticipated as it is theologically consistent that the orderings be reversed from their proposed taxonomic relationships. This finding casts some doubt on a simple ordering of religious experiences on the basis of degrees of interaction. It is evident that theological considerations must also be considered when attempting such an ordering.

The negative experiences also failed to meet their proposed progressive expectations. This led to the subsequent determination that they, in essence, constitute a separate dimension of religious experiences is an important finding of this study.¹ Further, this was rather surprising

¹The negative experiences association with social variables was also not as strong as the same association for the positive experiences. For example, the average Gamma between religious beliefs and the two negative experiences was .35 compared to a Gamma of .61 for the positive experiences.

since the operationalization of the responsive sanctioning experience was the same as used by Stark. It is still not clear why he failed to report the relationship between the responsive sanctioning experience and the confirming experience instead of resting his evidence for a progressive taxonomic relationship solely on the relationship between the responsive salvational experience and the confirming experience. However, while deviating from the taxonomic proposition of progression, the negative experiences relationships to the other experiences make sense from a theological perspective. The dominant modern view of God, at least for the majority of the Protestant denominations, is to view Him as a benevolent rather than as a vengeful being. Given this, future research should balance the responsive sanctioning experience with one which points to the benevolence of God. A benevolent being not only punishes deviations, but, also, or above all, forgives them. It is therefore suggested to include the following item as an additional sub-dimension fo the responsive experience: "A feeling that God has forgiven you for something you have done." A comparison of this item to the responsive sanctioning item would be straightforward; in both instances an individual by positively responding to either item would indicate that he had done something wrong, at least in his perception of God's view. Additionally, it would be interesting to see if the forgiving experience scaled with other positive experiences. It is this author's opinion that this would be a definite

possibility due to the implied relationship of this item to other positive experiences. For example, implicit in the concept of salvation is a commitment on the part of the Divine to forgive the person of all of his sins.

The proposition that religious experiences could be ranked according to saliency was considered a logical extension of Stark's taxonomic discussion. However, the results from the analysis did not meet the hypothesized rank-ordering. This was explained, in part, by different experiences within the same type or subdimension possibly having wide variation in their importance for the individual. For example, the revelational commission experience could have wide variations, while the responsive salvational experience would be more narrow in its saliency range.

One way to address the possibility of variations within types would be to have the respondents in future research describe their experiences. This should not take the form of a simple open-ended question, but should request an elaboration concerning specific experiences. This would allow the researcher to discern the range of experiences within a given type or subdimension. If the respondents reported only the non-trivial experiences and a rank-ordering of the experiences still failed to meet the proposed order, then the hypothesis concerning a saliency ordering would have to remain rejected. If, however, a substantial proportion of the non-salient higher-order experiences were of a trivial nature (e.g. of the commission type where God, for example, told the individual to let his hair grow long) then the

hypothesis need not be rejected. Rather, on the basis of the respondents' descriptions of their experiences, the hypothesis would have to be specified to account for particular variations in certain types of experiences.

Another implication for continuing research which is relevant to the question of saliency, is that it would be beneficial to have respondents date the last occurrence, in general terms, of their particular religious experiences. Certain experiences could be of such a nature that they would be important to an individual for only a limited length of time. On the other hand, experiences such as the responsive salvational are likely to remain important for an extended length of time.

A final implication for further research regarding the taxonomic relationships deals with the frequency of religious experiences. It will be remembered that the frequency of religious experiences for this study was only a count of how many individuals had any given experience. While it is important to be able to see how widespread the occurrence of a particular experience is, it also seems important to see how frequently individuals have a given experience. It is likely that this could shed further light on the proposed taxonomic relationships. It is this author's opinion that this procedure would support the previous contention that one cannot ignore theological considerations in the development of a taxonomy of religious experience. For example, according to the taxonomy, the responsive

salvational experience should occur somewhat frequently as it is a lower-order experience. However, on theological grounds, it appears unlikely, at least for many individuals, that this type of experience would be a recurring phenomenon.

The most important contribution of this analysis was the identification of a Guttman scale of religious experiences. This scale, being unidimensional, assured that the analysis concerning the social context of religious experiences was both reliable and valid. Had this study adopted the method of analysis used by Stark (e.g. using a simple index for all experiences; see footnote p. 13) the analysis indicated the two negative experiences were not on the same dimension as the positive experiences, such an index would have been formed from two different phenomenon; it would have been similar to adding apples and oranges.

The Social Context of Religious Experiences

The other substantive concern of the present study was with the social variables associated with the occurrence of religious experiences. Clearly, a sociological perspective concerning the study of religious experiences has its place. Four social variables (religious beliefs, religion's present importance frequency of prayer and frequency of attendance at religious services) were seen to explain fifty percent of the variation in the occurrence of religious experiences. Further, all of the remaining social variables were found to be positively associated to the occurrence of religious experiences. It is now time to consider the

implications of the previous social context discussion.

First, at the specific level, it would be possible to pursue in depth the relationship between social support and the incidence of religious experiences. Initially, this should take the form of replicating the work done concerning the number of friends one has in his local congregation to see if a pattern similar to that found in this study emerges. Stark, from whom this hypothesis was taken, found a progression in the incidence of religious experiences as the number of friends in the local congregation increased. However, on the basis of the present analysis, it was seen that the number of friends did not make a significant difference. Rather, it appeared that the crucial distinction was between differing levels of support, which took the form of no support, secondary support and both secondary and primary support.² If one operates on the assumption that religious experiences are in part a social phenomenon, then it becomes clear that further investigation of this relationship would be useful.

Another important implication of the analysis is the relationship between prayer and religious experiences. It was noted that some of this relationship could be explained by the fact that when one is praying he is, by the definition of religious experiences adopted in this paper, attempting

²It should be noted that Stark could not have made this type of distinction in his study because his sample consisted only of church members.

a religious experience. In this light, it is suggested that future research follow Bourque's (1969) lead and ask about the situation in which various experiences occurred. If most, or a substantial number occurred during prayer, this would indicate a sufficient condition for religious experiences to occur. This would mean that prayer, itself, would be a religious experience. This is not to say that prayer would be a particular type of religious experience; the experiences occurring during this act could vary according to specified types.

On the more general level, there is a definite implication concerning a theoretical model of religiosity. The dominant model at the present is the five-dimensional model proposed by Charles Glock (Glock and Stark 1965:18). Early research (e.g. Faulkner and De Jong, 1966 and Clayton, 1968) indicated support for this model as the five dimensions were found to be more or less independent. However, more recent research has indicated that this might not be the case. Nudelman, utilizing his own interviews with Christian Scientists and Glock and Stark's own data, found the belief dimension to be highly correlated with the other dimensions for both data sets. Campbell and Magill (1968), Gibbs and Crader (1970) and Weigert and Thomas (1974) also found the belief dimension to be the dominant. Clayton and Gladden (1974) also found this to be the case. As a result of this finding they argued that religion is not a multi-dimensional phenomenon, but "basically a commitment to an ideology and

the other so-called dimensions are merely expressions of the strength of that core commitment." (1974:142) Continuing:

In effect we would argue that the crucial task in the study of religiosity is, first, to pinpoint the belief system (Ideology) with which a subject identifies or toward which he reacts. His or her religiosity (Ideological Commitment) is determined by the degree of acceptance or non-acceptance of the traditional--and/or non-traditional--belief indigenous to the Ideology and the Saliency of these beliefs to his or her world view. The strength of the respondent's religiosity (Ideological Commitment) is or can be expressed in one or more of the directions in which commitment strength flows. (Italics in the original).

The results of the present study support Clayton and Gladden's position. The four dominant variables found to be related to the incidence of religious experiences represent two dimensions of an individual's religiosity. Religious beliefs and the present importance of religion are representative of a basic ideological commitment, whereas, the frequency of prayer and attendance at religious services are representative of religious ritual. Perhaps what this study has done is to predict the occurrence of religious experiences from two points of view; from the definition of the situation (ideological commitment) and from a "triggering mechanism" (ritual participation). However, the importance is not in the prediction of religious experiences from two points of view. Rather, it is in the relationship of the "triggering mechanisms" to the ideological commitment. It is likely, as stated by Clayton and Gladden, that the

ritual participation is a representation of a basic ideological commitment. This perspective is supported by the present data as few respondents (4%) indicated their attendance at religious services was a result of pressure from their parents, spouse or others. In other words, by attending religious services, they were acting in accordance with and manifesting a basic ideological commitment.

The centrality of the ideological commitment variables also receives statistical support from the analysis. Looking at the second-order partial correlation coefficients (Table XXIII), when controlling for religious beliefs and religion's present importance (ideological commitment) the ritual variables explanatory power does not remain very strong. However, when controlling for the two ritual variables, the strength of the ideological variables retains a significant amount of explanatory power.

While this discussion has questioned the five-dimensional approach to the study of religiosity, it does not intend to imply that religiosity is unidimensional. The implication of the present discussion is the need for the development of a new model of religiosity. It appears that there are two levels within the dimensions of religiosity. Ideological commitment is seen as the dominant dimension and the other dimensions can be viewed as the manifestations of this ideological commitment. Therefore, ideological commitment would be the center of a new model of religiosity. The other dimensions would flow from this

ideological commitment. Of course, there would be relationships between the other dimensions as well, (e.g. as between ritual and religious experiences). However, pursual of such a model and its possible causal connections to the occurrence of religious experiences cannot be undertaken at this time. The precise connection between some of the dimensions are not known at this time. For example, the precise connection between prayer and religious experiences is not presently known. Further, the data base for this study did not have measures of the other dimensions of religiosity. However, it is hoped the above discussion will give some direction to future research which would allow for a better understanding of the occurrence of religious experiences, in particular, and for a reconceptualization of the nature of religiosity, in general.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF TOTAL CITY POPULATION FOR AGE SPECIFIC GROUPS 15-19,
20-24, BY SEX, WITH 15 PERCENT ENUMERATION AREA SAMPLE FOR AGE
SPECIFIC GROUPS 15-19, 20-24 BY SEX, FOR CALGARY, 1966, WITH
POPULATION SURVEYED, 1971, WITH TOTAL POPULATION 1971

| | Sex | | | | Total Youth Population Age 15-24 |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|
| | Males | | Females | | |
| | Age 15-19 | Age 20-24 | Age 15-19 | Age 20-24 | |
| Calgary, 1966 ^a | 25.2 (12,939) | 22.6 (11,583) | 26.3 (13,505) | 25.9 (13,314) | 100.0% (51,339) |
| 15% E.A. Sample, 1966 ^b | 26.2 (1,869) | 21.8 (1,555) | 26.7 (1,901) | 25.2 (1,797) | 100.0% (7,122) |
| Population Surveyed 1971 | 28.9 (205) | 23.4 (166) | 25.8 (183) | 21.8 (154) | 100.0% (708) |
| Calgary, 1971 ^c | 23.8 (18,415) | 25.3 (19,585) | 24.1 (18,600) | 26.8 (20,710) | 100.0% (77,310) |

^aDBS, 1966, 95-625.

^bAlberta PO 1-66, DBS, 1966, Special Print-out available in Population Research Laboratory, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

^cDBS, 1971, 95-726 (CT-26A).

TABLE 2
 REPORTED INCIDENCE OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES
 BY TYPE OF EXPERIENCE

| Type of Experience | Yes, I'm sure | Yes, I think so | No, I have not | Total ^a |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Confirming | 18 (126) | 25 (173) | 57 (388) | 100% (687) |
| Responsive Salvational | 10 (65) | 17 (117) | 73 (501) | 100% (683) |
| Responsive Miraculous | 15 (102) | 24 (163) | 61 (419) | 100% (684) |
| Responsive Sanctioning | 14 (97) | 25 (170) | 61 (414) | 100% (681) |
| Fearful | 16 (109) | 23 (159) | 61 (419) | 100% (687) |
| Ecstatic | 18 (124) | 29 (202) | 53 (364) | 100% (690) |
| Revelational Enlightenment | 16 (108) | 25 (174) | 59 (402) | 100% (684) |
| Revelational Commission | 9 (62) | 12 (85) | 78 (536) | 100 ^b % (683) |

^aThis and subsequent tables have excluded all missing values.

^bAll total percentages have been rounded to 100 if the deviation is due to rounding error.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS WHO HAVE REPORTED HIGHER-ORDER EXPERIENCES WHO
HAVE ALSO REPORTED A CONFIRMING EXPERIENCE

| Confirming Experience | Higher-Order Experiences | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Responsive Salvational | | | Responsive Miraculous | | | Responsive Sanctioning | | | Fearful | | | Revelational Enlightenment | | | Revelational Commission | | |
| | (1) ^a | (2) ^b | (3) ^c | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| Yes, I am sure | 75 | 24 | 9 | 55 | 23 | 7 | 37 | 21 | 12 | 37 | 21 | 12 | 58 | 24 | 5 | 78 | 33 | 9 |
| Yes, I think I have | 16 | 55 | 20 | 32 | 41 | 18 | 29 | 35 | 20 | 33 | 35 | 20 | 22 | 52 | 14 | 13 | 52 | 22 |
| No, I have not | 9 | 21 | 71 | 13 | 36 | 75 | 34 | 44 | 68 | 30 | 44 | 68 | 20 | 23 | 81 | 8 | 15 | 69 |
| Total | 100% (65) | 100% (115) | 100% (500) | 100% (100) | 100% (163) | 100% (417) | 100% (97) | 100% (168) | 100% (413) | 100% (105) | 100% (159) | 100% (419) | 100% (107) | 100% (172) | 100% (401) | 100% (60) | 100% (85) | 100% (534) |

Gamma = .77

Gamma = .71

Gamma = .43

Gamma = .45

Gamma = .77

Gamma = .81

^aYes, I'm sure I have.

^bYes, I think I have.

^cNo, I have not.

TABLE 4

PERCENT OF PERSONS WHO HAVE REPORTED HIGHER-ORDER EXPERIENCES WHO
HAVE ALSO REPORTED AN ECSTATIC EXPERIENCE

| Ecstatic Experience | Higher-Order Experiences | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Responsive Salvational | | | Responsive Miraculous | | | Responsive Sanctioning | | | Fearful | | | Revelational Enlightenment | | | Revelational Commission | | |
| | (1) ^a | (2) ^b | (3) ^c | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| Yes, I am sure | 72 | 29 | 8 | 55 | 23 | 6 | 40 | 15 | 13 | 33 | 20 | 13 | 69 | 20 | 3 | 81 | 32 | 8 |
| Yes, I think I have | 23 | 52 | 24 | 32 | 46 | 22 | 31 | 43 | 23 | 39 | 44 | 21 | 19 | 60 | 18 | 14 | 57 | 26 |
| No, I have not | 5 | 19 | 68 | 13 | 31 | 72 | 29 | 42 | 64 | 28 | 36 | 66 | 11 | 20 | 79 | 5 | 12 | 66 |
| Total | 100% (65) | 100% (115) | 100% (499) | 100% (101) | 100% (162) | 100% (418) | 100% (97) | 100% (169) | 100% (413) | 100% (109) | 100% (157) | 100% (418) | 100% (108) | 100% (171) | 100% (401) | 100% (62) | 100% (85) | 100% (534) |

Gamma = .79

Gamma = .71

Gamma = .42

Gamma = .46

Gamma = .85

Gamma = .84

^aYes, I'm sure I have.^bYes, I think I have.^cNo, I have not.

TABLE 5
 PERCENTS OF PERSONS WHO HAVE REPORTED REVELATIONAL
 EXPERIENCES WHO HAVE ALSO REPORTED A
 FEARFUL EXPERIENCE

| Fearful Experience | Revelational Experiences | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Enlightenment | | | Commission | | |
| | Sure | Think | No | Sure | Think | No |
| Yes, I am sure | 39 | 19 | 8 | 43 | 24 | 11 |
| Yes, I think I have | 25 | 34 | 18 | 28 | 26 | 22 |
| No, I have not | 36 | 47 | 74 | 30 | 51 | 66 |
| Total | 100% (105) | 100% (172) | 100% (402) | 100% (61) | 100% (85) | 100% (534) |
| | Gamma = .50 | | | Gamma = .45 | | |

TABLE 6
 PERCENTS OF PERSONS WHO HAVE REPORTED REVELATIONAL
 EXPERIENCES WHO HAVE ALSO REPORTED A
 RESPONSIVE SANCTIONING EXPERIENCE

| Responsive Sanctioning Experience | Revelational Experiences | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Enlightenment | | | Commission | | |
| | Sure | Think | No | Sure | Think | No |
| Yes, I am sure | 42 | 13 | 8 | 40 | 22 | 10 |
| Yes, I think I have | 28 | 32 | 21 | 22 | 38 | 23 |
| No, I have not | 30 | 54 | 72 | 38 | 40 | 67 |
| Total | 100% (105) | 100% (169) | 100% (402) | 100% (60) | 100% (85) | 100% (533) |

Gamma = .49

Gamma = .47

TABLE 7
 PERCENTS OF PERSONS WHO HAVE REPORTED REVELATIONAL
 EXPERIENCES WHO HAVE ALSO REPORTED
 A RESPONSIVE MIRACULOUS EXPERIENCE

| Responsive Miraculous Experience | Revelational Experiences | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Enlightenment | | | Commission | | |
| | Sure | Think | No | Sure | Think | No |
| Yes, I am sure | 55 | 14 | 5 | 59 | 28 | 8 |
| Yes, I think I have | 24 | 49 | 13 | 25 | 46 | 20 |
| No, I have not | 21 | 37 | 82 | 15 | 26 | 72 |
| Total | 100% (104) | 100% (172) | 100% (402) | 100% (59) | 100% (85) | 100% (536) |

Gamma = .75

Gamma = .74

TABLE 8
 PERCENTS OF PERSONS WHO HAVE REPORTED REVELATIONAL
 EXPERIENCES WHO HAVE ALSO REPORTED A
 RESPONSIVE SALVATIONAL EXPERIENCE

| Responsive Salvational Experience | Revelational Experiences | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Enlightenment | | | Commission | | |
| | Sure | Think | No | Sure | Think | No |
| Yes, I am sure | 40 | 11 | 1 | 55 | 19 | 3 |
| Yes, I think I have | 27 | 36 | 7 | 15 | 42 | 13 |
| No, I have not | 33 | 54 | 92 | 30 | 39 | 84 |
| Total | 100% (105) | 100% (172) | 100% (401) | 100% (60) | 100% (84) | 100% (533) |
| | Gamma = .80 | | | Gamma = .78 | | |

TABLE 9
 PERCENT OF PERSONS WHO HAVE REPORTED A RESPONSIVE
 SALVATIONAL EXPERIENCE WHO HAVE ALSO REPORTED
 A REVELATIONAL ENLIGHTENMENT EXPERIENCE

| Revelational Enlightenment Experience | Responsive Salvational Experience | | |
|---|---|------------------------|-------------------|
| | Yes, I am sure | Yes, I think I have | No, I have not |
| Yes, I am sure | 66 | 24 | 7 |
| Yes, I think I have | 30 | 53 | 18 |
| No, I have not | 5 | 23 | 75 |
| Total | 100% (64) | 100% (116) | 100% (498) |

TABLE 10
 PERCENTAGE OF SALIENT EXPERIENCES BY TYPE OF
 EXPERIENCE AND SURITY OF RESPONSE

| Type of Experience | Sure they have had the experience | | | Think they have had the experience | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| | Type ¹ N | Salient N | Percent Salient | Type ¹ N | Salient N | Percent Salient |
| Confirming | 122 | 55 | 45% | 169 | 31 | 18% |
| Responsive Salvational | 61 | 32 | 52% | 116 | 18 | 16% |
| Miraculous | 102 | 50 | 49% | 159 | 30 | 19% |
| Sanctioning | 95 | 28 | 29% | 169 | 19 | 11% |
| Fearful | 108 | 30 | 28% | 155 | 10 | 7% |
| Ecstatic | 121 | 61 | 50% | 198 | 33 | 16% |
| Revelational Enlightenment | 106 | 46 | 43% | 171 | 19 | 11% |
| Commission | 61 | 25 | 41% | 84 | 10 | 12% |

¹The various "Ns" for each type of experience do not coincide specifically with those reported in Table 2. This is because of the exclusion of those respondents who had missing values on the saliency item.

TABLE 11
 PERCENT OF EACH DENOMINATIONAL CATEGORY
 ACCORDING TO THEIR RANK ON THE
 EXPERIENTIAL SCALE

| Experiential Scale Score | Denominational Scale | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| | Not Members | Liberal ^a | Moderate ^b | Sectarian ^c |
| 0 | 54 | 44 | 18 | 16 |
| 1 | 14 | 13 | 15 | 9 |
| 2 | 10 | 17 | 19 | 2 |
| 3 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 5 |
| 4 | 7 | 8 | 23 | 19 |
| 5 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 49 |
| Total | 100% (284) | 100% (176) | 100% (145) | 100% (43) |
| Gamma = .40 | | | | |

^aIncludes Anglican, United Church and Presbyterian.

^bIncludes Lutheran, Roman Catholic and Ukrainian Catholic.

^cIncludes Alliance Church, Baptists, Christodelphians, Christian Missionary Alliance, Church of Christ, Evangelical Free Church, Evangelical United Bretheren, Full Gospel, Jehovah's Witness, Latter Day Saints, Mennonite Bretheren, Methodist, Nazarene, Pentecostal and Seventh Day Adventist.

TABLE 12
 PERCENTAGE SCORING FIVE ON THE EXPERIENTIAL SCALE
 FOR THE DENOMINATIONS COMPARED TO THEIR
 PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION

| Denomination | Score Hi (5) | Percent of Total Population | Percentage Difference |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Not Members | 23 | 44 | -21 |
| Liberals | 19 | 27 | - 8 |
| Moderates | 26 | 22 | + 4 |
| Sectarians | 32 | 7 | +25 |
| Total | 100% (43) | 100% (648) | |

TABLE 13
 PERCENTAGE OF EACH DENOMINATIONAL CATEGORY WHO
 REPORTED THE RESPONSIVE SANCTIONING EXPERIENCE

| Responsive Sanctioning Experience | Denominational Category | | | |
|---|-------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| | Not Member | Liberals | Roman Catholic ^a | Sectarian |
| Yes, I am sure | 12 (36) | 9 (16) | 25 (29) | 21 (10) |
| Yes, I think I have | 23 (68) | 20 (37) | 38 (43) | 23 (11) |

^aRepresents the moderate category, but Ukrainian Catholics and Lutherans have been excluded.

TABLE 14

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NUMBER OF CLOSE FRIENDS IN LOCAL CONGREGATION
AND THE INCIDENCE OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES
(in percentages)

| Experiential Scale Score | Attached | Number of Friends | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | No Friends | One | Two | Three | Four | Five |
| | | 0 | 48 | 24 | 12 | 21 | 21 |
| 1 | 13 | 20 | 8 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 2 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 3 | 11 | 40 | 5 |
| 3 | 11 | 10 | 16 | 18 | 11 | 10 | 11 |
| 4 | 9 | 14 | 24 | 30 | 16 | 20 | 16 |
| 5 | 5 | 17 | 24 | 12 | 37 | 30 | 37 |
| Total | 100% (473) | 100% (70) | 100% (23) | 100% (33) | 100% (19) | 100% (10) | 100% (16) |

TABLE 15

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND
THE OCCURRENCE OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES
(in percentages)

| Experiential Scale Score | Religious Beliefs Scale Score | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Zero | One | Two | Three | Four | Five | Six | Seven | Eight |
| 0 | 87 | 70 | 58 | 40 | 19 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 2 |
| 1 | 6 | 16 | 10 | 13 | 22 | 20 | 21 | 5 | 6 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 12 | 24 | 18 | 20 | 23 | 10 | 12 |
| 3 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 18 | 10 | 21 | 14 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 15 | 27 | 29 | 22 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 18 | 12 | 34 | 43 |
| Total | 100% (105) | 100% (79) | 100% (96) | 100% (84) | 100% (85) | 100% (66) | 100% (52) | 100% (38) | 100% (49) |

Gamma = .63

TABLE 16
 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTENDANCE AT RELIGIOUS SERVICES
 AND THE OCCURRENCE OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES
 (in percentages)

| Experiential Scale Score | Attendance at Religious Services | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Never or Hardly ever | Every Three Months | One to Two Times Each Month | Every Week or More |
| 0 | 54 | 22 | 13 | 7 |
| 1 | 12 | 18 | 19 | 12 |
| 2 | 14 | 12 | 11 | 10 |
| 3 | 10 | 14 | 17 | 13 |
| 4 | 7 | 22 | 23 | 23 |
| 5 | 3 | 12 | 17 | 36 |
| Total | 100% (447) | 100% (68) | 100% (47) | 100% (102) |

Gamma = .60

TABLE 17
 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRAYER AND THE OCCURRENCE
 OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES
 (in percentages)

| Experiential Scale Score | Prayer | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|
| | Never | Only at Church | Not Regularly | Weekly | Daily or More |
| 0 | 78 | 33 | 21 | 8 | 3 |
| 1 | 9 | 13 | 19 | 16 | 8 |
| 2 | 5 | 22 | 18 | 19 | 11 |
| 3 | 3 | 15 | 16 | 11 | 18 |
| 4 | 2 | 13 | 16 | 27 | 19 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 19 | 41 |
| Total | 100% (235) | 100% (46) | 100% (277) | 100% (37) | 100% (63) |

Gamma = .66

TABLE 18
 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX AND THE OCCURRENCE
 OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES
 (in percentages)

| Experiential Scale Score | Sex | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Male | Female |
| 0 | 47 | 32 |
| 1 | 13 | 14 |
| 2 | 12 | 14 |
| 3 | 8 | 15 |
| 4 | 10 | 13 |
| 5 | 9 | 12 |
| Total | 100% (359) | 100% (308) |

Gamma = .22

TABLE 19
 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOUS CLIMATE IN THE HOME
 WHEN GROWING UP AND THE OCCURRENCE OF
 RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES
 (in percentages)

| Experiential Scale Score | Religious Climate in the Home | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| | None or Slight | Some | Quite Strong or Very Strong |
| 0 | 57 | 43 | 23 |
| 1 | 12 | 17 | 12 |
| 2 | 10 | 11 | 17 |
| 3 | 19 | 9 | 15 |
| 4 | 8 | 11 | 15 |
| 5 | 2 | 10 | 18 |
| Total | 100% (213) | 100% (218) | 100% (236) |

Gamma = .36

TABLE 20
 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOUS CLIMATE IN THE HOME
 WHEN GROWING UP AND THE PRESENT IMPORTANCE
 OF RELIGION
 (in percentages)

| Present Importance of Religion | Religious Climate in the Home | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| | None or Slight | Some | Quite Strong or Very Strong | |
| None or Slight | 44 ^a | 33 | 23 | 100% |
| | 75 ^b | 56 | 35 | (384) |
| Some | 17 | 40 | 44 | 100% |
| | 13 | 32 | 31 | (181) |
| Quite Strong or Very Strong | 18 | 20 | 62 | 100% |
| | 11 | 12 | 34 | (139) |
| Total | 100% (224) | 100% (228) | 100% (252) | 100% (704) |

^aRow Percents.

^bColumn Percents

TABLE 21

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PRESENT IMPORTANCE OF RELIGION
AND THE OCCURRENCE OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES
(in percentages)

| Experiential Scale Score | Present Importance of Religion | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| | None or Slight | Some | Quite Strong or Very Strong |
| 0 | 62 | 16 | 9 |
| 1 | 11 | 24 | 6 |
| 2 | 12 | 17 | 10 |
| 3 | 7 | 16 | 17 |
| 4 | 5 | 17 | 24 |
| 5 | 2 | 11 | 35 |
| Total | 100% (371) | 100% (170) | 100% (126) |

Gamma = .66

TABLE 22

ZERO-ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX FOR VARIABLES IN STUDY

| | Exp. Scale ^a | Beliefs ^b | Now ^c | Prayer | Attend. ^d | Denom ^e | Climate | Sex |
|------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------------|
| Exp. Scale | --- | .63 | .61 | .57 | .48 | .36 | .34 | .15 |
| Beliefs | | --- | .64 | .60 | .48 | .40 | .34 | .34 |
| Now | | | --- | .58 | .56 | .35 | .36 | .18 |
| Prayer | | | | --- | .49 | .34 | .31 | .28 |
| Attend | | | | | --- | .46 | .42 | .13 |
| Denom | | | | | | --- | .37 | .18 |
| Climate | | | | | | | --- | .04 ¹ |
| Sex | | | | | | | | --- |

^aExperiential Scale.

^bReligious Beliefs Scale.

^cPresent Importance of Religion

^dAttendance at Religious Services.

^eDenominational Affiliation (categorized)

¹Significant at .183: all other coefficients are significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 23

FIRST-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
WITH THE EXPERIENTIAL SCALE

| Control Variable | Independent Variable | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------|--------|-------|---------|-------------|
| | Beliefs | Now | Prayer | Attend | Denom | Climate | Sex |
| Beliefs | --- | .34 ¹ | .31 | .26 | .18 | .17 | -.08 (.015) |
| Now | .40 | --- | .34 | .21 | .20 | .17 | .05 (.098) |
| Prayer | .44 | .42 | --- | .29 | .21 | .22 | .02 (.329) |
| Attend | .52 | .47 | .44 | --- | .17 | .18 | .07 (.007) |
| Denom | .57 | .55 | .51 | .37 | --- | .24 | .08 (.015) |
| Climate | .58 | .55 | .52 | .40 | .27 | --- | .14 |
| Sex | .63 | .60 | .56 | .47 | .34 | .34 | --- |

¹Unless otherwise noted all coefficients are significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 24

SECOND-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS¹ WITH EXPERIENTIAL SCALE

| Control Variables | Independent Variables | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----|--------|--------|------------|------------|-------------|
| | Beliefs | Now | Prayer | Attend | Denom | Climate | Sex |
| Beliefs, Now | --- | --- | .23 | .15 | .11 (.003) | .12 (.002) | -.07 (.035) |
| Beliefs, Prayer | --- | .27 | --- | .19 | .11 (.003) | .14 | -.13 |
| Beliefs, Attend | --- | .28 | .26 | --- | .07 (.040) | .10 (.005) | -.08 (.02) |
| Beliefs, Denom | --- | .33 | .30 | .22 | --- | .14 | -.10 (.008) |
| Beliefs, Climate | --- | .32 | .30 | .22 | .11 (.004) | --- | -.07 (.03) |
| Beliefs, Sex | --- | .34 | .33 | .26 | .16 | .17 | --- |
| Now, Prayer | .31 | --- | --- | .15 | .15 | .13 | -.03 (.26) |
| Now, Attend | .37 | --- | .30 | --- | .14 | .12 (.002) | .05 (.13) |
| Now, Denom | .36 | --- | .31 | .16 | --- | .12 | .03 (.26) |
| Now, Climate | .38 | --- | .32 | .17 | .16 | --- | .06 (.07) |
| Now, Sex | .40 | --- | .33 | .21 | .19 | .17 | --- |
| Prayer, Attend | .39 | .35 | --- | --- | .12 | .14 | -.02 (.35) |
| Prayer, Denom | .41 | .39 | --- | .23 | --- | .16 | -.04 (.16) |
| Prayer, Climate | .42 | .39 | --- | .23 | .16 | --- | .01 (.43) |
| Prayer, Sex | .46 | .42 | --- | .29 | .22 | .21 | --- |
| Attend, Denom | .50 | .46 | .42 | --- | --- | .15 | .08 (.03) |
| Attend, Climate | .50 | .45 | .43 | --- | .14 | --- | .10 (.005) |
| Attend, Sex | .52 | .46 | .43 | --- | .17 | .18 | --- |
| Denom, Climate | .54 | .52 | .48 | .33 | --- | --- | .10 (.007) |
| Denom, Sex | .57 | .55 | .51 | .38 | --- | .25 | --- |
| Climate, Sex | .57 | .54 | .51 | .39 | .25 | --- | --- |

¹Unless otherwise indicated all coefficients are significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 25

THIRD-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS¹ WITH EXPERIENTIAL SCALE

| Control Variables | Independent Variables | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----|--------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| | Beliefs | Now | Prayer | Attend | Denom | Climate | Sex | | | |
| Beliefs, Now, Prayer | --- | --- | --- | .11 (.003) | .09 (.012) | .10 (.006) | -.11 (.004) | | | |
| Beliefs, Now, Attend | --- | --- | .21 | --- | .07 (.042) | .08 (.02) | -.07 (.04) | | | |
| Beliefs, Now, Denom | --- | --- | .22 | .12 | --- | .09 (.01) | -.08 (.022) | | | |
| Beliefs, Now, Climate | --- | --- | .22 | .12 | .09 (.016) | --- | -.07 (.054) | | | |
| Beliefs, Prayer, Attend | --- | .23 | --- | --- | .06 (.079) | .09 (.011) | -.12 (.002) | | | |
| Beliefs, Prayer, Denom | --- | .27 | --- | .16 | --- | .12 (.002) | -.14 | | | |
| Beliefs, Prayer, Climate | --- | .26 | --- | .16 | .08 (.025) | --- | -.12 (.002) | | | |
| Beliefs, Attend, Denom | --- | .28 | .26 | --- | --- | .09 (.01) | -.09 (.017) | | | |
| Beliefs, Attend, Climate | --- | .27 | .25 | --- | .05 (.104) | --- | -.07 (.037) | | | |
| Beliefs, Denom, Climate | --- | .32 | .29 | .20 | --- | --- | -.08 (.019) | | | |
| Now, Prayer, Attend | .30 | --- | --- | --- | .11 (.004) | .10 (.007) | -.02 (.278) | | | |
| Now, Prayer, Denom | .29 | --- | --- | .10 (.005) | --- | .10 (.007) | -.04 (.154) | | | |
| Now, Prayer, Climate | .30 | --- | --- | .12 (.002) | .12 (.002) | --- | -.02 (.324) | | | |
| Now, Attend, Denom | .35 | --- | .29 | --- | --- | .09 (.012) | .03 (.242) | | | |
| Now, Attend, Climate | .36 | --- | .30 | --- | .12 | --- | .05 (.105) | | | |
| Now, Denom, Climate | .36 | --- | .31 | .14 | --- | --- | .03 (.196) | | | |
| Prayer, Attend, Denom | .38 | .34 | --- | --- | --- | .11 (.003) | -.03 (.273) | | | |
| Prayer, Attend, Climate | .38 | .34 | --- | --- | .10 (.007) | --- | -.01 (.422) | | | |
| Prayer, Denom, Climate | .40 | .37 | --- | .20 | --- | --- | -.03 (.260) | | | |
| Attend, Denom, Climate | .49 | .45 | .42 | --- | --- | --- | -.08 (.019) | | | |

¹Unless otherwise noted all coefficients are significant at the .001 level.

INTRODUCTION TO

SECTION B

THIS PAGE CONTAINS INSTRUCTIONS TO BE GIVEN BY INTERVIEWER TO RESPONDENT.

The rest of this interview contains a lot of questions asking you about your attitudes toward different things and your behavior. In order that you can have complete privacy in answering them, I am going to give you this questionnaire to answer by yourself. When you have finished, you can put the answers in this envelope and seal it so that your answers are completely confidential. Obviously, you are free not to answer any questions you consider too personal.

HAND QUESTIONNAIRE AND PENCIL TO RESPONDENT

There are a few remarks I want to make before you begin.

1. First, don't worry about all the numbers in front of the answers. They are code numbers for the computer.
2. You will not have to answer every question in this section. In some cases if you answer yes or no you will be asked to skip several questions.
3. The first attitude questions are a little complicated. So I would like to read the instructions along with you. Also, I will be ready to answer any questions you have as you go through the questionnaire.
4. If you would follow on the front page then, I will simply go over the first instructions with you.

INSTRUCTIONS

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief; obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer the items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. Circle the a or b which you choose as the statement more true.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices. While there is some overlapping, each item is important for itself.

NB: Is sample number on Section A and B?

Deck 2 Col 27

SECTION B

SAMPLE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief; obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer the items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. Circle the a or b which you choose as the statement more true.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices. While there is some overlapping, each item is important for itself.

Circle the a or b which you choose as the statement more true.

48. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
49. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
50. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
51. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
52. a. In the case of a well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
53. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

Col 33

54. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
55. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
56. a. Racial discrimination is here to stay.
b. People may be prejudiced but it's possible for Canadian society to completely rid itself of open discrimination.
57. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
58. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
59. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
60. a. Many Indians who don't do well in life have good training, but the opportunities just always go to whites.
b. Indians may not have the same opportunities as whites, but many Indians haven't prepared themselves enough to make use of the opportunities that come their way.
61. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There really is no such thing as "luck".
62. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
63. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
64. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
65. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

Col 60

The following are questions
pertaining to the use of drugs.

79. Do you favor the legalization of marihuana?
- 1 ___ Yes, definitely
 - 2 ___ Yes, I think so
 - 3 ___ I really don't know
 - 4 ___ I don't think so
 - 5 ___ Definitely not
80. Drugs include marihuana, glue, barbiturates, opiates, stimulants (pep pills), tranquilizers, LSD and other hallucinogens. Check the category that applies to you.
- 1 ___ I have used drugs - I am still using them.
 - 2 ___ I have used drugs - I might use them again.
 - 3 ___ I have used drugs - I am not using them again.
 - 4 ___ I have not used drugs - I might like to try them. } skip to
 - 5 ___ I have not used drugs - I am not going to use them. } q. 85
81. In the past six months (since September) I have used marihuana:
- 1 ___ Not at all
 - 2 ___ One or two times
 - 3 ___ Three or four times
 - 4 ___ Five or six times
 - 5 ___ Seven or more times
82. In the past six months (since September) I have sniffed glue or other solvents (i.e., nail polish remover, paint thinner, gasoline, etc.):
- 1 ___ Not at all
 - 2 ___ One or two times
 - 3 ___ Three or four times
 - 4 ___ Five or six times
 - 5 ___ Seven or more times
83. In the past six months (since September) I have used tranquilizers:
- 1 ___ Not at all
 - 2 ___ One or two times
 - 3 ___ Three or four times
 - 4 ___ Five or six times
 - 5 ___ Seven or more times
84. In the past six months (since September) I have used opiates (heroin, morphine, opium)
- 1 ___ Not at all
 - 2 ___ One or two times
 - 3 ___ Three or four times
 - 4 ___ Five or six times
 - 5 ___ Seven or more times