

THE EFFECT OF RELIGION TOWARD MORAL VALUES OF COLLEGE STUDENTS IN LOCOS SUR, PHILIPPINES

A Case Study By Fr. Damianus Abun & Riza Cajindos, Phillipines

Email:- frdamy@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Many wonder why self-confessed religious nations such as Christian nation, Islam nations, Hinduism nation, have not become better country in terms of morality such as corruption, killings, gambling, cheating, abortions, and many more immoralities. Those immoralities raise question in the mind of many people: does religion have no influence to the moral life of people? At the same time, some nations that claim to have no religion, they are advanced and less corrupt. Such picture deserves to be investigated.

KEYWORDS

Religion, Morality, Life, Individual, Human Welfare, Realities

INTRODUCTION

The question about the effect of religion toward morality has been raised by many people. “Does religion have any effect toward moral life of every individual?” This question might have been triggered by the fact that there is violence in the world initiated by persons in the name of religion. At the same time there are so many people relentlessly trying to advance human welfare in the name of religion. These realities raise question about the relevance of religion if not to promote good life here on earth and even the life to come. People assume that living a life in the way that God wants is to live moral life. That kind of life will lead to a happy life. It was the original purpose of ethics when it was introduced by the ancient philosophers. For some morality is not only to lead a happy life here on earth but also after death. That is ultimate happiness that we cannot gain here on earth which we can achieve when we live moral life, live according to God’s commandments. Thus, religion is somehow a way of life, a life that is based on God’s teaching, a life which is based on morality

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The study wants to find out the role or the effect of religion toward human life, particularly, the moral life of college students in Ilocos Sur. Many students come from different religious communities and most parents are belonged to religious communities. The question here is: does religion affect the morality of College students? The results of the study will be used to reassess the religious practices at home, and school. It can be also used by schools to revisit ethics instructions/strategy and religious practices in the schools.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, LITERATURE AND STUDIES

THEORIES ON RELIGION AND ITS ROLE IN HUMAN LIFE

The discussion on the effect of religion toward morality cannot proceed without understanding religion and its role in human life. To understand religion, we look into its etymology. Religion is from Latin word “religionem” (nom. “religio”) meaning: respect for what is sacred, reverence for the gods, obligation, the bond between man and the gods”. Therefore, from such etymological meaning, we define religion as a system of belief and practice that accepts a “binding relationship to such a being or beings”. St. Augustine used the word, “ligare” meaning “to bind, to connect”. (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Religion>)

From its etymological definition, religion is the belief in the existence of gods (the sacred) and its bond with men. Its function is to connect men to gods and men to men. Thus the business of religion is to worship gods, God (the sacred) and also to unite/bond people who believe in the same gods (the sacred). From such understanding we lead to an understanding that religion is actually a binding relationship between men and gods, God (the sacred). Thus, gods, (the sacred) become the centre of a religious community and its unifying factor. In this sense, religion and life are not in separate ways. In the *Eudemian Ethics* Aristotle argued that the goal of our lives is service and contemplation of the god. As we contemplate the god, we become like what we contemplate and so we become most like god by contemplating the god. In his *Metaphysics*, Aristotle explained that the best human activity is the most god-like namely thinking about the god and about things that do not change. Aristotle considered god as a magnetic, drawing us by his attractive power to live the best kind of life possible for us (Hare, 2006).

The purpose of religion is to give a new direction to human life style, keeping in mind the immediate future and contemporary point of view. Religion contains many eternal values as basis of direction out of which one remained principal (*Kumar, 2008*). Looking into such understanding, how can we deny the role of religion in human life? We do not believe that human welfare was not the motive behind the establishment of religious communities by their founders, although their scope might be limited. Religion is committed to general human welfare. It was needed not only in the beginning of human beings but today is also needed. It urges for unity and cooperation to build conducive environment for all human being to stay.

The idea of religion's involvement in human life is further emphasized by *Reza's* definition on religion. *Reza* (1998) defined religion as all around movement in the light of faith in Allah (God) and a sense of responsibility for the formation of thought and belief, for the promotion of high principles of human morality for the establishment of good relations among members of the society and the elimination of undue discrimination. This definition provides us a clear role of religion in human life particularly human morality.

According to Reza, we need religion to provide principles of morality like justice, peace, honesty, righteousness, brotherhood, equality, virtuousness, tolerance, sacrifice, help the poor and others. He argues that these are the virtues without which our lives will lose its order, normalcy and turn into chaos. It is possible to acquire these values without religion *but certainly in the absence of firm religious belief, those values appear to lose their meaning and become a mere piece of advice which can be accepted or rejected*. These qualities are based on internal feelings and faith and are naturally beyond ordinary law. We believe that it is God who cultivates the values within man and impels him to automatic righteousness and adherence to duty. Will Durant a philosopher, in his book, Pleasures of Philosophy, as cited by Reza says that without the backing of religion, morality is nothing more than arithmancy, as without it, the sense of obligation disappears.

Supporting the above concepts, different religions have similar teachings about the role of religion in human lives. In India, the word "Dharma" is used to mean "religion". Dharma comes from the root "Dhre" which means "to sustain". Thus, Dharma is the greatest sustaining force or the binding force of the society. The goal of Dharma is to create mental and spiritual fellowship among all men and to regulate its relation with all living beings. It thus tries to keep the world in perfect equilibrium (Barua, 2008). Hinduism, according to Gandhi, is the most tolerant and liberal religion. It contains ethical and spiritual outlook. Gandhi said that the chief value of Hinduism lies in holding the actual belief that all lives is one, that is all lives coming from one universal source and that is Allah (God).

Islam also has personal and social code of behaviour, not only code of behaviour related to their behaviour to God but also to human beings. In the Qur'an there are rules and regulations for virtues like righteousness, generosity, gratitude, contentment, humility, kindness, courtesy, purity, good speech, respect, wisdom, tolerance, justice, mercy, dignity, courage, firmness, frankness, hope, patience, perseverance, discipline, self-restraint, moderation, prudence, unity, frugality, sincerity, responsibility, loyalty, trustworthiness, honesty, repentance, and spatiality (Da'wah Group, 2010). One of the five pillars of Islam, such as Zakat encourages Muslims to look beyond themselves and help the needy through giving alms to the poor particularly during the month of Ramadan. (Zahid, 2010)

Christianity is not all about God and his relations to human being and how human beings are related to Him but it is all about love. God became human being (incarnation) to save humankind from their sins because of love. God loves human beings, thus He sent his only son to be a human being to save human beings. In return, human beings must love God and his fellow human beings too which is summarized into the greatest commandments: Love your God with all

your mind, heart and soul and love your neighbour as you love yourselves. Such commandments are the source of inspirations on how Christians carry their live every day. Thus Christian moral life is based on trying to live and treat others as Jesus did (Jakoblich, 2007)

THEORIES ON MORALITY AND RELIGION

Morality is playing important role in regulating human behaviour. It is about what is good and what is bad, right and wrong that affect others. However, this does not mean that there is a written rule or specific codes conduct established by society as it is defined by descriptive theory of morality but it is more on a universal code of conduct that all rational beings would put forward for governing the behaviour of all moral agents. These codes of conducts are not written by society but it is based on natural law as defined by normative theory of morality. Natural law would tell us that it is possible for any normal adult in any society to know the general kinds of actions that morality prohibits, requires, discourages, encourages and allows (*Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, 2010). In this case, all adult rational beings everywhere must know what is good and bad, what is right and wrong based on their reason and informed conscience and must conduct themselves according to the command of their conscience. Hauser (2006) said that it is possible that all normal moral and rational agents know the truth, know what is right and wrong, good and bad.

Randall Niles (2007) further explained that this knowledge comes from one's own self. There is no need for certain behaviour to be taught. A person makes decision based on his own knowledge. Lewis as cited by Niles (2007) presents three levels of the importance of morality: first, to ensure fair play and harmony between individuals. Second, to help make us good people in order to have a good society, and finally, to keep us in a good relationship with the power that created us. The last concept reminds us that our belief is critical to our moral behaviour. Faith is prerequisite to moral behaviour. Thus, the most significant predictor of a person's moral behaviour may be religious commitment.

However, some arguments point out that source of morality is not attached to religion. The idea of what is good and bad, right and wrong originally are not defined and taken directly from religion but it is from natural law. Such concept of good and bad, right and wrong grow together with human life as person grows older. On his *On Truth* (1624) Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury (1582-1648) claimed that all humans have an intuitive grasp of certain basic moral truths that show us to live.

Thus Herbert rejected the subordination of philosophy to theology, holding that religious claims in conflict with intuitively known moral principles must be false. The idea of Herbert was supported by the idea of Thomas Hobbes (1599-1679) and John Locke (1632-1704). All agreed that moral laws of nature were the basic directions for solving the problems posed by our unsociably social nature (www.Questia.com/Ethics_of_Psych) In this case; even people without religion are capable of understanding of what is good and bad and live a moral life because it is already in the human nature. People without religion do not mean they are immoral but they are moral being too. Montaigne (1533-1592) argued that we must determine for ourselves what good

life is. We each have a distinctive natural form that tells us what we need and what we cannot tolerate. For each person that must be the supreme guide (www.Questionia.com/Ethics_of_Psych).

The question why we need morality, Aristotle in his *Nicomachean Ethics* argued that the purpose of moral life is happiness. Our morality aims at our happiness. The ancient moral philosophers thought that their task was to determine what was required for human flourishing which is the highest good and to show what virtues were needed in order to attain it. But such argument has been challenged because it lacks of foundation. If our existence is accidental and life ends with death, what is the use of living moral life if only to attain happiness? We sacrifice to help other people, we control our self not to harm other people's life, and we are invited to live in love and peace with one another. Is it worthwhile to do all those things? What are our fundamental motives to be good?

However, Mavrodes (1986) as cited by Ramsey (2004) challenged all those who deny the relationship between religion and morality. He said that if there is no fundamental basis for morality, then morality is bound to fail. He continues to emphasize that any attempt to arrive at basis for morality that is independent from religion is bound to fail. Secular ethics have no fundamental motive to be good. It is too superficial. It lacks of metaphysics and a basis for values and obligations. Thus secular ethics cannot answer the question "why be moral all the time?" If we do not believe in life after death and salvation, then there is no basis for morality. Our belief in life after death and salvation serves as basis for our morality. Religion supports the feeling of obligation to that which makes sacrifices worthwhile. Religion supports the hope in something better or richer which is to come and makes being good and sacrificing worthwhile. Secular morality is inadequate method for providing reasons for people to be moral. Considering that there is no higher form of judgement and no after life as incentives, and then there is no much reason for citizens to be moral.

Kaminer (1997) argued that religion is essential to virtue. He claims that it is not surprising to find faith being touted as the solution to drug abuse, teenage pregnancy and other social ills. Such claims are not baseless. Criminologist Byron Johnson as cited by Wayne Jackson (2010) in his study, argued that there is a relationship between religion and moral values of individual persons. The report said that most delinquent crimes are committed by youngsters who have low levels of religious commitment. Children who attended church become delinquent with far less frequency than those who do not. Myers as cited by Jackson (2010) in his study also pointed out that most benevolent people of our society are the ones who are involved in religious activity.

Those findings convince us that a person who believes in God is a better person or moral person. Morality cannot be maintained without religion. Religion is a necessary factor that can shape the morality of individual persons. Gandhi as cited by Barua (2008) says that religion and morality are inseparably bound up with each other. To Gandhi, there is no religion higher than truth and righteousness. Morality is prized by almost all the great religions of the world. Baier (2001) also maintains the argument on the relationship between religion and morality. Morality is an expression of one's faith in God. In his book, "If you love me, keep my commandments" he argues faith in God is requirement for morality.

Even someone like Nietzsche who is credited with giving a major boost to the elimination of God from Western culture, never tired of pointing out that Christianity is a whole and one cannot give up faith in God and keep Christian morality. Nietzsche as quoted by Lewis (1995) said:

“ when one gives up the Christian faith, one pulls the right to Christian morality out from under one’s feet. The morality is by no means self-evident. Christianity is a system, a whole view of things thought out together. By breaking one main concept out of it, the faith in God, one breaks the whole. It stands or fall with faith in God”.

Such statement indicates that Nietzsche recognize the relationship between religion or faith and morality that both cannot be separated. Morality stands or falls with faith in God. Lewis (1995) further strengthened the argument that morality begins with the character of God.

Bertrand Russel (1957) acknowledged the influence of religion toward morality; however its influence is not only good but also bad aspect. However such bad influence is caused by the wrong teaching. He accused the clergymen as the cause of such problem. Thomas Dixon (2008) further pointed out that many today argue that religious beliefs are necessary to provide moral guidance and standards of virtuous conduct in an otherwise corrupt, materialistic, and degenerate world. In the same vein Christian Theologian Ron Rhodes (2010) has remarked that “it is impossible to distinguish evil from good unless one has infinite point which is absolutely good. In supporting such argument,

Kelley, et.al (2008) conducted a study on the interactive effects of religion and deterrence on patterns of drinking among college students. As indicators of different aspects of religion, they include religiosity, a belief in biblical literalness and a belief in drinking is sin. The study found that there is an interactive effect for religion with deterrence efforts drinking in campus.

Along the same interest, Desmond, Purpura, Elizabeth and Sarah (2010) studied on the effect of religion toward morality. They concluded that although religiosity is a strong predictor of moral beliefs, however, the study found out that the correlation is not perfect. In other words, individuals may frequently attend church, and report that religion is an important part of their lives, without adopting all of the moral standards that are promoted by religious groups.

Study on religion and tolerance for crime was conducted by Corcoran, Pettinicchio, Robbins, (2009). They found that individuals who are members of religious communities and those who attend church more often are more likely to be intolerant of crime and the magnitude of these effects are larger in non-modern countries. Thus they use tolerance of crime as a potential mechanism explaining variation in violent crime across a large sample of countries.

The effect of religion toward tolerance of same sex marriage was also examined by Powell-Williams, et.al, (2007). They examined both direct and indirect effects of religiosity and tolerance of same sex marriage. The study found that beliefs regarding morality and family are significant intervening factors influencing the effects of religion and tolerance of same sex marriages.

In line with such comparison, another comparative study on moral values between Theists and Atheists were made by Deem (2005). He surveyed 1,600 Canadian and asked them what their beliefs about God were and what moral values they considered to be very important. The result of the study showed that Theists got higher moral values than the Atheists in all indicators.

However, it does not also mean that Atheists have no moral values. Morality exists to a certain degree even without religion. This opinion is supported by the study of Hauser (2006). The study pointed out that when it comes to unfamiliar moral dilemmas, atheists and those with religious background show no difference in their moral judgments. It suggested that our intuitive judgment of right and wrong operate independently from our religious beliefs but religion strengthens and improve our moral life.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGION AND MORALITY

Realities may challenge those arguments supporting the relationship between religion and morality. Many people who claim to be religious and yet, in reality they are far from godliness as one can be. Marc Hauser and Peter Singer, (2005) argued that religion is separable from morality. They claim that there is no connection between religion and morality. There are millions of people who participate in no religion who live moral lives. This indicates that it is possible to live a moral life without participating in any religion. Thus religion is not absolutely necessary to live moral life. **Harris** (2006) argued that there is no evidence to support that there is a relationship between religion and morality. If religion were necessary for morality, there should be some evidences that atheists are less moral than believers. He concluded that there is no difference in moral thinking and moral behaviours of religious and non-religious people. Further he said that religious societies are not more moral than those that are more secular in their cast.

The argument of Hauser and Singer might have been influenced by the argument of positive atheism argument as represented by Cohen. Cohen (1868-1954) argued that there is no relationship between religion and morality. We quote his statement:

“Are we to believe that if we had never received revelations from God or even if there were no belief in God, a mother would have never learned to love her child, men and women would never have love each other, men would never have placed any value upon honesty, truthfulness or loyalty? After all we have seen an animal mother caring for its young, even to the extent of risking its life for it. We have seen animals defend each other from common enemy and join together in running down prey for a common meal.

The argument of Cohen is related to the previous argument of Leibniz as promoted by Christian Wolff (1679-1754). Christian Wolff argued that we are obligated to do what will make us and our condition, or that of others, more perfect and this is the law of nature that would be binding on us even if God did not exist. He further pointed out that even Confucius already knew by reason all that mattered about morality, even though he did not know anything about Christ.

Such argument is followed by Baron d'Holbach (1732-1789) argued that morality did not need religion especially Christianity.

Indeed religion is not always associated with morality. Philosopher, David Hume stated that “the greatest crimes have been found, in many instances, to be compatible with a superstitious piety and devotion; hence it is justly regarded as unsafe to draw any inference in favour of a man’s morals, from the fervour or strictness of his religious exercise, even though he believe them sincerely” (Hitchcock, 2007) Farrell Till (1994) further argued that we have not proven the existence of God. If we have not proven the existence of God, how we can talk about morality? Morality is possible without God, without religion. He argued that gentiles where St. Paul was sent, has discovered morality on their own even before they know God and before they know the Bible.

Michael Wang (1997) conducted a study on the relationship between religious beliefs and ethical behaviour. The study concluded that religious beliefs have no correlation with ethical behaviour. The ethical behaviour of people who say “religion is essential” to their life is often no distinguishable ratings from the behaviour of those who describe religion as unimportant factor in their life. Such finding seems to confirm the idea of Atheist, George H. Smith as cited by Till (1994) in his book, *“Atheism: The Case against God”* that religion is not connected to morality. Hauser (2005) argued that if religion were necessary for morality, there should be some evidence that Atheists are less moral than the believers. According to him, some more secularized society may be less violent.

Amid such controversy, in the Philippine contexts, we are challenged to find out really in real life, if there is a relationship or no relationship between religion and morality. Thus, we have to go down to the reality of life and ask people how religion affects their moral life or no affect at all. The summarized aforementioned ideas and studies served as initial ideas from which the researcher derived insights to conduct this study.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEMS

The study was aimed to determine the effect of religion toward moral values of college students in Ilocos Sur, Philippines. Specifically the study answers the following questions:

1. What is the level of religious awareness and practices of college students in Ilocos Sur?
2. What is the level of moral values of college students in Ilocos Sur?
3. Is there any significant relationship between religion and morality?
4. Is there any significant relationship between religious awareness and morality?
5. To what extent does religious awareness affect the morality?
6. To what extent does religion affect the moral values of college students in Ilocos Sur?

HYPOTHESES

Based on the statement of the problems, the study is guided by the following hypothesis:

1. There is no significant relationship between religion and morality.
2. There is no significant difference between religions and morality.
3. There is no significant relationship between religious awareness and morality
4. There is no effect of religious awareness toward morality.

SCOPE AND DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted to fourth year college students in Ilocos Sur particularly in Vigan City and Vigan- Bantay who are currently enrolling in education course. Two schools were located inside Vigan City and two schools were located at Bantay, a town that is close or attached to Vigan City. It will be limited to measure the effect of religious awareness toward their moral lives and to what extent religious awareness affect morality.

METHOD OF RESEARCH

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research utilized the descriptive method of research. This method is considered appropriate because it seek to determine the religious beliefs and practices of students and their moral values and how far religion affects the morality of students.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Two sets of questionnaires were used to gather the data, the questionnaires on religious belief and practices and the moral values of the students. The questionnaire is consisted of three parts: Part I: solicited the data of demographic profiles of students such as school, gender and religion where they belong. Part II was made of questions to identify the extent of religious awareness and practices of students. Part III was made of questions to identify the level of the moral values of college students in Ilocos Sur.

Scale	Descriptive Interpretations
1	Strongly Disagree
2.	Somewhat disagree
3	Disagree
4.	Agree
5.	Strongly agree

To answer questionnaires along moral values of the students, the following scale was used:

Scale	Descriptive Interpretations
1	Not very relevant
2	Somewhat relevant
3	Relevant

- 4 Very relevant
- 5 Extremely very relevant

To interpret the average score on each dimension on the religious belief and practices of college students, the following norms were used:

Range of Scores	Descriptive Interpretations
4.21-5.00	Strongly Disagree.
3.41-4.20	somewhat disagree
2.61-3.40	Disagree
1.81-2.60	Agree
1.00-1.80	Strongly Agree

To interpret the average score on each dimension on the moral values of students, the following norms were used:

Range of Scores	Descriptive Interpretations
4.21-5.00	Not very relevant
3.41-4.20	slightly relevant
2.61-3.40	Somewhat Relevant
1.81-2.60	Very relevant
1.00-1.80	Very relevant

POPULATION

The population of the study were composed of fourth year college students who are taking up college education in Vigan City and Vigan Bantay Ilocos Sur and only those who are taking up elementary and secondary education course. To determine the sample size, the Slovin's formula was used where:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

Where:

n=sample size

N=Population size

e=desired margin error (percent allowance for non-precision because of the use of the sample instead of the population).

Data Gathering Procedures

In the pursuit of the objective of the study, the researcher asked the permission of the Presidents of different colleges in Vigan City and Vigan Bantay. After given the permission, the researcher

then distributed questionnaires to different colleges/university and retrieved those questionnaires after the students filled them up.

STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF DATA

To enable the researcher present and summarize the data in accordance with the objectives set in this study, the following statistical treatment were used:

1. The weighted mean was used to determine the level of religious awareness and practices and moral values of the students.
2. The One-way of Analysis of F-test (ANOVA) was used to determine the differences on the effect of religion on morality between religions.
3. The Pearson's r was used to determine the correlation between religion and morality, religious awareness and morality.
4. Multiple regression analysis was used the effect and the magnitude of the effect of religion and religious awareness toward morality.

RESULTS/ FINDINGS

PROBLEM 1: WHAT IS THE LEVEL OF RELIGIOUS AWARENESS AND PRACTICES OF COLLEGE STUDENTS IN ILOCOS SUR?

This question was to measures the level of their religious awareness as indicated by their mean ratings. As indicated by their mean ratings, the findings show that all students are high along their level of religious awareness and practice. Thus, we can conclude that all students in Ilocos Sur are religious.

PROBLEM 2: WHAT IS THE LEVEL OF MORAL VALUES OF COLLEGE STUDENTS IN ILOCOS SUR?

This problem was to measure the level of moral awareness of the students. Based on their overall mean rating, it was found that all students from different religions and schools live a high moral values such love (concern for others and society), purity, kindness, and honesty.

PROBLEMS 3: IS THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGION AND MORALITY?

This was to find out whether there is a relationship between religion and morality or not. In other words, it is to find out whether religion does affect morality of the students from those schools taken in the study.

Result of Correlation Coefficient Showing the Relationship between Religion and Morality

Variable	College/University				
	A	B	C	D	As a Whole
Religion	0.2597* p<0.05	0.0206 p>0.05	0.0412 p>0.05	0.0291 p>0.05	0.1234* p<0.05

Legend: * significant @ 0.05 level of significance

It shows that there is a relationship between religion and morality as indicated by its correlation coefficient of 0.1234 which has a probability level lower or smaller than 0.05 (p<0.05) which attained 0.05 significant levels. It really confirms that there is a relationship between religion and morality, one does affect the other.

PROBLEM 4: IS THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOUS AWARENESS AND MORALITY?

This problem was to measure the relationship between religious awareness and morality. It is found that there is a relationship between religious awareness and morality of the students as indicated by its correlation coefficient of 0.2594 which have a probability level lower than 0.05 or p<0.05 at significant levels. It concludes that religious awareness affects the morality of the students

Result of Correlation Coefficient Showing the Relationship between Religious Awareness and Morality

Variable	College/University				
	A	B	C	D	As a Whole
Religious Awareness	0.2597* p<0.05	0.3421* P<0.05	0.0691 p>0.05	0.4151* P<0.05	0.2594* P<0.05

Legend: * significant @ 0.05 level of significance

PROBLEM 5: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES RELIGIOUS AWARENESS AFFECT THE MORALITY?

This question measures the effect of religious awareness on morality. As it is gleaned from the table and based on the computed Mult R of 0.2567, indicating a relationship between religious awareness and morality. It means that in general, the higher the level of religious awareness, the higher the level of morality prevalent to the students.

Result of Multiple Regression Analysis of Religious Awareness on Morality

Variable	beta	t-value	t-prob
Religious Awareness	0.0843	4.4846*	0.000

Mult R = 0.2567

R sq = 0.0659
F-ratio = 20.1112
F-prob = .000(p<0.05)

Looking at the variable, the table shows that religious awareness significantly influence the level of morality (f-ratio=20.1112, p<0.05). It means that the level of morality depends on the level of religious awareness of the students.

PROBLEM 6: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES RELIGION AFFECT THE MORAL VALUES OF COLLEGE STUDENTS IN ILOCOS SUR?

This question measures the effect of religion toward morality. Based on the result of the data, the computed Mult R of 0.1234 suggests a relationship between religion and morality.

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis of Religion on Morality

Value	beta	t-value	t-prob
Religion	3.578334	34.46316	0.000

Mult R = 0.1234
R sq = 0.0152
F-ratio = 4.4236
F-prob = 0.036319(p<0.05)

Looking at the figures shown in the table, the variable considered in the study yielded a significant influence on the level of morality of the respondents as backed up by F-ratio of 4.42, p<0.05. This means that the level of morality is influenced by the religion.

DISCUSSION

The main objective of the study is to find out the effect of religion toward morality. After tracing the related literatures and studies taken in this study, it is found that they have no common agreement as to whether religion affects morality or not. On one hand, several authors claimed that religion affect the morality, and on the other hand, others claim that religion and morality have no connection, even they claim that morality comes ahead of religion.

Through the use of research methodology and statistical tools employed in this study, the study determines the relationship between religion and morality. It concludes that religion, religious awareness and morality are connected and both religion and religious awareness affect the level of the morality of the students. It further concludes that the more religious students are, the higher their morality is. It then understands that all religions help the formation of morality of students. In other words, religion enhances moral awareness of the students and religion is important for moral development in the Philippines context.

Thus, the question that is raised in the background of the study has been answered that religion is necessary to the formation of moral behaviour of an individual. Besides, the finding of the study really confirms the role of religion in human life as a unifying factor between God and men and between men. The relationship between the two is necessary.

Therefore, the hypotheses in the study that there is no significant relationship between religion and morality, no significant relationship between religious awareness and morality and there is no effect of religious awareness toward morality are denied. There is really a relationship between religion, religious awareness and morality.

However, the hypothesis of “no significant difference between religion and morality” is accepted. No matter what religion we belong to, we all have the same moral values and it does not make one religion is better than the other. In other words, all religions and their practices promote moral values.

However, religion alone without religious awareness will not increase the level of morality. Even though morality can exist without religion; however, religion and religious awareness improve the level of moral awareness of students. Further, religion provides a deeper reason why someone has to be moral all the time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are emanated from the study. These recommendations are addressed to the parents, school and students themselves.

1. *RECOMMENDATION TO THE PARENTS.* Parents should promote religious awareness to their children at home by regularly praying together, attending worship, listening to spiritual reflections and reading the bible and other religious activities.

2. *RECOMMENDATION TO SCHOOL.* It is not enough to teach religion subject but to live it is important. Thus, the school should promote religious awareness by introducing religious activities in the school campus such as prayer, worship, bible reading and meditations and other religious activities that increase religious awareness of the students. Schools also need to have religion subjects, whatever religion in which students belong to. Religion subject is not only for private schools but also for public schools or government owned schools

3. *RECOMMENDATION TO THE STUDENTS.* Religious awareness is not something that only comes from outside but it should come from within. To improve their religious awareness, they should practice and strengthen their faith by prayer, worshiping, attending worship regularly and reading the bible as a source spiritual inspiration for daily living.

4. *ETHICAL ENVIRONMENT* in which students/children are growing should be given attention by the parents and the school. Home where students spend most of their time should be the first place where students learn how to behave ethically, learn how to love other people, to be kind,

and to be honest. School should establish ethical environment by initiating ethical activities to promote and increase moral awareness of the students.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher would like to express sincere thanks to all President of four schools namely Fr. Cyrilo Ortega, SVD, Dr. Gilbert Arce, Dr. Carmencita Paz, and Sr. Tessie Bayona, SPC for allowing the researcher to conduct his study in their school.

Special thanks to research director of Divine Word College of Vigan who helped the researcher to distribute the questionnaires to all schools and the statistician, Riza Cajindos, who patiently worked on the statistical computation.

REFERENCES

- 1) Baier, C.J. & Wright, B.R. 2001. If You Love me, Keep my Commandments: A Metaanalysis of the Effect of Religion on Crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. www.religionandmorality.com
- 2) Barua, Manisha. *Gandhi and Comparative Religion*. <http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Comp/CompBaru.htm>
- 3) Chapman, Steve. 1999. Praise the Lord, *Chicago Tribune*. <http://www.positiveatheism.org/writ/passammo.htm>
- 4) Chapman, Cohen. 1995. *Morality Without God*. *Positive Atheism Magazine (PAM)*. <http://www.positiveatheism.org/hist/cohen02.htm>
- 5) Corcoran, Katie, Petticchio, David, and Robbins, Blaine. 2009. *Tolerance for Crime and Religion: Explaining variation across National*. http://www.allacademic.com/meta/33416_index.html
- 6) Da'wah Group. 2010. *Islamic Virtue*. http://www.meccacentric.com/islamic_virtues.html
- 7) David Hume, "The Natural History of Religion". In Hitchen's Christopher (2007). *The Portable Atheist: Essential Readings for the Non Believers*. Philadelphia: Da Capo Press.
- 8) Deem, Rich. 2005. *Are Atheists and Theists Morally Equivalent?*. http://www.godandscience.org/apologetics/atheists_theists_morality.html
- 9) Desmond Scott, Purpura, David, Smith, Elizabeth, and Soper, Sarah. 2010. *Religiosity, Moral Beliefs, and Delinquency*. http://www.allacademic.com/meta/33416_index.html

- 10) Dixon, Thomas. 2008. *Science and Religion: A very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 11) Hamer, Katarzyna. 2010. *Social Identities and Religion*.
http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p40093_index.html
- 12) Hauser, Marc. 2006. *Moral Mind: How Nature Designed our Universal Sense of Right and Wrong*. Harper Collins: New York.
- 13) Hare, J. 2006. *God and Morality, a Philosophical History*. Oxford: Blackwell
- 14) Hauser, Marc and Peter Singer. 2005. *Morality Without Religion*.
<http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/mnkylab/publications/recent/HauserSingerMoralRelig05.pdf>
- 15) Hauser, Marc. 2005. *Trends in Cognitive Science*.
<http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/mnkylab/publications/recent/HauserSingerMoralRelig05.pdf>
- 16) Jakoblich, Jon. 2007. *Christian Morality*. <http://www.chritianmorality.com>
- 17) Jackson, Wayne. 2010. *The Connection between Religion and Morality*.
<http://www.christiancourier.com/articles/411-the-connection-between-religion-and-morality>
- 18) Kaminer, Wendy. 1997. *Pro & Con: Atheists can Be Moral Too*.
<http://speakout.com/activism/opinions/4991-1.html>
- 19) Kelly, Margaret, Fukushima, Miyuki and Jenson, Tiffany. 2008. *Religion and the Deterrent effect of An Alcohol Ban on Drinking among College Students*.
http://www.allacademic.com/eta/p241601_index.html
- 20) Knoll, Benjamin. 2008. *And Who is My Neighbor? Religion and Attitude Toward Immigration Policy*. http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p268926_index.html
- 21) Kumar, Ravindra. 2008. *Role of Religion in Human Life*.
<http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/view/48503>
- 22) Lewis, S.C. 1995. *Can We have Morality without God?*
<http://www.christianity.co.nz/moralit2.htm>
- 23) Mavrodes, George. 1986. *Religion and the Queerness of Morality: Rationality, Religious Beliefs and Moral Commitment: Essays in the Philosophy of Religion*. Ithaca: Cornell University.
- 24) *Moral Philosophy and Ethics*. www.Questionia.com/Ethics_of_Psych

- 25) Powell-William, Melissa, Sherkat, Darren and Madox, Gregory. 2007. Examining the Direct and Indirect Effects of Religiosity on Tolerance of same sex Marriage. http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p184706_index.html
- 26) Ramsay, Meghan. 2004. Secular Morality. http://www2.sunnysuffolk.edu/pecorip/SCCCWEB/ETEXTS/PHIL_of_RELIGION_TEXT/CHAPTER_9_MORALITY_VALUES/Secular_Morality_Inferior.htm
- 27) Reza, Imam. 2010. Religion and Its Role in Human Life. <http://www.imamreza.net/imamreza.php?id=3346>
- 28) Rhodes, Ron. Strategies for Distinguishing with Atheists”. Reasoning from Scriptures Ministries. <http://home.earthlink.net/ronrhodes/Atheism.html>. Retrieved, February 8, 2012.
- 29) Russell, Bertrand. 1957. Why I am not A Christian. New York: Goerge Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- 30) Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. 2010. <http://www.standforencyclopaedia.com>
- 31) Till, Farrel. 1994. No Morality Without the Bible? <http://www.theskepticalreview.com/tsrmag/1front94.htm>
- 32) Wang, Michael. 1997. More Research Concerning Atheist Morality. <http://www.infidels.org/library/modern/mathew/sn-morality.html>
- 33) Religion. (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Religion>)
- 34) Zahid, Ishaq. 2010. Five Pillars of Islam. <http://islam101.com/dawah/pillars.html>