

**LIBRARY**  
**Michigan State**  
**University**

**PLACE IN RETURN BOX** to remove this checkout from your record.  
**TO AVOID FINES** return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
JUL 18 2006	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

**DIVERSITY IN THE HOMOGENEOUS HOUSE: A STUDY OF  
RELIGIOSITY WITHIN A MIDWESTERN UNITED  
CHURCH OF CHRIST CONGREGATION**

By

John Eric Lund

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1996

Professor David Wiley

## **ABSTRACT**

### **DIVERSITY IN THE HOMOGENEOUS HOUSE: A STUDY OF RELIGIOSITY WITHIN A MIDWESTERN UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST CONGREGATION**

**By**

**John Eric Lund**

This thesis is based on a study of religious preferences of a midwestern United Church of Christ congregation which is relatively homogeneous on most demographic variables. We start with Weber's analysis of the relationship between lower social class and "other worldly" orientation. A series of religious dimensions are developed such that they are both autonomous and comprehensive.

Our results are based on a 56 percent response rate of survey questionnaires administered to all adult members. Based on ratings of importance and open-ended responses, we found four autonomous modes of religiosity; traditional, which emphasizes belief, devotion, and ritual; fellowship and personal support; intellectual quest; and social action.

Given this diversity, we did not discover salient explanations from the predictor variables. The only significant relationship is between the traditional grouping and a sense of social marginality which is evident in combinations of being female, single, and childless. We recommend further research.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I want to thank the good people of Mychurch who had the desire and flexibility to bring us into their study; my advisor, Dr. David Wiley, who had the insight and knowledge to make this all possible; and my wife, Karin, who provided patience and encouragement through four years of work on this project.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	viii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
1. Theory	
A. Relationship Between Religiosity and Society .	5
B. Dimensions of Religiosity	
1. Literature Review . . . . .	12
2. Development of Dimensions of Religiosity	24
C. Relevant Findings on Religious Variety . . .	26
2. Methodology	
A. Research Design . . . . .	30
B. Measurement	
1. Dimensional Measures . . . . .	34
2. Measures of Religious Belief. . . . .	42
3. Measures of Religious Participation . .	43
4. Measures of Demographic Characteristics	45
5. Other Measures of Religious Attitudes .	46
C. Data Collection	
1. Pretest . . . . .	46
2. Sampling . . . . .	47
3. Administration of The Survey . . . .	48
D. Data Processing	
1. Coding The Dimensional Variables . . .	49
2. Data Entry and Cleaning . . . . .	51
E. Construction of The Indexes and Scales	
1. Development of Scales . . . . .	52
2. Construct Validity and Internal Reliability	52
3. Weighting The Scale Items. . . . .	56
4. Factor Analysis of The Scale Items . .	57

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

3. Results	
A. Demographic Portrait of The Population . . .	59
B. Analysis of The Dimensions of Religiosity	
1. Section A Frequencies . . . . .	62
2. Difference Between Dimensional Means .	64
3. Open-ended Responses . . . . .	65
4. Inter-Dimensional Analysis . . . . .	69
C. Analysis of Beliefs . . . . .	72
D. Analysis of The Effects of Socio-Economic Status On Religiosity . . . . .	77
E. Analysis of The Impact of Lifecycle Variables on Religiosity . . . . .	79
F. Analysis of Effects of Length of Attendance at Mychurch . . . . .	83
G. Analysis of Participation . . . . .	85
H. Summary of Results . . . . .	87
4. Conclusion . . . . .	89
APPENDIX A . . . . .	94
APPENDIX B . . . . .	100
APPENDIX C . . . . .	101
APPENDIX D . . . . .	102
APPENDIX E . . . . .	105
APPENDIX F . . . . .	107
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	109

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Item to Total Correlations of Constituent Items of The 10 Scales . . . . .	5 4
2. Item to Item Correlations Among Five Constituent Variables in The Personal Support Dimension . . . . .	5 5
3. Percentages of Responses to the Section A Questions Represented by Their Corresponding Dimensions . . . . .	6 2
4. Standardized Mean Scores of Scales of Religiosity. . . . .	6 4
5. Frequency of Open-ended Responses as They Pertain to The Religious Dimensions . . . . .	6 7
6. Correlations Between Each Dimension. . . . .	6 9
7. Frequencies of Religious Belief Orientations . . . . .	7 3
8. Frequencies of Religious Beliefs . . . . .	7 4
9. Correlations of Beliefs With Religious Dimensions . . . . .	7 5
10. Correlations Between SES Variables and The Dimensions of Religiosity . . . . .	7 7
11. Correlations Between Lifecycle Variables and The Dimensions of Religiosity . . . . .	8 0
12. Cohort to Dimensions and Participation to Dimension Correlations . . . . .	8 4
13. Demographic Characteristics. . . . .	10 0
14. Marginal Frequencies of Participation Variables . . . . .	10 1

## **LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)**

15. Item to Item Correlations in Each Religiosity Scale . .	102
16. Results of Religiosity Scale Factor Analysis . . . . .	105
17. Frequencies of Section C (Program Preferences) . . .	107
18. Frequencies of Section F (Clergy Roles) . . . . .	108

## INTRODUCTION

The study of religion is not new to the social sciences. However, the accumulated knowledge in this field is not considered extensive, and, in fact, many social science theorists and researchers avoid the topic of religion. Religion frequently is dismissed as insignificant and an institution that has lost much of its influence and power. It is also difficult to effectively study and is often avoided. Whatever the case, there is much uncharted territory in this field of research. In addition, there is strong support by Weber, Glock, Berger, Marty, and others that religion still may be strongly connected to the actions, values, beliefs, political decisions, and life decisions of many people. It is with that possibility that this project is relevant to the field of sociology.

This study and analysis is based on a survey of the adult population of a United Church of Christ (UCC) congregation in a Midwestern university town. For the sake of anonymity we will refer to this church as Mychurch. The UCC is a predominately middle to upper class and liberal Protestant denomination. In fact, it is known as the most liberal on all measures and also serves people in the higher socioeconomic (SES) categories, relative to most other Protestant denominations.

Mychurch, in particular, fits this image quite well. The congregation has a mean family income of over \$60,000 with many members in professional fields. They are a highly educated population with two-thirds of the adults having at least a masters degree. In addition, they have a rich history, dating back to the 1960's, of social action in both peace and justice activism and community service. They also have developed an atmosphere of openness and diversity along with a drive for intellectual scrutiny. This, in part, is undoubtedly connected to the university climate, although this has also been mainstream to the UCC denomination as well.

The purpose of the study was twofold. First, a committee of the church opted to survey their congregation to help formulate a plan for future direction and long range planning. They wanted to learn how members define their religious needs, what type of programs are most important to them, and what types of clergy would be most effective in the congregation.

Second, our theoretical inquiry is to examine the nature of diversity of religiosity in a congregation which is relatively homogenous, liberal, and upper-middle class. We are interested in the extent to which groups or individuals within the congregation differ in their religious orientations. That is, do they differ in their expressed needs, desires, and interests as to what the church leadership can and should provide? In addition, if differences do exist, what are some of the sources of religious variation in the congregation? Do relative variations in SES impact religious needs?

Or are we better informed by looking at demographic, participation, belief, or contextual variables? Perhaps there are other analyses to better uncover and develop an understanding of Mychurch religiosity.

To investigate these questions, we start with Weberian theory on the relation between socio-economic status and religiosity. We also review other theories based on Weber, which shed light on the nature of religious variation. To look at people's religious orientations, a set of religious dimensions are developed based on the relevant literature as well as some contextual factors within the church. We then analyze the dimensions to verify that they are indeed salient, or, in other words, that they are an accurate description of ways that people are religious. Next, we investigate the relation between the dimensions and different independent variables to determine possible causes of religious variance within the congregation.

Studies of people's religiosity have been frequently conducted in the research of religion. However, most of the literature is based on significant differences between Protestants and Catholics, different Protestant denominations, regional areas, and groups which have clear demographic or class differences. These are all studies in which the explanatory variables are obvious and intentional, (such as, do Southern Baptist differ from Northern Baptist in their religious orientations?) In addition, researchers have done congregational case studies, studies of the organization of congregations and

denominations, and studies of the inter-dynamics of congregational life. This study is significantly different from all of these.

First, our population consists of a single UCC congregation. The members are predominately liberal, well educated, upper middle class, and Caucasian. This gives us quite a homogenous population sample. While there is some variation on these variables, it is much less than in the general population, or even in the wider UCC denomination. With this homogenous population, we can analyze the extent of religious variety within a population in which there are no clear or obvious explanatory variables. We can then explore several possible avenues as to why there is a variety of religious needs.

In addition, we are not really concerned with how the church is organized, what the people do in the congregation, nor how they relate to each other or to the pastor(s). We are also not concerned with how faithful or committed members are, how much they believe, or what they believe. These are all irrelevant to our study of religious orientations. Instead, we are interested in the individual cognitions of members; that is, what individuals desire in religious practice and behavior for their own needs. We want to know how individual members prioritize ways that they can be religious.

Once these priorities are established, we study differences between members and check for groupings of similar orientations within the population. Possible explanatory variables from our theoretical framework are then tested as indicators of religious variance in our sample.



## **1. Theory**

Our theoretical approach is three-fold. First, are the relevant theories which explain why there is religious diversity. Next, are the theories and studies which examine how people express their religious needs differently. From these we develop our own set of religious dimensions. Lastly, similar studies are reviewed in which researchers have attempted to measure and explain variance in religious orientation.

### **1A. Relationship between Religiosity and Society**

We begin with an overview of Weber's analysis of social class and religion. (Weber, 1963; Wiley, Dissertation: Chapters 2,3) His basic premise is that within every society there is a set of "material interests" that are valued in that society. These include the physical needs for survival and production. In addition, there are particular societal goods which have social value and are thus in demand. The most important interests are usually economic power, political power, and social honor and prestige. However, within every society there are limited resources to obtain these "material interests." Therefore, those with access to the resources have the most power, honor, and prestige within that society. Over time, the society

develops class differentiation based on the access to the "material interests."

In addition to the material interests, societies develop "ideal interests." These develop out of the need for social order, stability, and understanding. The primary "ideal interests" are usually legitimacy and meaning. While it is valued to have access to the "material interests," it is also important to legitimate that access. Thus, societies develop rules and norms which govern the means to increase one's status. This legitimacy for the privileged provides a rationale and an understanding of class differentiation. However, it is usually the upper strata who define legitimate power and also who hold the political power and make the laws. Hence, the laws and rationales are made to serve the elites and support the status quo.

In addition to legitimacy and laws, people of all strata need an explanatory system which justifies status differentiation and the status quo. The elites, on one hand, need to feel just in their wealth and power. The lower strata, in contrast, need an explanation and a means to accept their relatively lower class in society. It is from these needs of individuals and societies that religious ideologies and theologies become important. It is the religious doctrine in societies that provide the explanation and meaning to social stratification.

Weber acknowledges that development of doctrine is quite complicated and takes place over long periods of time. However, he noticed that members of religious collectives are often of the same social strata. In addition, over time, different religious collectives will align their doctrine to match the needs, interests, and particular

experiences of their members. However, the experiences and interests of people in any particular stratum are related to their position in society and the material and ideal interests of that group. Therefore, religious needs and doctrine vary between religious collectives, depending on the members' social stratum. This can be applied to the beliefs, behaviors, and organization of most religious collectives. Thus, according to Weber, the upper class churches will provide different religious beliefs and practices than the lower class churches based on the different needs and interests of those groups.

Weber goes on to make numerous generalizations about the relation of social class with religious belief, behavior and organization. We begin with his analysis of the higher strata, or elites. Among the higher classes, people tend to be "this worldly" in contrast to "other worldly" in orientation. They place less emphasis on salvation religion, and salvation is seen to come through legitimate religious organization. They have less affinity for prophetic, ethical, or judgmental religion. They place more religious merit on success in this world and have a need for legitimation of their success. They also have an affinity for ritual conducted by religious professionals. Their religious organizations lean toward bureaucracy and professionalism. The intellectual groups have a greater need for meaning and conceptual understanding, and have a strong desire for individualism.

The lower strata, in contrast, have a need to explain and accept their relative deprivation. They need a sense of self-worth and seek it through "other worldly" means. They place a greater emphasis on

contact with the deity and on salvation through a savior, which will give them greater rewards and justice in the next life. They have a stronger affinity for emotional religious experiences, magical and irrational explanations, and ethical prophets.

The above is a brief outline of Weber's premise. He goes on to analyze the religious organizations of his time. We will not discuss these as they do not pertain to this study. However, from the outline above, it is clear that Weber suggests a strong connection between SES and religious beliefs, actions, and organization.

Given this basic theory, we need to consider the characteristics relevant to the context of this study. As mentioned, the population is relatively homogenous with an elite status. Many members are in the higher stratum in education, occupational prestige, and income. While not all of the respondents are in that stratum, the group as a whole should reflect the religious attitudes, needs, and behaviors of the higher strata, following Weber's theory. While there may be some variety of religiosity, great diversity is not expected due to the low SES differentiation within our population.

To continue, we also want to extend the basic Weberian premise. Weber's theory is based on the differentiation of access to "interests" which are valued in the society. This is extended to SES differentiation, although it could easily be extended to other types. As mentioned, SES is not expected to cause much variance. However, other variables, such as singleness, retirement, old age, and the absence of children can be seen as indicators of isolation and marginality. These may be situations of relative deprivation, much

like the lower SES for Weber, and thus be indicators of religious diversity. In addition, women in our society are still given less respect, honor, and power than men. This too may be a cause of differentiation. Also, these variables may combine with SES or each other to suggest distinct groups within the population who have different needs. This theory is exploratory in nature, and may be an avenue for future work.

Another factor worth examination is historical and contextual in nature. The Mychurch community has a rich history of social action and service in the community. During the 1960's and 1970's, the community was known for its liberal stance on political issues, its work for justice and peace, and its leadership in the community on service projects such as eliminating racially-restrictive housing covenants, building low-income housing, and advocating media responsibility in the greater metropolitan area. During this time they had strong leadership in these areas and the church was well known in the community as a socially and politically active congregation. Many thought that this identity attracted people to attend Mychurch and join in their cause.

Much of the social action at Mychurch took place during a period when the whole country was experiencing social action. In a sense, Mychurch was involved in a societal movement of social change. Now, 20 to 30 years later, U.S. society has experienced a decade of political and religious conservatism. The societal pendulum has swung away from the liberal, social action orientation of the past. Since that time, Mychurch has changed as well. Through

different leadership, the emphasis has changed away from the social action orientation. The pastor in 1993 had an agenda which leaned more toward traditional neo-orthodox theology and interpersonal relationships and support in the contemporary mainstream Protestant mode. One possibility is that people who have joined the church since the new leadership are looking for a more conservative direction than those who joined the church during the times of greater social action. Therefore, religious diversity is expected based on respondent's length of attendance.

A final theory we examine is Martin Marty's "Two Party System" (Marty, 1970). Marty argues that the Protestant churches are divided into "Public Protestants" and "Private Protestants." He sees these as two inherently contrasting world views. The Public Protestants have a scientific, humanist, and somewhat secular religious perspective. They are more socially, or "this worldly", oriented in terms of social action and fellowship. Their focus is often directed toward social reform and liberation rather than moral behavior.

The Private Protestants, on the other hand, are individualistic and have an "evangelical" religious view. They adhere more to Biblical doctrine and place strong emphasis on personal salvation. They are more "other worldly" oriented, placing importance on belief, evangelism, individual morality, devotion, and experiences with the Holy Spirit. They also see justice being served in another world to come.

These two religious types closely resemble the upper and lower strata types which Weber described. There are, however, some inherent differences between them. The Public Protestants are much more interested in social reform and liberation than the upper strata, who have more interest in maintaining the status quo. In addition, the Private Protestants are not necessarily using the "other worldly" approach to "escape" from this world because of their own deprivation. The key for Marty has been to follow the development of these two parties. He argues that they have been present in U.S. society since the Civil War. They have developed as two opposing world views in the political, academic, and religious arenas throughout the course of the 20th century. However, these were not divisions of social strata per se; they were more historical and contextual in nature.

Social class, power, and status quo issues were undoubtedly involved in these struggles. In fact, the Private Protestant world view has been supportive of the status quo. This is why we find many adherents from the middle classes. It becomes clear that reasons for groups or individuals to fall in one camp or another are complex and contextual and are beyond the scope of this study. However, we will examine Marty's theory as an explanation of variance, and thus as a possible future avenue of study.

In addition to the above theories, we also seek to examine the relationship between the amount of time people participate and what their religious preferences are. Our study here is without expectations and is thus exploratory.

## **1B. Dimensions of Religiosity**

### **1. Literature Review**

Before possibilities of differentiation can be examined, reasonable measures of religiosity must be developed. To study the varieties of religiosity, we need to measure all of the possible ways in which people can be religious. The literature offers strong research in this task.

Over the years many sociologists have tried to measure the extent to which people are religious. The initial premise typically has been that religiosity varies, and different types or categories of people might have distinct religious commitments and needs. This has usually been in connection with some religious institution or organization, and often the goal has been to measure the level of commitment individuals may have to their particular religion. The focus of this study is different in that we did not try to measure commitment, but instead looked at preferences or priorities in how people are religious. Although these concepts are quite similar, it is not our question whether one group or person is more religious than another. That is a very complex question and is beyond the scope of this project. Our question is whether there is diversity of religious orientation. The study of commitment is relevant here because in the pursuit of measuring it, researchers realized there are distinctly



different ways that people are religious. Hence, religiosity is approached as multi-dimensional.

In early studies of religion, many researchers tried to measure commitment by focusing on simple variables of participation and belief. However, many also realized that being religious has different meaning to people in different religions, denominations, regions, classes, and so on. In fact, being religious may have different meanings among people within the same congregation or even the same family. One person may read the Bible and pray on a daily basis, while another only attends church weekly. It becomes very difficult, if not impossible, to determine if one or the other is more religious or more committed to their religion. The goal of researchers in this area has been to develop a comprehensive and multiple strategy to measure religiosity.

The most direct and focused work in this area was derived from the writings of Weber and began in the early 1960's with the work of Charles Glock, Yoshio Fukuyama, Gerhard Lenski, and others. In the course of their work, researchers developed what they thought was a comprehensive list of religious dimensions. That is, a list of all the possible ways in which people are religious, yet which were relatively independent of each other. This was seen as a necessary first step to measure commitment. It is the work of Weber, then Glock, and later Rodney Stark (1965, 1967, 1968) that has been observed as the primary starting point to the development of religious dimensions. While the dimension names are different,

Glock's work is quite similar to that of Fukuyama, Lenski, reflecting the influence of the earlier researchers.

Glock and Stark initially proposed five dimensions such that,

within one or another...all of the many and diverse manifestations of religiosity prescribed by the different religions of the world can be ordered. (1965, p. 20).

In the discussion, they emphasize that different social groups and religions value dimensions differently and place importance accordingly. They also indicate that there are many varieties, levels, and degrees within each dimension. The dimensions identified by Glock and Stark are: experiential, ritualistic, ideological, intellectual, and consequential. (1965, Ch. 1)

The **experiential** dimension is that part of religion in which the individual achieves a direct knowledge of an ultimate reality, has some type of experience or contact with a supernatural agency, or experiences religious emotion. The subjective and emotional experience and emphasized; in particular, the feelings and sensations involved in some type of communication with the supernatural.

The **ideological** component suggests that being religious may involve adherence to particular theological outlooks or one or more religious beliefs. Indeed, all religions have a belief system or tenets of faith which members are expected to accept to some degree. However, the salience varies.

The **ritualistic** dimension includes religious practices in which participation is expected from the members of the group. This may

include worship, devotion, prayer, and other acts in which people express their religious commitment.

The **intellectual** dimension has to do with knowing what the basic beliefs and tenets of the religion are. The religious person may be expected to understand the stories, faith, and sacraments which are core to the group. This is distinct from the ideological dimension which looks at belief of the tenets rather than knowledge of the them.

The **consequential** dimension is sometimes set apart from the other four and may be dependent on them. In a sense, it may be the combined effect that the experience, belief, practice, and knowledge dimensions have on the individual. It is the actions and attitudes of the individual in daily life which are a response to his or her religious convictions. Included here are the ethics, moralities, and religious tenets which describe what people "ought" to do and how they "should" relate to others in the world.

Glock and Stark (1965) went beyond these dimensions to make distinctions and levels of degree within each one. The belief or ideological dimension distinguishes between what the person believes, how important that belief is, and what is the function of the belief. They also distinguish between types of beliefs: those which warrant the existence of the divine and define its character, those which explain divine purpose and the actors role, and those which give direct conduct for the realization of the divine purpose. It becomes clear that belief itself is multidimensional, and one needs to be clear and direct in trying to measure it.

The ritualistic dimension distinguishes between what people do and the meaning of what people do. In addition, there are different kinds of practices such as worship attendance, organizational involvement, and prayer.

The experiential, or feeling, dimension is also broken into subparts. Glock and Stark suggest concern, cognition, fear, and trust or faith, as four different components of experiencing religious feeling or emotion.

In the knowledge dimension a variety of types of knowledge are emphasized. This may vary from a historical understanding, a literal interpretation of scripture, or perhaps secular knowledge and critical review. Also, there may be variance in how knowledge is transferred and how salient it is for all members.

The consequential, or effects, dimension is complicated as well. Some religions may state very clearly what is appropriate behavior in all aspects of life. Others may be more vague by emphasizing "responsibility" or "stewardship" by members. In addition, Glock and Stark distinguish between what the individual can expect from the religion and what she or he is expected to do for the religion. They also emphasize that a specific act has only a religious effect if it is in response to one of the other aspects of religion. Thus, it can be seen as a derivative of at least one of the other dimensions.

At this point it may be clear that while religion is multidimensional, even the dimensions can be ambiguous and complex. While this is a great concern for those trying to measure commitment, it is not a concern for our purposes. The intention of

this study is look at what aspects or dimensions of religion are important to people. For our dimensional analysis we are not concerned with what people believe or how biblically literate they are. We are interested in knowing how important that belief or knowledge is to the individual, whatever it happens to be. We address some issues of Christian belief in the questionnaire, but not as part of the analysis of dimensions of religiosity.

Given the above dimensions and perspective, it is important to progress beyond the Glock and Stark theory and to outline the subsequent development of dimensions of religiosity. One early work based on the Glock and Stark model was completed by Faulkner and DeJong (1966) using a study of college students. They took the five dimensions and created Guttman-type scales for each. They selected four or five items per scale to represent each dimension. (This is problematic in the development of religious scales as there have been as many different selections of items as there have been scales created. There seems to be a lack of continuity over time and across various research projects.) The questions were developed in an effort to measure participation, knowledge, belief, etc. for each scale. Their primary goal was to then look at the interrelationships between the scales.

In comparing correlations between the scales, they found positive relations of varying strength between the scales. The highest correlations were with the ideological scale, with the highest between the ideological and the intellectual. The lowest relationships were with the consequential scale, with the lowest between the

consequential and experiential. The principal significance of this study was its support of the multi-dimensional approach as a reasonable measure of religiosity.

Another study of religious dimensions was conducted about the same time by Morton King (1967). King originally proposed 11 possible dimensions and then created 121 items based on them. The dimensions he chose were based on Glock, Lenski, and others plus some of his own. He then did factor and cluster analysis in an attempt to verify the dimensions. In conclusion, King first rejected the idea that religion is uni-dimensional. From the two factor and one cluster analyses he developed nine dimensions as hypotheses for further research. They are as follows:

1. Creedal Assent and Personal Commitment (belief)
2. Participation in Congregational Activities
3. Personal Religious Experience
4. Personal Ties in the Congregation
5. Intellectual Search
6. Openness to Religious Growth
7. Dogmatism/ Extrinsic Orientation
8. Financial Behavior/Attitude Toward Giving
9. Talking and Reading about Religion

Many of these seem quite similar to Glock and Stark's dimensions. However, researchers seem to have given different names to categories representing the same concept. Thus, it is difficult to say they are actually measuring the same dimensions. We can only say that they are similar. King has dimensions which overlap Glock's ideological, ritualistic, experiential, and intellectual components; however, the intellectual could be found in all of King's fifth, sixth, and ninth dimensions. King did introduce the personal ties, dogmatism-extrinsic orientation, and financial dimensions that were not included in the Glock model. He also did not include the consequential dimension of Glock's, partly because it is somewhat vague and difficult to measure.

In American Piety (1968) Glock and Stark continued their development of dimensions, adding three types of beliefs (orthodoxy, particularism, and ethicalism) as well as two ritual components (devotionalism and ritual) from the original list. In addition, they

included communal and friendship dimensions. They saw the latter two as set apart from the individual criteria of religious commitment; however, they suggest these can be central in the function of the church. They did a survey in northern California and developed indexes for each of the dimensions.

In their analysis, Glock and Stark looked at the interrelations between the dimensions. They found positive associations between most, but none so high as to doubt the independence of any of them. They also found "orthodoxy" to be the best indicator of religious commitment, as it had the highest correlations amongst the dimensions. (1968)

King came back to the multi-dimension question again in 1972 in a project with Richard Hunt. This was based on a survey of a variety of Protestants in the Dallas area. They again prescribed dimensions and then used factor analysis with varimax rotations. Their findings supported their earlier work; distinct dimensions did indeed emerge. They too had variations in their dimensions. The "experiential" dimension was changed to "devotionalism," and "congregational involvement" was given three sub-dimensions, including attendance, organizational activity, and financial support. They also included two dimensions for "orientations" to religion and for "salience" of religion in their list. (1972)

There is some discontinuity of the indexes. First, some of the questions overlap. The "orientation" and "salience" questions both ask about several of the other dimensions. Also, King and Hunt examined salience in only some of their dimensions; while in others



they measured importance. It is hard to compare dimensions in this light.

Another significant contribution to the development of religious dimensions came from the work of James Davidson (1975, 1977). He argued that Glock and Stark did not intend to use their five dimensions as a final product. Indeed, they have developed more dimensions over time. Davidson theorized that the different dimensions may have distinct components within them. He developed components based on religious orientation and distinguished between conservative and liberal types of commitment or church activity. The conservative orientation is other-worldly, personal, unquestioning, conventional, and consensual. The liberal orientation is this-worldly, social, rational, critical, and community minded. Based on these types, he developed two components of each dimension for a total of ten. They are as follows starting with the conservative components; vertical beliefs (supernatural) and horizontal beliefs (social relations) within the ideological dimension; private (devotional) and public (worship) within the ritual dimension; religious knowledge and intellectual scrutiny within the intellectual dimension; experiential desirability and religious experiences within the experiential dimension; and personal consequences (personal needs) versus social consequences (social action) in the consequential dimension. Davidson then predicted positive and negative correlations based on the orientation theory. (This will be discussed later in more depth.)

Davidson found that the ten dimensions were independently differentiated and held merit. The correlations did indeed match the predicted results based on the conservative-liberal orientation theory. He criticized earlier researchers for using one of the two components of each dimension when creating their scales. This would lead to inaccurate results.

Davidson (1977), along with Dean Knudsen, also used a combination of religious consciousness and participation to develop commitment scales. They used other dimensions such as vertical belief, horizontal belief, experiential desirability, experience, and intellectual inclination as indicators of religious orientation. They suggested that the number of dimensions used may vary depending on the context of the study. As the authors wrote,

...approaches to religious orientations should be flexible enough to allow for many different kinds of phenomena to be included.....to search for a magic number of dimensions would impede rather than stimulate more meaningful questions about the nature of people's religious orientations. (pages 160-161)

It is clear that there may be cultural or contextual differences between groups that may influence the nature of orientation. It is important to note here that the authors did not propose any new dimensions, except for the religious consciousness scale for commitment.

In 1980 G.H. Mueller offered a general critique of the multi-dimensional model. First, he recognizes that over the years many of the researchers have developed dimensions with slightly different

names and meaning. Also, they have used the same name, but were inherently measuring different things. There has been a lack of consensus and consistency in the field. Mueller also argues that several of the dimensions have measured phenomenon such as cult, knowledge, and creed which are all components of faith. However, much of Mueller's criticisms are directed toward the measurement of commitment. He does discuss ideal types and polar opposites such as *gemeinschaft* vs. *gesellschaft*, inclusiveness vs. exclusiveness, Protestant vs. catholic ethos, subjective vs. objective, and so on.

Religious dimensions are discussed again by Marie Cornwall and Stan Albrecht (1986) in a study of Mormons. They, too, tried to measure commitment as the extent to which a person is religious. They suggested three core dimensions: belief, commitment, and behavior-- all of which have two components. They then had a series of peripheral dimensions which were related to the core, but were not seen as indicators of religiosity. This study, however, seems to significantly divert from the efforts of our development of dimensions to look at religious orientations.

In 1989, Dale Wimberly suggested that one could not look at "religious norm adherence," which is the basis of the Glock model, without looking at "religious salience," or the importance of the religion to the individual. He further indicates that "identity salience" is an important cause of the norm adherence, although this may vary depending on other cultural pressures. In short, he suggests that it is important to look at how important religion is to

the individual, and that this might have some bearing on the religious activity she or he might engage in.

## **1 B. 2. Development of Dimensions of Religiosity**

Clearly, there has been progress over the past 30 years as researchers have built on (and reacted to) each others' work regarding dimensions of religiosity. However, as the reader can see, there has not been much agreement, continuity, or resolution in the process. Many have suggested ideas for further research, yet the further research has usually taken different directions. While this is frustrating, there is enough summation of theory in the literature to proceed in our study.

To begin, we will re-emphasize the difference between those dimensions which are specific ways of being religious (orientations) and those which measure how religious someone is (commitment). These two types have been combined, overlapped, and overlooked on numerous occasions in the literature. However, it is our goal to examine the differences in religious orientations in the population. We will return to some commitment variables as possible indicators of religious preference. Initially, though, we needed a set of dimensions of religious orientation which are exhaustive but yet not overlapping to a great degree.

Previously, we defined a list of dimensions which were used by Glock and Stark and are also supported in other literature. This

initial list of six consists of the following: devotional, fellowship (communal), intellectual, belief, ritual (worship), and experiential. The consequential dimension of Glock is somewhat ambiguous and unresolved in much of the research. The best interpretation is by Davidson (1975), who divided this dimension into personal consequences (needs) and social consequences (action) which will be used in this study.

Contextually, the social action dimension was seen as very strong in this congregation of our study; therefore, we thought it helpful to distinguish between social advocacy (working to create political and structural changes in the society) and social service (helping the needy of society through donations of time, money, and services). The first seeks social structural change, while the latter seeks to assist the needy rather than change their circumstances. These are ideologically different approaches to helping people. One may argue that they are only variations of "service," but this is not an important issue in this study.

Another contextual dimension that was suggested and considered is "aesthetic experience." This includes creative music, art, and architecture within the worship experience and other aspects. This was seen as important because the sanctuary of the church in our study is known for its beautiful architecture and the choir is known for its high quality music. This dimension is conceptually related to the ritual, devotional (spiritual), and experiential dimensions. However, we see it as sufficiently different to use as a separate dimension. Again, we always have the option to

discard it or to combine it with another dimension if it is not verified.

Thus, our final list of dimensions are:

- |                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| <b>1. Devotional</b>       | (prayer, meditation, spiritual growth)   |
| <b>2. Fellowship</b>       | (social programs, social groups, social relations within the church)                           |
| <b>3. Intellectual</b>     | (search for truth, meaning, Christian perspectives, thought-provoking and challenging)         |
| <b>4. Belief</b>           | (biblical teachings, theological studies, teachings of the Christian faith)                    |
| <b>5. Ritual</b>           | (congregational worship)   |
| <b>6. Personal Needs</b>   | (caring for the needs and crises of individuals, minister to one another, pastoral counseling) |
| <b>7. Experiential</b>     | (experience of God, the holy, or sacred)   |
| <b>8. Aesthetic</b>        | (orientation toward music, art, architecture in worship or other context)                      |
| <b>9. Ethical Advocacy</b> | (working for and/or studying justice and peace, civil rights, environment)                     |
| <b>10. Ethical Service</b> | (respond/take action for needy in the community and the world through service)                 |

### **1C. Relevant Findings on Religious Variety**

Here we overview recent studies which address questions of religious diversity using dimensions similar to those we developed. The question raised here is why there might be variation of religious needs in a relatively homogenous population.

In the literature, there are a number of researchers who have looked at SES and other variables in relation to involvement, commitment, participation, and beliefs. There has been little agreement and inconsistent results over the years. The main problem has been that most of the studies vary in methodology, sample populations, definition of terminology, and even the variables they measured. It becomes difficult to compare them or to use them as evidence for our own research question. Thus, we will focus on studies that use or develop a list of dimensions similar to ours and also examine possible causes of religious variation. Several studies shed some light on our research questions.

The first study is detailed by Dean Hoge in Division in the Protestant House (1976). Hoge examined differences in religious preferences amongst United Presbyterian parishioners. The preferences that he developed are similar to the dimensions in this study. However, the population was not homogenous in regard to SES, region of the country, income, and education. In his study, Hoge found a slight relationship between professionalism and social action. In regard to income and education he found no relation among white laity. In conclusion, Hoge states that class conflict is not a good indicator of religious preference.

In the same study, Hoge also examined the effects of age, sex, marital status, number of children, and state of employment. Of these, only age provided any significant variance. Age was positively related to "personal moral standards" and "evangelism," and negatively related to "fellowship" and "communication within the

church." This suggests that older people may have more of an "other-worldly" orientation.

James Davidson (1975) used Glock's initial five dimensions and developed "this-worldly" and "other-worldly" dimensions for each, as previously mentioned. These dimensions closely resemble Marty's Public Protestant and Private Protestant religious types. In general, Davidson found strong positive relationships between vertical beliefs, private practice, religious knowledge, religious experience, and personal consequences. All of these are "Private Protestant" characteristics. In addition, he found positive, although weaker, relationships between the "Public Protestant" dimensions. However, he did find strong negative relationships between most of the "Public" and "Private" dimensions. This study clearly supports Marty's two party system in the sense that there is evidence of two distinct groupings of dimensions. This would also support Weber's theory as well. What is lacking in this study is an analysis of why these two groups exist and what independent variables might be indicators of such a division.

James Davidson (1977) also studied the relationship between SES religious dimensions developed from the Glock model. He surveyed two Methodist and two Baptist congregations. Davidson failed to get a good measure of income, and thus used occupation and education as indicators of SES. He developed three levels of SES for middle-class Methodists, which most closely matches our population. In his results, Davidson found a positive relation between SES and intellectual scrutiny and a negative relation between SES and belief,



devotion, and experiential dimensions. These results support Weber's theory of social class as an indicator of religious variety.

In summary, this seems to be the area most lacking in conclusive research. The religious dimensions have been developed quite well, as well as the evidence of salience between them. However, there is very little in regard to what causes some people to desire certain dimensions and other people other dimensions. In addition, research in this area has dropped off significantly in the past 10 years, with almost nothing being done in the past five years. Thus, the current status of the literature is very limited. There seems to be room for more research in this area.

For this reason, this part of our study is somewhat exploratory in nature. We look at Weber's social class theory and also look at the possibility of leadership changes as reasons for differences. Also, we consider other groups who might be alienated or marginal in some manner such as singles and women as possible indicators of variance.

## **2. Methodology of The Study**

### **2A. Research Design**

As we consider the theoretical questions, there are several research methods that surface. We want to know individual preferences of religious activity as specified by the religious dimensions previously developed. We then want to determine if groups or clusters of people have the same or similar preferences within the congregation. Finally, we want to determine if various factors might be associated with these clusters. These include SES (despite a homogeneous population), some sense of marginality, and the length of membership at Mychurch. In addition, if the theoretical factors do not seem to be connected with the clustering, then we want to be able to hypothesize what factors are involved.

To get this information, we needed to measure everyone's preferences in the same way and also get basic demographic and church participation data. Thus, survey research was the primary method used in our research.

With this said, we also felt there was use for both field and historical analysis research. While using field methods, one may have gotten involved in some of the church activities, conducted interviews with members, and developed focus groups to observe and interview. This would have shed insight into some of the different dynamics and factors that are involved in the religious life

of individuals and also the congregation as a whole. These types of insights are often not obtainable in survey research. However, they could not have easily replaced the survey method to get the information we wanted.

The other method that would have been helpful is historical research. A study of Protestantism and the UCC would undoubtedly shed light on Marty's "two-party" theory and what factors have caused divisions over the years. A study of Mychurch history with its social action and change of leadership might show us the shift in agenda's and attitudes over the years. This would have given us a better sense of the historical context of Mychurch.

Given all this, the survey method is the most essential to address our theoretical questions and was also the method readily available to us. Early on, we discussed doing interviews with key people as well as conducting some historical research. However, time restraints and limited resources including the limits of a master's thesis kept this from being realized.

Likewise, the survey method has its limits. To start, we are limited by the type and amount of questions asked. We can only make educated guesses as to what type of questions and what wording to use will give us responses that closely reflect the reality of people's attitudes and desires. We can only hope to minimize our biases. With this type of method, it is possible that there are other factors involved unknown to us.

In addition, we have to rely on the means of measurement chosen. Somehow we have to convert what someone believes in

their head into some type of data that we can quantify. A lot can go awry in this process. In the end we have to rely on the statistics produced from this process to give us some sense of truth and knowledge about Mychurch. While we can gain insights that shed light on our theories, we must also be aware that there might be more to the picture.

Given this, the study that was conducted did not begin from our theoretical basis. Rather, it was based on the desire of Mychurch members to develop a better understanding of its congregation. They created a long range planning committee to conduct research and develop a report for the congregation. This report was to have recommendations for future programming, resource allocation, and hiring of clergy and personnel.

Thus, this study started as a tool for that committee. They wanted to know what the people of the church desired and expected as far as programming, direction, and focus. They wanted to test what areas of church life are most important to people and what their religious preferences are. To achieve this goal, it was important for them to cover all the possible areas of programs and services that the church and clergy could offer or emphasize. They decided to survey the congregation to achieve this goal. This is precisely the type of survey we needed for our own research. Thus, we offered to join the committee research project as soon as possible.

From the onset, the committee had some concerns, guidelines, and structure to work with. They had decided to divide the survey into four basic parts. The first section assessed what people wanted

personally in the religious experience. The second section measured what people thought was important in regard to church programming possibilities. This included an evaluation of current programs. The third section asked what the clergy of the church should be doing, or how they should focus their attention. The final section had demographic variables. The committee also had questions about church attendance and church identity in the community.

This basic four part outline was given to us work with. In addition, the committee was leery of adding questions and making the survey too long. They had already generated more questions than they were comfortable with. Finally, they were under a time constraint. They were in a hurry to develop the questionnaire and administer it so as to produce a timely report.

Prior to our joining the project, the committee had several people researching types of questionnaire designs and questions to use for their survey. In particular, they had used the Handbook for Congregational Studies by Jackson Carroll (1985). Thus, they had already developed some researched and educated questions prior to our involvement.

When we joined the project, we offered technical advice and statistical analysis in exchange for use of the data. We were also given limited freedom to alter and add or delete some questions; all changes had to be approved by the board. We also had a two to three week deadline to make proposed alterations. While this was somewhat limiting, we had enough room to administer the type of

survey needed. The final survey was reasonable and worthy of sociological research.

Working within the context of this type of research design has some clear advantages and disadvantages. On one hand, we were not concerned with issues such as gaining entry, human subjects, and funding for the project, which was taken care of by the committee. They even had money to hire coders and a typist for the data entry. On the other hand, we were restricted in the type of survey design, use of additional methods, time limitations, and the number and structure of questions. However, these limits were rarely problematic as the committee tried to be flexible to our sociological needs, and the benefits were much appreciated.

## **2B. Measurement**

### **1. Dimensional Measures**

Given the above guidelines, we thought it was quite feasible to use the survey as a tool to measure the dimensions from Glock and Stark and also others. Essentially, the committee wanted to know the same information as we did, but for different reasons. They wanted to assess people's religious orientations or preferences within the church, based on a pool of all possible orientations. This is precisely what the theoretical dimensions were created to do. In addition, we did not find the distinct sections of personal preference, programming, and clergy roles all that problematic. It seemed a

survey needed. The final survey was reasonable and worthy of sociological research.

Working within the context of this type of research design has some clear advantages and disadvantages. On one hand, we were not concerned with issues such as gaining entry, human subjects, and funding for the project, which was taken care of by the committee. They even had money to hire coders and a typist for the data entry. On the other hand, we were restricted in the type of survey design, use of additional methods, time limitations, and the number and structure of questions. However, these limits were rarely problematic as the committee tried to be flexible to our sociological needs, and the benefits were much appreciated.

## **2B. Measurement**

### **1. Dimensional Measures**

Given the above guidelines, we thought it was quite feasible to use the survey as a tool to measure the dimensions from Glock and Stark and also others. Essentially, the committee wanted to know the same information as we did, but for different reasons. They wanted to assess people's religious orientations or preferences within the church, based on a pool of all possible orientations. This is precisely what the theoretical dimensions were created to do. In addition, we did not find the distinct sections of personal preference, programming, and clergy roles all that problematic. It seemed a

reasonable method for obtaining information and was an approach we could work with.

The committee accepted grouping all the questions around the 10 dimensions that we developed. This assured us that all the dimensions were measured, and also gave us an indication if any dimension had too many or too few questions. Also, we could screen for questions which overlapped two or more dimensions. Ideally, we wanted a set of questions, some from each section, which related to each dimension. In addition, we wanted the questions to cover most, if not all, of the aspects of every dimension, giving us a full range of coverage for each one. However, some dimensions were more prevalent in this particular congregation than others. It was these dimensions that received the most coverage.

To begin, it was imperative to have at least one solid question for each dimension. It was most fitting to develop these in the personal preference section (Section A), as it was the most direct way to measure people's preferences. The following is a list of the 10 initial descriptions we developed based on the dimensions:

1. Devotion:                      Helping me seek a more spiritual life through prayer, meditation, and devotions.
2. Fellowship:                    Offering me fellowship and social relationships with others in the congregation.
3. Intellectual:                    Assisting me in my intellectual quest for truth, meaning, or Christian perspectives.
4. Belief:                            Strengthening my belief in the biblical and theological teachings of the Christian faith.
5. Ritual:                            Joining in the ritual of congregational worship services.



reasonable method for obtaining information and was an approach we could work with.

The committee accepted grouping all the questions around the 10 dimensions that we developed. This assured us that all the dimensions were measured, and also gave us an indication if any dimension had too many or too few questions. Also, we could screen for questions which overlapped two or more dimensions. Ideally, we wanted a set of questions, some from each section, which related to each dimension. In addition, we wanted the questions to cover most, if not all, of the aspects of every dimension, giving us a full range of coverage for each one. However, some dimensions were more prevalent in this particular congregation than others. It was these dimensions that received the most coverage.

To begin, it was imperative to have at least one solid question for each dimension. It was most fitting to develop these in the personal preference section (Section A), as it was the most direct way to measure people's preferences. The following is a list of the 10 initial descriptions we developed based on the dimensions:

- |                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| 1. Devotion:     | Helping me seek a more spiritual life through prayer, meditation, and devotions.          |
| 2. Fellowship:   | Offering me fellowship and social relationships with others in the congregation.          |
| 3. Intellectual: | Assisting me in my intellectual quest for truth, meaning, or Christian perspectives.      |
| 4. Belief:       | Strengthening my belief in the biblical and theological teachings of the Christian faith. |
| 5. Ritual:       | Joining in the ritual of congregational worship services.                                 |

- 6. Personal Support: Caring for personal needs and crises of individuals and families in the congregation.
- 7. Experiential: Providing experience of God or the sacred.
- 8. Aesthetic Experience: Experiencing the aesthetics of spiritual expression through music, architecture, and other arts.
- 9. Ethical Advocacy: Providing ways for me to work for justice and peace at home and abroad.
- 10. Ethical Service: Offering me ways to respond to the needy in our community and the world through service.

In addition to these 10 questions, we also added a question about families for the sake of the committee:

- 11. Family support: Strengthening families through shared participation in church activities.

However, we decided not to develop family support as a specific dimension.

The committee was somewhat adamant in how they wanted to measure each question or variable. Our primary concern was first to have a reasonable amount of variance. That is, enough to see significant differences in the population, but yet still have substantial representation in each step of variance. Given that, we also wanted to have as close to interval measurement as possible. The committee wanted to have ordinal categories rather than just numbers (interval), so we agreed to have both. We also attempted to make the ordinal categories approximate interval:

<i>Very</i>		<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Not so</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
<i>important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>important</i>	<i>important</i>	<i>important</i>
4	3	2	1	0

In addition, we used the following question to obtain more variance:

Now, among these statements above, write the letter of the one that to you is:

\_\_\_ most important              \_\_\_ next most important              \_\_\_ least important

The next set of questions that addressed the dimensions was those which asked about respondent preferences for different types of programs and activities. For these we developed a list of 24 questions in which respondents were asked to rank importance as in the previous section (see Appendix A). Of these about 18 questions were directly related to our 10 dimensions. The other six asked questions about youth education, openness and diversity, and missions of the greater church body. There was at least one question which addressed each dimension, except for the "experiential." This type of question did not seem appropriate here. Members of the committee did not feel that "experiencing the holy" was an integral part of the religious experience at this church. It was not part of their common vocabulary and would not have been considered if not for the influence of our dimensions.

This set of questions (Section C) had the same scale for measurement as in section A. The difference here was that we asked respondents to circle the five questions which they believed were the most important from the list of 24. This was done at the request of the committee. It would increase the variance for these questions as well as determine which variables were the most important

In addition, we used the following question to obtain more variance:

Now, among these statements above, write the letter of the one that to you is:

\_\_\_ most important      \_\_\_ next most important      \_\_\_ least important

The next set of questions that addressed the dimensions was those which asked about respondent preferences for different types of programs and activities. For these we developed a list of 24 questions in which respondents were asked to rank importance as in the previous section (see Appendix A). Of these about 18 questions were directly related to our 10 dimensions. The other six asked questions about youth education, openness and diversity, and missions of the greater church body. There was at least one question which addressed each dimension, except for the "experiential." This type of question did not seem appropriate here. Members of the committee did not feel that "experiencing the holy" was an integral part of the religious experience at this church. It was not part of their common vocabulary and would not have been considered if not for the influence of our dimensions.

This set of questions (Section C) had the same scale for measurement as in section A. The difference here was that we asked respondents to circle the five questions which they believed were the most important from the list of 24. This was done at the request of the committee. It would increase the variance for these questions as well as determine which variables were the most important

overall. In addition, this would give us a sense if any of the variables were more salient than the others.

In addition, Section C had an evaluation for each of the items in the list. Respondents were asked to evaluate with the following measure:

<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Not good at all</u>	<u>Not sure</u>
4	3	2	1	0	N

There was no opportunity for increased variance in this section.

The final section which addressed the dimensions was Section F: "Roles of the Clergy." This section had 21 items which described possible clergy roles (see Appendix A). When constructing our scales, items such as "preparing and preaching sermons," "planning and leading worship," and "conducting weddings and funerals" were excluded because they were seen as essential roles of all clergy. Of the 21 items, 13 represented the 10 dimensions. Again, most were addressed except for "aesthetics," due to difficulties in developing a suitable question. This section also had the "most important," "next most important," and "least important" options at the end as in Section A.

The following is a combined list of the questions asked for each dimension from all the sections (A, C, and F), beginning with the defining Section A question. Included is the section letter, question letter, our code for that variable, and the question itself.

**1. Devotional**

- Aa. TDEVOTN helping me seek a more spiritual life through prayer, meditation, and devotions.
- Ch. IDEVOTN finding a deeper spirituality through devotion and prayer.
- Cu. ISPGROW inspiring and assisting persons in their spiritual growth.
- Cx. ISMGRUP providing small groups for study, prayer, or mutual ministry.\*
- Fa. PSPIRIT counsels people in the congregation about their spiritual growth and religious life.
- Fb. PDEVOTN offers programs on spirituality through prayer, meditation, and devotion.

**2. Fellowship (communal)**

- Ab. TFELLOW offering me fellowship and social relationships with others.
- Cd. INEWMEM bringing new members into the church fellowship.
- Ck. IYTHGRP providing young people with a meaningful social group within the church.
- Ct. IFELLOW providing active social programs.
- Fc. PFELLOW encourages fellowship among people in the congregation.

**3. Intellectual**

- Ac. TINTELL assisting me in my intellectual quest for truth, meaning, or Christian perspectives.
- Ce. ISERMON listening to challenging and insightful sermons.
- Fd. PINTELL offers programs on challenging and thought-provoking topics.

**4. Christian Belief**

- Ad. TBELIEF strengthening belief in the biblical and theological teachings of the Christian faith.
- Cf. IBELIEF learning about the biblical teachings of the Christian church.
- Co. ITHEOLO studying the theology of the Christian faith.
- Fe. PBIBLTH leads biblical and theological programs on the Christian faith.

**5. Ritual**

- Ae. TRITUAL joining in the ritual of congregational worship services.
- Ca. IWORSHIP experiencing a meaningful Sunday morning worship service.
- Fl. PWORSHIP encourages creativity of expression in worship.

**6. Personal Support**

- Af. TSUPPORT caring for personal needs and crises of individuals and families in the congregation.
- Ci. IENABLE enabling members to minister to one another's needs.
- Cp. ISUPPRT offering pastoral counseling and support in times of personal and family crisis.
- Ff. PCOUNSL provides pastoral counseling.
- Fg. PSICKDY ministers to the sick, dying, and bereaved.
- Fh. PCALLS makes pastoral calls in the homes or offices of members.

**7. Experience of the Holy**

- Ag. TEXPRI providing experience of God or the sacred.
- Fi. PEXPERN assists people in the congregation to experience God or the holy.

**8. Aesthetic Experience**

- Aj. TAESTHE experiencing the aesthetics of spiritual expression through music, architecture, other.
- Cv. IAESTHE experiencing music, art, and architecture in the worship of God.

**9. Ethical Advocacy**

- Ah. TADVOCA providing ways for me to work for justice and peace at home and abroad.
- Cg. ICIVILR working in the society for the civil rights of all groups.
- Cj. IENVMNT understanding and acting on our responsibility for environment as God's creation.
- Cn. IJPREF offering reflection and study on key issues of justice and peace.
- Cs. ISOCACT acting with others in the congregation to change unjust social conditions.
- Fj. PENCJP encourages people to work for justice and peace at home and abroad.
- Fk. PLEAJP assumes leadership role in congregation and community on justice and peace issues.

**10. Ethical Service**

- Ai. TSERVIC offering me ways to respond to the needy in our community/world through service.
- Cm. INEEDY taking action to help the needy in our community.
- Fo. PNEEDY seeks to involve people to respond to the needy in community and world.

\*This item was later deleted from the devotional section because it was not clearly only a "devotional" item.

These were the original questions that were determined to be conceptually connected with the various dimensions. Notice here that the dimensions are discrete; no question is mentioned in more than one dimension.

It is obvious that some dimensions have more items than others. This is due mostly to considerations of the committee. Again, some dimensions were not seen as important in the context of the church, and others were seen as more important, such as "ethical advocacy" and "fellowship." Some questions were kept or added because individual committee members had specific questions they

thought were important. It was tricky balancing between maintaining the dimensions, serving the needs of the committee, and limiting the length of the survey to a reasonable size. In retrospect, it may have been worth some extra energy to try to balance the dimensions; however, we believe we still have a reasonable representation on most of the dimensions (and at least the more important ones) for our analysis. Lastly, in regard to data analysis, it is not necessary for all of the dimensions to have the same amount of items.

Upon inspection, it is apparent that some of the dimensions have items that overlap or even seem to be asking the same question. This is due, in part, to the structure of the survey. The three sections all have somewhat different agenda. Section A measures personal needs; Section C measures preferences for programming and activities; and Section F measures affinity for pastoral roles. Thus, if two questions in one dimension are essentially the same concept, they are still measuring different phenomenon. For example, a person wanting personal support may want pastoral counseling and not support programming. Others may not want personal support for themselves, but think the church should offer programming and pastoral counseling regardless. Clearly, combined responses on different dimensions may have different patterns; however, using a combined total we feel that we can assess the degree that a respondent feels a particular dimension is important.



Finally, it is also apparent that the items in some of the dimensions do not necessarily cover all of the possible aspects that could be identified within those dimensions. Three things should be considered here: First, the time constraints and committee agenda were such that we did not have as much flexibility to contextually design groups of questions for every dimension as we would have liked. Second, this task was made more difficult with the above-mentioned subsections in the questionnaire. Third, it was not important for us to cover all the possible aspects of the dimensions. We were primarily concerned with how important, or desirable, each dimension was to a respondent. Thus, it was necessary to cover the major elements of the dimension, but not all the possible elements. Each individual is expected to perceive and interpret a concept (such as a belief) a bit differently. However, we simply want to know if the concept is important to them, such as the need to have a clearly articulated belief system.

## **2B. 2. Measures of Religious Belief**

Throughout the literature, "religious belief" is viewed and conceptualized in different ways as a religious dimension. Most researchers measure belief by asking people what they believe using a continuum from orthodox to agnostic. Few researchers look at how important that belief is compared to other dimensions of religiosity. As we have made clear, our intentions have been to measure the

importance of the dimensions and not necessarily how respondents interpret the dimension. However, it is helpful to measure the orthodoxy of belief in order to analyze the relationship between levels of orthodoxy and religious preference. Since this was not part of the agenda of the committee, we were constrained to keep this section as short as possible.

To have a short, quick, and yet useful measure of orthodoxy it is best to use a measure that had been used and tested before. We opted to use two questions from a suggested questionnaire from the Handbook of Congregational Studies (Carroll, 1985). See Appendix A for a list of the questions.

### **2B. 3. Measures of Religious Participation**

The Mychurch committee felt it was important to measure the participation of respondents in the church community. They wanted to distinguish between worship participation (ritual) and all other church activities, including positions on boards and committees. We were more interested in the number of years that individuals had attended Mychurch. This would allow us to see differences in preferences among people who came to Mychurch during different leadership eras. This was earlier discussed as one possible theoretical explanation for differences in the congregation.

With these intentions, the survey included questions regarding the number of years of attendance, membership, and frequency of

attendance in the past year. This was done with average ranges such as "once a month" or "usually every week." We also asked if church attendance had increased, decreased, or stayed the same in the past few years.

In regard to participation, we asked how many church positions they had served in the past two years in the following categories:

- \_\_\_elected or appointed Board or committee
- \_\_\_voluntary task force, work group, other
- \_\_\_Sunday school teacher, youth program

Respondents were asked to estimate the average time per month they spent on all church activities, excluding worship. We also asked if this type of participation had increased, decreased, or remained the same. See Appendix C for a list of the participation questions and the respondents' percentages.

## **2B. 4. Measures of Demographic Characteristics**

This section is relatively straight forward. There was a general consensus that a series of good demographic measures of the respondents was needed for various reasons. Respondents were asked information on the following variables:

1. age
2. gender
3. marital status
4. whether spouse or partner participate
5. number of children in household aged 0-4 yr., elementary school age, middle school age, high school age, and 18-25 yr. old age
6. highest level of formal education
7. principal employment
8. occupation
9. household income

(See Appendix B for a list of the respondents' percentages.)

We intended to ask about political preference, but the committee was strongly against asking the question. We were told there were few Republicans in the congregation. In addition, questions on race, ethnicity, or national origin were not included. These were not needed in the context of this church.

Most all of the variables were measured using categorical measures with the following exceptions: age which is ratio, education which is interval, occupation which is translated into an interval scale, and income categories which approximate interval data. In regard to income, we felt it was too personal to ask for exact figures. In addition, as income levels become higher, small intervals have much less frequency and may reveal the identity of respondents.

Thus, we developed the following income intervals for respondents to choose from:

Under \$ 15,000	35,000-49,000	100,000-124,999
15,000-24,999	50,000-75,000	125,000 or more
25,000-34,999	75,000-99,999	

## **2B. 5. Other Measures of Religious Attitudes**

The above-mentioned measures are those which are central to our analysis. However, there were other questions in the survey which were important for the committee that were not used in this analysis. These include a series of nine open-ended questions designed to further reveal perceptions, attitudes, needs, and desires of respondents. They were dispersed throughout the questionnaire and covered a range of topics. There was also a section inquiring about church identity and respondents' perceptions of the church in the community. See Appendix A for these questions.

## **2C. Data Collection**

### **1. Pretest**

Whenever research is attempted using new questions, it is important to do some type of pretest of the instrument. A pretest was done using the members of the committee. Most of the members were not directly involved in the construction of the survey, as they only received progress reports and provided input on

a weekly basis. Thus, when we finished a draft, it worked well to give the survey to the committee to preview it and pretest it. The final draft had seven pages of questions covering the sections detailed above. The average time in taking the pretest for the committee was 15 minutes, which seemed reasonable. Based on feedback from the pretest, there were no major changes made in the survey. We did make a number of grammatical and word changes for various questions. Since all of the participants of the pretest were active members of Mychurch, and therefore part of the sample population, we felt confident in the survey as an instrument of measurement for the Mychurch population.

## **2C. 2. Sampling**

Questionnaires were given to almost everyone who attended or participated in the Mychurch community, not restricting the list to members, since many non-members attend on a regular basis. Children under 15 years old were not surveyed. The high school age people were included in the list, although we excluded them for some analysis. Those who had left Mychurch within the past three months were also surveyed. If they had left for a specific reason, it might be revealed in their answers. Some argued that those who had left in the past two years or even five years should be surveyed, but this was voted down. Thus, we sent surveys to the entire adult population, high school age and above, who attend Mychurch, are

members, or have recently left. We did not restrict the number of questionnaires per family, and many families received two or more. A final list of 431 people was generated with these guidelines.

The target population for the committee was obviously the community of Mychurch. Our target population for sociological purposes, however, is not so clear. Ideally, we would like to generalize to the population of Protestants in the United States. Short of that, we would like to generalize to United Church of Christ congregations, Protestants in the Midwest, UCC congregations in the Midwest, or perhaps Protestant congregations in college towns in the Midwest. Based on the type of sample we have, it is very difficult to determine how much we can reasonably extrapolate our findings. However, our analysis is not meant to be conclusive for a larger population. We are simply trying to look at theories of religious diversity and see if they hold in the context of a single and relatively homogenous church population.

### **2C. 3. Administration of The Survey**

It was important for both the committee and ourselves that respondent's answers be anonymous to the general population and to the members of the committee. This is considered standard procedure in survey research. A packet was developed for each respondent which included the survey, a short instruction sheet, and a return envelop. These were distributed in church on two

consecutive Sundays, and those left over were mailed first class. A number was put on each return envelope which corresponded to a number on the master respondent sheet. This identified who did not return a survey so a follow-up could be sent. This provided both anonymity and a means to increase our response rate.

We initially distributed 431 questionnaires, and 248 were completed. This is a 56% response rate, which we consider acceptable for survey research. There was not any detectable bias as to who responded or who did not.

## **2D. Data Processing**

### **1. Coding The Dimensional Variables**

For sections A, C, and F each answer was coded with the numbered response. Sections A and F were then transformed using the most, next most, and least categories as follows:

1. Two points were added to a response (ranging from 0-4) if they indicated that item was "most important."
2. One point was added to a response if they indicated that item was "next most important."
3. One point was subtracted if the item was "least important."
4. A no-answer was given a "9".

These numbers are somewhat arbitrary, but were also given careful thought. It was important to use the information that these questions were giving us. However, if we gave too much weight to the



"most important" responses, then some variables would be top heavy. On the other hand, we did want The method above is a balance between these tensions. In addition the scale is measured in one unit increments and this is just an extension of that scale.

The Section C questions were coded differently. Here, respondents were instructed only to indicate the five most important items. Thus, we added one to each item that was mentioned. Anything more that this might give a skewed curve of responses.

The occupation responses were coded using the "Bose Index Three-Digit Occupation Census Code" based on the 1980 census. These codes were then transformed into the Bose occupational prestige ranking which varies between zero and 100. This variable of the survey may be somewhat suspect because many of the responses were too vague to ascertain what type of occupation they had (such as "manager"). In cases of slight uncertainty we took a respondent's education and age into account to determine their probable occupational ranking. However, because of this vagueness, a number of cases were thrown out on this variable.

The occupational prestige variables were transformed prior to analysis. All other variables in Section C were coded using a typical coding procedure, but were never transformed, outside of missing data. In the cases of missing data, we only eliminated the case when we did analysis on the item(s) with missing information. This was done so we could use whatever information each respondent did provide, rather than use only those respondents who provided

answers for all of the questions. While the latter option is preferred, it would have reduced our sample to an unacceptable size.

## **2D 2. Data Entry and Cleaning**

For data entry, the SPSS Data Entry Program was used. One spreadsheet was created using the general Data Entry procedures. A member of the committee who had worked closely with the coding process and had data entry experience was hired to complete the actual data entry. She was trained on the SPSS program and was comfortable with the process.

To reduce the amount of coding error, cleaning procedures were set up for most of the variables. All the variables had a fixed number of allowed digits. In addition, we set ranges that each variable would allow. Thus, errors could occur only within the range of possible and expected codes.

Having a single data entry person reduced the chances of error, eliminated varying styles or interpretations of codes, and avoided the problems of transitions between coders. However, with only one person coding, the risk of systematic error increases. If the same mistake was made throughout, we would have systematic errors that are difficult to detect. We will address this when looking at the consistency of the results. At this time, though, we feel confident that the work was completed with reasonable, acceptable, and probably high levels of accuracy.

## **2E. Construction of The Indexes and Scales**

### **1. Development of Scales**

Our first step in looking at modes of religiosity was to develop instruments to measure levels of importance for each dimension. This was done first by theoretically and conceptually grouping questions around each dimension. This step is a process of face validation and was outlined in the chapter on measurement.

In our scale construction, it was important to place emphasis on the conceptual dimensions. It was preferred to develop the scales conceptually and then test them for reliability and validity. This is in contrast to developing the scales empirically and then looking at conceptual relations within and between them. We were more interested in looking at relationships within our theoretical model. With this intent, the Likert scaling technique was best suited for our needs based on the ordinal type measures used for each item.

### **2E. 2. Construct Validity and Internal Reliability**

In the Likert scale method, the assumption is that a combined score of all the items in a scale is a reasonable measure of that concept. This test is done using the theoretical construction of the scales. Total scores for each scale were computed, and item-to-total correlations were generated. Any individual item should correlate

with the total scale score at a minimum of 0.30, as they are assumed to reflect the same underlying construct.

In addition, we tested the internal reliability using Cronbach's alpha statistic. This indicator is based on the average inter-correlation and the number of items in the scale. Basically, the higher the inter-correlations and the higher the number of items, the more internal consistency and thus confidence we have in the scale. For this statistic a measure of 0.70 or higher is considered an indicator of a good scale. The following table shows the item-to-total correlations and the alpha levels for each scale. They are given in the order of alpha levels. The codes are those which were given earlier and can also be found in Appendix A.

Notice that the "Ethical Advocacy" and "Ethical Service" categories are combined into one "Social Action" grouping. While we see them as conceptually different, the respondents usually did not. This is supported by the lack of distinction in the open-ended questions as well as the factor analysis results which will be discussed later (see Appendix E for factor analysis results). Also, note that the three "service" items all have strong correlations with the "advocacy" items (see Appendix D for item to item correlations with each scale). Basically, this gives us one strong "social action" scale and does not take away from our analysis.

Table 1  
Item to Total Correlations of Constituent Items of The 10 Scales

<u>dimension</u>	<u>item</u>	<u>item to total corr.</u>	<u>Cronbach's alpha level (standardized)</u>
Social Action	TADVOCA	.73	.90
	ICIVILR	.78	
	IENVMNT	.52	
	IJPREF	.68	
	ISOACT	.78	
	PENCJP	.69	
	PLEAJP	.65	
	TSERVIC	.56	
	INEEDY	.59	
	PNEEDY	.54	
Aesthetics	TAESTHE	.73	.84
	IAESTHE	.73	
Belief	TBELIEF	.54	.79
	IBELIEF	.68	
	ITHEOLO	.61	
	PBIBLTH	.52	
Devotion	TDEVOTN	.54	.72
	IDEVOTN	.62	
	ISPGROW	.41	
	PDEVOTN	.50	
Fellowship	TFELLOW	.53	.71
	IYTHGRP	.48	
	IFELLOW	.62	
	PFELLOW	.39	
Experiential	TEXPERI	.51	.67
	PEXPERN	.51	
Personal Support	TSUPPORT	.39	.66
	IENABLE	.42	
	ISUPPRT	.44	
	PCOUNSL	.43	
	PSICKDY	.38	
Intellectual	TINTELL	.41	.56
	ISERMON	.34	
	PINTELL	.38	
Ritual	TRITUAL	.35	.52
	IWORSHP	.35	

When looking at Table 1, we first find that all of the items in each scale meet the 0.30 item-to-total correlation standard. We also find acceptable alpha levels for the first five scales. This gives us some assurance of construct validity and internal reliability for each of these scales. In addition, the correlations between items in each scale are at least 0.25, with most above the 0.30 level (see Appendix D). The one exception to this is the "personal support" dimension. While all of the item-to-total correlations are acceptable, the inter-correlations in that scale were weak. This is highlighted in the following table:

Table 2  
Item to Item Correlations Among Five Constituent  
Variables in The Personal Support Dimension

	TSUPPORT	IENABLE	ISUPPRT	PCOUNSL	PSICKDY
TSUPPORT	1.00				
IENABLE	.46	1.00			
ISUPPRT	.22	.19	1.00		
PCOUNSL	.14	.21	.50	1.00	
PSICKDY	.20	.21	.29	.37	1.00

As Table 2 shows, several of the correlations are quite small. In addition, the alpha level from above is 0.66, which is somewhat marginal. Furthermore, there is not any one or two items that can be thrown out on an empirical basis. They all correlate highly with at least one other item. There does seem to be a cluster of higher correlations between ISUPPRT, PCOUNSL, and PSICKDY. However,

conceptually we do not feel comfortable throwing out the other two variables, as they are seen as most representative of our dimension. Thus, we can only accept that we have a poor measure for the "support" dimension in terms of validity and reliability.

In addition, we also have weak alpha levels for the "experiential", "intellectual", and "ritual" dimensions. Within these dimensions all of the inter-correlations are reasonable and the item-to-total correlations are acceptable, albeit they are not all very strong. Thus, the primary reason for low alpha levels is the small amount of items in each dimension. With this, we argue that these scales may indeed be valid, since the correlations support this; but we do not have enough items to verify reliability. Therefore, we will use these dimensions in our analysis with the reservation that they have weak measurements. The "support" dimension will be used in the same light. While we admittedly have poor measures on these scales, they still may give evidence and insights to further research.

### **2E. 3. Weighting The Scale Items**

A technique used to increase the reliability of a scale is weighting. Typically, it is argued that the item which has the highest correlation with the total score is the best indicator of that scale. Therefore, that item merits more weight than other items in the scale. This was tried in an attempt to gain further insights from the data. Each item was multiplied by its corresponding item-to-total

correlation which gave us a new scale total. We then compared the weighted scales with the unweighted scales by looking at inter-correlations. However, only minuscule differences in the correlations were found. Some were slightly higher, while others were slightly lower. Thus, we determined that the weighting was not helpful and opted to use the original scales.

#### **2E. 4. Factor Analysis of The Scale Items**

In addition to the above analysis, we decided to conduct a factor analysis in an attempt to verify the dimensions that were developed. We included all the items that had been used in constructing the nine scales. The factor analysis was run using the common "varimax" rotation. See Appendix E for the factor analysis results. In the results, we found nine factors with eigenvalues over 1.0. In addition, seven of the factors matched the theoretical dimensions item for item. The exception was a combination of the "belief" items and the "devotion" items. This is reasonable, as these dimensions are conceptually very connected; however, we still maintain that they are conceptually distinct as well. In addition, the correlations between factors were all quite small, suggesting that each factor is relatively independent of the other factors.



The factors came out in the following order. Notice the similarity between this ordering and the alpha ordering from before.

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Dimension</u>
1	social action
2	belief/devotion
3	fellowship
4	experiential
5	aesthetics
6	personal support
7	intellectual
	(no factor for the ritual dimension)

Note in Appendix E that the “personal support” dimension had high loadings on only two of its three variables. This parallels the sporadic correlations between those items. Also, we did not get factor loadings for the “ritual” dimension.

We find the factor analysis further supports the development of the dimensions. While two of the scales seem to be weak measurements, the others seem quite strong. With these limitations in mind, we feel confident in proceeding with the inter-scale analysis and exploratory analysis of additional variables.

### **3. Results**

#### **3 A. Demographic Portrait of The Population**

In the demographic section we find some interesting characteristics. (See Appendix B for demographic frequencies.) First, only 16.0% of the respondents are under the age of 40, which suggests a relatively older sample. In addition, the mean age is 52, and the median is 54. It is apparent that either Mychurch is an older congregation, or many of the younger people did not respond to the survey, a possible response bias.

In regard to gender, 20% more women responded than men. In addition, 72.6% of the respondents are married or living with a partner, which suggests that most all of the men are married, along with many of the women. This may be typical of church participation across the country. There also may be a population of women who are partners with other women.

We did not ask people the total number of children they had. Instead, we asked for the number of children in different age groups. Since some families have children in more than one age group, it is not immediately clear how many children each family has. This was not considered critical data and we did not do the analysis to get it. However, we do estimate that about 40-50% of the respondents have at least one child living at home. With an older population this

makes sense, as many couple's children should be out of the house. However, it also seems reasonable to say that families and children are still an integral part of the congregation. Nonetheless, a larger older population may be moving on to other concerns.

The respondents are highly educated, with 60% having masters degrees or higher, and another 23% have a college degree or higher. This might be expected with Mychurch being located in a university town.

It appears that most of the people of Mychurch either work or did work, as 85% work at least part-time or are retired. Surprisingly, few people are students at 5.7%, especially if we subtract out the high school age people. This does reflect the age distribution, however. Also, at 1.2%, there is very little unemployment, in spite of the recent national and local recession. Finally, only 4.1% reported themselves as homemakers, which either suggests that many of the women are not in the traditional women's role, or they do not perceive themselves as such.

In regard to occupation, most of the people have some type of professional job. By far, the most frequent occupation is teaching, either at the university or elementary/high school levels. From there, many people are in different management, research, administration, doctor, technical specialists, lawyers, and clergy positions. There were a few secretaries, sales clerks, and support personal and almost no manual laborers.

While there is a wide range of family incomes, there is a strong cluster of 63.3% in the \$35,000 to \$100,000 income range. In

addition, almost 84% of the respondents have a family income of over \$25,000. The median income is \$65,000, a level reflecting the middle to upper-middle income range.

It is important to note that there are a few African Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanics, but the population of Mychurch is overwhelmingly white. This majority is so large that it was inappropriate to ask the question. Also, as mentioned before, we were told there are very few Republicans in the church.

With this demographic overview, we obtain a sense of the homogeneity of the congregation. In general, the sample population is mostly middle aged or older. The majority are married, and many couples have children or have had children. Most are highly educated, employed or were employed in professional occupations. Most probably are of European descent and are politically liberal relative to the general U.S. population. Basically, the sample is much more homogenous than the general population, and even significantly more homogenous than Protestants in general, or even the United Church of Christ denomination. While its characteristics may be closer in line with other university town Protestant churches, we still venture that the high level of education, occupation, and income is somewhat unique.

The interesting question for us is that with this high level of homogeneity on the demographic variables, are there still significant differences in religious preference? If we control for many of the demographic variables that have been utilized in previous theories and studies, then what is/are the primary causes of these

differences? It is our next step to explore the differences between the religious dimensions. Then we can explore some possible predictor variables of these differences.

### 3B. Analysis of The Dimensions of Religiosity

#### 1. Section A Frequencies

Our first result is the frequencies of the Section A responses. We will only report these here as they are the best single indicators of our dimensions, and as the other sections are quite long. See Appendix F for the frequencies of Sections C and F.

Table 3  
Percentages of Responses to the Section A Questions  
Represented by Their Corresponding Dimensions

		(Imp = Important)							
		*Most	Next	Very		Not	Least	Wght	Very
		Imp	Imp	Imp	Imp	Imp	Imp	mean	Imp +
<u>Dimension</u>									
a.	Devotional	17.4%	6.2	30.6	36.4	9.5	4.5	4.2	67.0
b.	Fellowship	9.1	14.1	30.3	42.7	5.4	2.9	4.3	73.0
c.	Intellectual	17.4	10.8	36.9	36.1	5.8	5.0	4.4	73.0
d.	Belief	4.1	4.1	15.4	33.6	19.5	16.6	3.2	49.0
e.	Ritual	6.6	8.3	23.2	43.2	9.6	7.9	3.8	66.4
f.	Personal Needs	6.2	12.8	31.5	41.5	4.1	2.5	4.2	73.0
g.	Experiential	6.1	5.6	25.7	33.5	13.9	6.5	3.7	59.2
h.	Aesthetics	3.3	7.1	24.5	36.9	10.0	13.7	3.5	61.4
i.	Ethical Advocacy	5.4	5.8	22.4	27.8	16.2	14.9	3.3	50.2
j.	Ethical Service	2.1	7.1	25.8	36.7	8.4	3.3	3.9	62.5

\* Most Imp = Most Important

Next Imp = Next Most Important

Not Imp = Not so Important or Not at all Important

Wght mean = Weighted mean

Very Imp + Imp = Combination of Very Important and Important

From the above table, we see that there is a wide variety of variation among the items. Several stand out including intellectual, fellowship, devotional, and personal needs; however, these do not overwhelmingly stand out, and there is significant representation in the "most" and "next most" important categories in all of the items. From these Section A items it appears that there is great diversity in the religiosity of the sample.

In addition, note the distribution of responses within each item. While the "Important" and "Very Important" answers have between 50% and 70% of the total responses, there is significant representation in the other categories. There is enough representation of categories to make distinctions between possible answers.

In reference to Appendix F, note that in Section C the highest priorities in programming are focused around meaningful worship and preaching, education and socialization for the youth, helping the needy, pastoral care in times of need, and encouraging respect for differing opinions. The least important tends to be around biblical and theological teachings as well as spirituality and devotional time.

In section F, by far the most desired pastoral role is the ability to provide a sense of vision for the congregation. Other important items include ministering to the sick, developing spirituality, social activism, and pastoral counseling. The least important are managing the buildings, making pastoral calls, and encouraging creativity of expression in worship. Interestingly, there is mixed support for leadership on justice and peace issues as there are high frequencies

on both the "most important" and "not at all important" responses for these questions.

### **3B. 2. Difference Between Dimensional Means**

Next is the comparison of total mean scores between dimensional scales developed from all of the sections A, C, and F questions. Since the scales have different numbers of items, they were first standardized so that the maximum is 60, which is an arbitrary number for convenience. Thus, the means given below can be compared to each other, as they represent the same scale. They are given in rank order by means.

**Table 4**  
**Standardized Mean Scores of Scales of Religiosity**

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Dimension</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1	Ritual	40.5
2	Personal support	39.8
3	Intellectual	39.5
4	Fellowship	37.4
5	Devotion	35.8
6	Social Action	34.8
7	Experiential	33.7
8	Aesthetics	33.4
9	Belief	31.9

In the sample, we find the "ritual," "personal support," and "intellectual" dimensions to be ranked the highest overall, and the "experiential," "aesthetics," and "belief" dimensions the lowest.

"Fellowship" also ranks relatively high in the list, and "social action" is somewhat low, although the mean differences on all these scales is low.

In looking at the population as a representation of the middle to upper professional and intellectual strata in our society, we find support for Weber's theory. According to Weber, we expect greater affinity for ritualism, intellectual scrutiny, and fellowship. In addition, Weber theorized low affinity for beliefs, experiences with the holy, devotion, and social action. These are generally true in our population.

The two exceptions to Weber's theory are a higher ranking for "personal support" and a midrange ranking for "devotion." These may be due to the older age of the population. It is possible that as people become older they have a greater need for personal and spiritual support. We will also explore other possible factors in the demographic analysis.

### **3B. 3. Open-ended Responses**

Throughout the survey there is a series of nine open-ended responses which were used by the planning committee. These were asked in addition to the closed-ended responses to further explore what was important to the respondents at Mychurch. Therefore, the responses were coded to match our religious dimensions, with a few others added in. We thought it helpful to mention the rank of



frequency of those responses related to our dimensions. We also added the category "openness and diversity" here because it was addressed so often. First, is a list of the questions used in this report. See Appendix A as well.

B3 What attracted you to Mychurch?

B5 What do you see as Mychurch's distinctive identity?

Combined sections C and E:

3. What strengths of Mychurch do you most want to see enhanced....

4. ...what changes are most needed in programs, worship, other...

5. Are there important aspects not now given attention to ....

6. If attendance at worship increased or decreased, why?

7. If involvement in church activities increased or decreased, why?

Next, in table 5, are the frequencies of responses to these questions.

Table 5  
Frequency of Open-Ended Responses as They  
Pertain to The Religious Dimensions

Questions	(attracted) B3	(identity) B5	(changes) C and E(combined)
total responses	483	306	704
1. devotional	1.24%	1.63%	4.69%
2. fellowship	13.66	7.19	8.66
3. intellectual	10.77	14.38	10.09
4. belief	1.24	0.65	5.40
5. ritual	2.07	1.31	7.95
6. personal support	3.11	2.29	7.10
7. experiential*	--	--	--
8. aesthetics	7.66	5.56	2.98
9. ethical advocacy	15.11	43.46	14.77
10. ethical service**	--	--	--
11. openness and diversity	11.39	14.71	5.40

\* Combined with devotion because of lack of response.

\*\* This dimension was combined with ethical advocacy because people did not make the distinction between the two in most cases.

B3 What attracted you to Mychurch?

B5 What do you see as Mychurch's distinctive identity?

Combined sections C and E:

3. What strengths of Mychurch do you most want to see enhanced....

4. ...what changes are most needed in programs, worship, other...

5. Are there important aspects not now given attention to ....

6. If attendance at worship increased or decreased, why?

7. If involvement in church activities increased or decreased, why?

In Table 5 it is clear that ethical advocacy, or social action, is by far the dimension most mentioned, followed by the intellectual and fellowship dimensions. We also have a high percentage of "openness and diversity" comments which was a category not incorporated in our dimensions. However, it is clearly an attitude that is important in the congregation. This sense of openness seems to be tied to the identity and vision of Mychurch and has played an important role since the 1960's. Interestingly, the experiential, devotion, and belief

dimensions were hardly mentioned, and personal support was quite low as well. These patterns are consistent throughout all of the questions.

In this analysis, there is still some support for Weber's theory. Intellectual challenge and fellowship are important, and the openness and diversity category fits into Weber's individualism of the intellectual elites. Also, the experiential, devotion, and belief categories are low as predicted.

The high ranking of social action is quite interesting. It is apparent that the social action identity of the 1960's and 1970's still exists, and is perceived as important today. However, this contradicts the relatively low ranking of social action in the closed-ended dimensions. Perhaps social action is still perceived as important as the church identity, but in comparison to other needs, individuals have other preferences. Maybe the past 10 years of conservatism have changed the religious orientations of individuals, but not the identity of the church itself.

This phenomenon may also suggest that social activism and intellectual quest are dimensions that are very salient in this congregation. Other needs may appear to take precedence in the close-ended questions, but as people write about their church identity and personal needs, these issues come to the forefront. It may be that they are almost taken for granted in the community and this emphasis is under-represented in the earlier questions.

### 3B. 4. Inter-Dimensional Analysis

From comparing dimension means, we move to the correlations between each dimension. Below is a simple correlation matrix with all of the scale relationships. The correlations were all computed using the "Pearson's r" correlation statistic.

Table 6  
Correlations Between Each Dimension

	Dev	Fel	Int	Bel	Rit	Sup	Exp	Aes	Soc
Dev	1.00								
Fel	.04	1.00							
Int	.06	-.08	1.00						
Bel	.52*	-.02	.18	1.00					
Rit	.23	-.12	-.04	.28*	1.00				
Sup	.21	.38*	-.13	.13	.16	1.00			
Exp	.51*	.07	.03	.39*	.24*	.18	1.00		
Aes	.09	.18	-.04	-.01	.19	.20	.07	1.00	
Soc	.00	.06	.11	.11	.03	.07	.17	.16	1.00

\* significant at the .001 level(two-tail)

Dev:	Devotional	Sup:	Support
Fel:	Fellowship	Exp:	Experiential
Int:	Intellectual	Aes:	Aesthetics
Bel:	Belief	Soc:	Social Action
Rit:	Ritual		

In looking at these inter-scale correlations there are some interesting results. First, there is significant relationships between all of the "Belief", "Devotion", "Experiential", and "Ritual" dimensions. Second, we find a relationship between "Fellowship" and "Personal

support." Third, there are no other relationships between any of the scales.

It is most interesting that the items of belief, devotion, experiential, and ritual are all related to each other. This suggests that there is a group in the population who are more "other-worldly" oriented. Note, too, that the belief, devotion, and experiential dimensions are all ranked low by the population in general. Therefore, we speculate this group is a minority in the population.

The other significant relationship is that between fellowship and personal support. Since neither of these correlate significantly with other dimensions, it appears that there is a distinct group of people for whom social and relational needs constitute a high priority in their church life. Also, this grouping is clearly distinct from the other worldly grouping described above.

In addition, we have the items of intellectual quest and social action. Neither one of these had significant relationships with any other item, and they are not strongly connected with each other. However, both of these items were given great mention in the open-ended responses. It is conceivable that they both represent distinct groups of people or at least distinct modes of religiosity. Given that, four distinct groupings emerge; the other-worldly, fellowship-personal support, intellectual quest, and social action. Thus, for the entire population sample we see a distinct diversity of religious needs.

The only item left is the aesthetic scale which does not correlate with anything nor was it ranked as important in either the

closed or open-ended measures. Thus, while it might be a distinct scale, it does not seem to be significant in the life of this particular church.

In reference to our theory, the belief, devotion, and experiential subgroup resembles Weber's "other-worldly" orientation. However, there is no clear grouping around his "this-worldly" orientation. All three of the other three groups might be considered this-worldly in focus. In addition, none of these groups correlate with each other and are thus distinct from each other. Thus, it appears that the diversity in our group is more complicated than what Weber's theory speaks to. One possibility is that most of the congregation shares a "this-worldly" focus amongst the three groups while there is a small "other-worldly" group that is in the minority.

We also find some resemblance of Marty's "two party" theory. The traditional grouping closely resembles his description of the "Private Protestants". However, it is not clear who the "Public Protestants" are. Perhaps all of the fellowship, intellectual, and social action groupings are basic varieties of the "Public Protestant" orientation just as they might represent a "this-worldly" view. Also, given the history of this particular church, it is probable that these dimensions may be salient in the population. The identity and characteristics of Mychurch in the 1970's resembles the "Public Protestant," and this identity is still important to a majority of the population. Again, we might have a minority group of "Private Protestants."

What is not clear at this point is the cause of this religious diversity. Why are there four groups that appear to be distinct in this congregation? Also, how do we have one group which seems to hold a minority religious world view? To start, we look at beliefs, SES, and demographic variables as possible indicators of this diversity.

### **3C. Analysis of Beliefs**

We now focus on the belief questions. The following are the questions asked with their perspective options and the percent choosing each option. Given is the percent of those who answered and not the percent of the total population.

Table 7  
Frequency of Religious Belief Orientations

1. Which of the following best expresses your belief about God?
  - 1.0% a. I do not believe in God.
  - 12.3 b. I really don't know what to believe about God.
  - 14.4 c. I do not believe in a creating and saving God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind.
  - 5.1 d. God is the creator of an orderly world, but does not now guide it or intervene in its course of affairs or the lives of individuals.
  - 7.7 e. Although God has and can act in history and communicate with persons directly, it is not something that happens very often.
  - 13.8 f. God is constantly at work in the world from "above" directing people, nations, and events.
  - 45.6 g. God is the world and is in every person, thing, and event.

( Note that 195 people, or 79.0%, responded to this question.)

2. Which of the following best expresses your belief about sin and salvation?
  - 10.8% a. Sin and salvation really don't have much meaning to me personally.
  - 23.6 b. Sin is a helpful way of talking about people's capacity to harm themselves and others, and salvation is a helpful way of talking about hope for a better future.
  - 38.9 c. I believe all people are inherently good, and to the extent sin and salvation have meaning to all, it has to do with people realizing or not realizing their human potential for good.
  - 6.9 d. Although people are sinful, all people participate in God's salvation regardless of how they live their life, even if they do not believe in God.
  - 17.2 e. All people are sinful but need only to believe in and ask for God's forgiveness to be saved.
  - 2.5 f. All people are sinful and if they are to be saved they must earn it through living a good life, devoted to God.

(Note that 203 people, or 82.2%, did respond to this question.)



In examining these frequencies, it is clear that question two has a broader distribution of responses. We also noticed that items f. and g. in question one might not be in the right order on an orthodoxy scale. Item f. appears to be more orthodox than item g. Rather than run correlations with each question, we opted to group responses around the following conceptual categories. The new frequencies for these categories are added as well.

Table 8  
Frequency of Religious Beliefs

Question 1			
13.3%	B1.	a,b:	Agnostic or Atheist
27.2	B2.	c,d,e:	This-Worldly Orientation
*40.5	B3.	B1 & B2:	God not Immanent
13.8	B4.	f:	Other-Worldly Orientation; God Active in History
45.6	B5.	g:	God Everywhere and in Everything
Question 2			
73.3%	S1.	a,b,c	Anti-Sin and Salvation
26.6	S2.	d,e,f	All People Are Sinful and Need Salvation

\*Note that B3 is a combination of B1 and B2.

First, there appears to be a relatively balanced split between those who do not believe God is Immanent and those who believe God is more active and present in the world. Fewer believe that God actually has a hand in the history of the world. From question two it is apparent that a majority of the people really do not operate with a traditional understanding of sin and salvation. This points to Weber's "this-worldly" orientation. There is, however, a significant group who do seem to have a more traditional understanding.

We now examine the relationships between these different beliefs and the dimensional scales.

Table 9  
Correlations of Beliefs With Religious Dimensions

	Agnostic- Atheist B1	This- Wordly B2	God Not Immanent B3	God Active B4	God All Over B5	Anti Sin/Sal. S1	Based On Sin-Sal. S2
Dev	-.06	*-.26	*-.27	.13	.11	-.13	.10
Fel	.01	-.05	-.04	-.03	.08	.10	-.10
Int	.15	.00	.10	-.17	.04	.15	-.14
Bel	-.05	-.22	*-.23	.06	.15	-.17	.19
Rit	.02	-.10	-.10	-.08	.08	-.08	.06
Sup	.03	-.06	.03	.01	.04	-.08	.06
Exp	.02	*-.30	*-.28	.02	.12	-.10	.09
Aes	.04	.03	.05	-.10	.08	.03	.02
Soc	-.11	-.10	-.16	-.11	.22	.14	.04
S1	.11	.20	*.25	-.21	.11		
S2	-.14	.01	-.10	*.36	.06		

\* Significant at the .001 level(two-tail)

Dev: Devotional  
Fel: Fellowship  
Int: Intellectual  
Bel: Belief  
Rit: Ritual

S1: Anti Sin/Salvation  
S2: Based On Sin/Salvation

Sup: Personal Support  
Exp: Experiential  
Aes: Aesthetics  
Soc: Social Action  
B1: Agnostic/Atheist  
B2: This-Worldly  
B3: God Not Immanent  
B4: God Active  
B5: God All Over

While looking at Table 9, it is clear that there are relatively few relationships between the dimensions and the belief variables. We do find negative correlations between both B2(This-Worldly) and B3(God not Immanent) and the devotion, belief, and experiential dimensions. This suggests that these three dimensions are

connected, and this connection has to do with not believing that God is not immanent. This, again, resembles Weber's "other worldly" focus. However, these dimensions only have weak positive correlations with B4(God Active) and B5(God All Over) which both give God more control and action in the world.

There is also a weak relationship between B5(God All Over) and social action. This is a bit of a surprise as B5(God All Over) is supposed to represent a more orthodox and "other worldly" position and social action is seen as a "this worldly" endeavor. Given these discrepancies, we have to question the accuracy of the B5(God All Over) question as a reflection of "other worldly" orientation.

The question two variables do not give us quite as strong relationships. The only correlations to report are weak relationships between S2(Pro Sin/Salvation) and belief, and S1(Anti-Sin/Salvation) and intellectual quest. These both support our "this worldly" and "other worldly" split, but are not really strong enough to carry much weight. Question two may have not been a good question for this population. Numerous respondents commented that sin and salvation were not even issues in the context of Mychurch. The lack of relationships here may also be related to a non-traditional understanding which is salient in the congregation.

Lastly, there are stronger connections between S1(Anti-Sin/Salvation) and B3(God not Immanent), as well as S2(Pro Sin/Salvation) and B4(God Active). These findings seem to be consistent with each other and reflect respondents on different sides of the orthodoxy continuum.

### 3D. Analysis of The Effects of Socio-Economic Status On Religiosity

In looking at these variables, we examined occupation, income, and education separately, and also combined them for a total SES score. See Appendix B for the frequencies of these variables. The following is the correlation table between these variables and the dimensions of religiosity.

Table 10  
Correlations Between SES Variables  
and The Dimensions of Religiosity

	Occupation	Income	Education	Socio-Economic Status
Devotion	-.16	-.22	-.12	-.21
Fellowship	-.02	-.07	-.14	-.08
Intellectual	.09	.15	.06	.11
Belief	-.01	-.10	-.09	-.08
Ritual	-.02	.09	-.05	.04
Personal Support	-.16	-.14	-.15	-.17
Experiential	.00	-.05	-.02	-.03
Aesthetics	.14	-.02	-.04	.09
Social Action	.09	-.05	.07	.04
B3(God n/Immanent)	.04	*.26	.15	.16
B4(God Active)	-.09	-.13	-.09	-.12
B5(God All Over)	.01	-.09	-.06	-.05
S1(Anti Sin/Salvation)	.17	.22	.19	.21
S2(Pro Sin/Salvation)	-.10	-.12	-.11	-.12

\* significant at the .001 level(two-tail)

SES: Socio-economic Status (A combination of occupation, income, and education.)

In reviewing the SES table above, clearly there are few strong relationships between the SES indicators and the dimensional scales. Income and total SES both have a weak negative relation with

devotion and personal support. Apparently, those with less money place a higher value on personal spirituality and devotion as well as personal support and care.

These findings do offer some support of Weber's general theory that lower SES status is associated with an "other-worldly" orientation. However, this is rather weak. First, it is interesting to note that the personal support dimension does not have a significant correlation with the devotion dimension.(see Table 6) Personal support is also more of a personal need rather than an "other-worldly" focus. Also, we find minimal relationships between the SES variables and the experiential or the belief dimensions, which are likely indicators of an "other worldly" focus. We also find minimal relationships between the SES variables and those variables that might be considered "this worldly" in focus such as social action or intellectual quest.

Beyond that, we find a stronger relationship between income and belief item B3, "God not immanent," as well as with S1 "anti sin and salvation." The belief of God acting in the world is less prevalent with the increase of income, even in this homogeneous population. In addition, we have weak positive relationships between all our SES variables and B1, "agnostic or atheist" as well as S1, "anti sin and salvation".

While somewhat weak, these relationships do support Weber's theory of social class and religiosity in regard to people's beliefs. Despite the homogeneity, we still see some variation of belief associated with income and SES. However, SES only explains a small

portion of our belief variety, and almost none of our dimensional variety. It is true that we expected little effect here because of our homogenous group. It may be significant that we found anything at all.

### **3E. Analysis of The Impact of Lifecycle Variables on Religiosity**

In regard to demographic variables we examined variables of age, gender, married or not, children or not, full time work, retired, and homemaker. The following is a correlation table between these variables and the dimensions:

Table 11  
Correlations Between Lifecycle Variables  
and The Dimensions of Religiosity

	<u>Age</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Employed</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Homemaker</u>
Devotional	-.01	-.07	-.32*	-.15	-.06	.15	-.07
Fellowship	-.14	-.12	.00	.21	.03	-.06	.02
Intellectual	.07	.06	.11	.01	.02	.07	-.01
Belief	.12	-.02	-.05	-.11	-.09	.07	-.01
Ritual	.20	-.12	-.07	-.21	-.01	.12	.02
Support	-.07	-.23*	-.08	-.05	-.13	.06	.05
Experiential	.07	-.19	-.06	-.03	-.11	.06	-.09
Aesthetics	.07	-.14	-.12	-.17	-.02	.09	-.02
Social Action	-.10	-.08	-.02	.03	-.01	-.09	.06
Occupation	-.17	.23	.07	.14	.35*	-.38*	-.10
Income	.00	.24*	.45*	.07	.35*	-.37*	-.01
Education	.30*	.34*	.12	.14	.24*	-.22	-.16
SES	n a	.32*	.24	.11	.39*	-.43*	-.08
B3(God N/Imm)	n a	.05	.19	.11	-.01	-.01	.08
B4(God Active)	n a	.03	.00	.04	-.07	.04	.00
B5(God All Ov.)	n a	-.03	-.06	-.04	.10	-.10	.02
S1(Anti S/S)	n a	.02	.16	.13	.09	-.15	.00
S2(Pro S/S)	n a	.06	-.03	-.07	-.05	.03	.04
Male	.05	1.00	.30*	-.02	.14	.06	-.18
Married	.22*	.30*	1.00	.12	.00	-.09	.06
Children	-.66*	-.02	.12	1.00	.23*	-.41*	-.02
Employed	n a	.14	.00	.23*	1.00	-.62*	-.24*
Retired	.63	.06	-.09	-.41*	-.62*	1.00	-.12
Homemaker	n a	-.18	.06	-.02	-.24*	-.12	1.00

\* significant at the .001 level(two-tail)

n a (We only did limited correlations with age.)

B3: God Not Immanent

B4: God Active

B5: God All Over

S1: Anti Sin/Salvation

S2: Based on Sin/Salvation

Deve  
Fell  
Inte  
Belh  
Ritu  
Sup  
Exp  
Aes  
Soer  
Occ  
Inc  
Edu  
SES  
B3(G  
B4(G  
B5(G  
S1(G  
S2(G  
Mal  
Mar  
Chi  
Emp  
Ret  
Hor

B3:  
B4:  
B5:  
S1:  
S2:



Table 11  
Correlations Between Lifecycle Variables  
and The Dimensions of Religiosity

	Age	Male	Married	Children	Employed	Retired	Homemaker
Devotional	-.01	-.07	-.32*	-.15	-.06	.15	-.07
Fellowship	-.14	-.12	.00	.21	.03	-.06	.02
Intellectual	.07	.06	.11	.01	.02	.07	-.01
Belief	.12	-.02	-.05	-.11	-.09	.07	-.01
Ritual	.20	-.12	-.07	-.21	-.01	.12	.02
Support	-.07	-.23*	-.08	-.05	-.13	.06	.05
Experiential	.07	-.19	-.06	-.03	-.11	.06	-.09
Aesthetics	.07	-.14	-.12	-.17	-.02	.09	-.02
Social Action	-.10	-.08	-.02	.03	-.01	-.09	.06
Occupation	-.17	.23	.07	.14	.35*	-.38*	-.10
Income	.00	.24*	.45*	.07	.35*	-.37*	-.01
Education	.30*	.34*	.12	.14	.24*	-.22	-.16
SES	n a	.32*	.24	.11	.39*	-.43*	-.08
B3(God N/Imm)	n a	.05	.19	.11	-.01	-.01	.08
B4(God Active)	n a	.03	.00	.04	-.07	.04	.00
B5(God All Ov.)	n a	-.03	-.06	-.04	.10	-.10	.02
S1(Anti S/S)	n a	.02	.16	.13	.09	-.15	.00
S2(Pro S/S)	n a	.06	-.03	-.07	-.05	.03	.04
Male	.05	1.00	.30*	-.02	.14	.06	-.18
Married	.22*	.30*	1.00	.12	.00	-.09	.06
Children	-.66*	-.02	.12	1.00	.23*	-.41*	-.02
Employed	n a	.14	.00	.23*	1.00	-.62*	-.24*
Retired	.63	.06	-.09	-.41*	-.62*	1.00	-.12
Homemaker	n a	-.18	.06	-.02	-.24*	-.12	1.00

\* significant at the .001 level(two-tail)

n a (We only did limited correlations with age.)

B3: God Not Immanent

B4: God Active

B5: God All Over

S1: Anti Sin/Salvation

S2: Based on Sin/Salvation

Table 11  
Correlations Between Lifecycle Variables  
and The Dimensions of Religiosity

	<u>Age</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Employed</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Homemaker</u>
Devotional	-.01	-.07	-.32*	-.15	-.06	.15	-.07
Fellowship	-.14	-.12	.00	.21	.03	-.06	.02
Intellectual	.07	.06	.11	.01	.02	.07	-.01
Belief	.12	-.02	-.05	-.11	-.09	.07	-.01
Ritual	.20	-.12	-.07	-.21	-.01	.12	.02
Support	-.07	-.23*	-.08	-.05	-.13	.06	.05
Experiential	.07	-.19	-.06	-.03	-.11	.06	-.09
Aesthetics	.07	-.14	-.12	-.17	-.02	.09	-.02
Social Action	-.10	-.08	-.02	.03	-.01	-.09	.06
Occupation	-.17	.23	.07	.14	.35*	-.38*	-.10
Income	.00	.24*	.45*	.07	.35*	-.37*	-.01
Education	.30*	.34*	.12	.14	.24*	-.22	-.16
SES	n a	.32*	.24	.11	.39*	-.43*	-.08
B3(God N/Imm)	n a	.05	.19	.11	-.01	-.01	.08
B4(God Active)	n a	.03	.00	.04	-.07	.04	.00
B5(God All Ov.)	n a	-.03	-.06	-.04	.10	-.10	.02
S1(Anti S/S)	n a	.02	.16	.13	.09	-.15	.00
S2(Pro S/S)	n a	.06	-.03	-.07	-.05	.03	.04
Male	.05	1.00	.30*	-.02	.14	.06	-.18
Married	.22*	.30*	1.00	.12	.00	-.09	.06
Children	-.66*	-.02	.12	1.00	.23*	-.41*	-.02
Employed	n a	.14	.00	.23*	1.00	-.62*	-.24*
Retired	.63	.06	-.09	-.41*	-.62*	1.00	-.12
Homemaker	n a	-.18	.06	-.02	-.24*	-.12	1.00

\* significant at the .001 level(two-tail)

n a (We only did limited correlations with age.)

B3: God Not Immanent

B4: God Active

B5: God All Over

S1: Anti Sin/Salvation

S2: Based on Sin/Salvation

Starting with age, we find a weak positive relationship with ritualism. Age also correlates positively with education, being retired, being married, and strongly with not having children; all which we might expect in a typical lifecycle. However, we did not find a relationship between age and income or occupation. This indicates that there may be a group of younger professionals in the population.

In considering gender, we find a relationship between being a woman and personal support, as well as a weak relation between being a woman and the experiential dimension. Being male correlates positively with the SES variables and also correlates highly with being married (0.30). ie Also, we earlier reported 20% more women than men and there are notably more widows than widowers in the population. It is apparent that we have a significant group of women in the population who are single. In addition we find women expressing a greater need for personal support than men. What we failed to check correlations with is a category of "single women."

In examining the variable of marital status, we find a strong negative relationship between singleness and income, a strong relationship between singleness and devotion, and a weak negative relationship between singleness and a perception of God not immanent in the world. Recall that devotion and income were negatively related which offers support to Weber's theory that lower income links with the need for "other worldly" support. With these new relationships between singleness and devotion we also have a

factor of social deprivation. Perhaps being single also gives people a need for "other worldly" support.

Interestingly, there was no relationship between singleness and personal support. This is true despite the fact that most of the single people are women and that being female is correlated with personal support and weakly with "Experiencing the Holy." Thus, being female seems to point toward personal support, while being single points towards a need for devotion.

With the presence of children in the household, we find a weak positive relationship with fellowship and a weak negative relationship with ritual. There is also a positive relationship with being employed. In addition, we find no relationship with gender or marital status. This suggests that there may be a number of single parents in the population, most of whom are females.

In examining the employment status of respondents, we find few relationships. Working full time correlates positively with the SES variables and also with having children. Being retired strongly correlates with not having children, which is to be expected, and also has weak positive relationships with both the devotion and ritual dimensions. Being a homemaker correlates with none of our variables except negatively with both being married and being employed. Overall, employment doesn't seem to be a strong predictor variable for much of our variance.

In summary, what we find most interesting in the lifecycle variables is the population of unmarried women. Being female is related to personal support, and being single is related to devotion.

Both of these are also negatively related to income. In addition, a significant number of these women may be single parents. It is this subgroup that may feel the most relative deprivation in the population. It is also this subgroup that has the most affinity towards personal support, a need for devotionism, and possibly experiencing the Holy in their lives.

### **3F. Analysis of Effects of Length of Attendance at Mychurch**

In looking at our theory of the historical developments of Mychurch, we created attendance variables to examine people's religiosity based on how long they have attended. We divided attendance in to three "cohort" groups:

- Cohort 1: Have attended more than 10 years. This group started when the leadership was still based on the social action orientation of the 1970's.
- Cohort 2: Have attended between 5 and 10 years. This is considered a transition group between the founding and the new leadership.
- Cohort 3: Have attended 0 to 4 years. This is how long the leadership at the time of the survey had been present.

The following table shows the correlations of these cohorts with the dimensional scales. Note that we also include the participation variables in this table as they will come up in the next analysis.

Table 12  
Cohort to Dimension and Participation to Dimension Correlations

	4 yrs or less cohort1	5-10 yrs cohort2	over 10 yrs cohort3	attendance	number of positions
Devotional	.04	-.07	.01	.26*	.10
Fellowship	.09	.00	-.08	.17	.29
Intellectual	-.01	-.05	.04	-.01	-.02
Belief	-.01	-.13	.10	.16	.05
Ritual	-.03	-.09	.10	.24*	.15
Personal Support	-.05	.12	-.04	.12	.09
Experiential	.00	-.07	.05	.16	.04
Aesthetics	-.11	-.08	.15	.19	.05
Social Action	-.07	-.01	.07	.01	.12
SES	-.21	.14	.09	-.11	-.03
B3(God N/Immanent)	-.12	.07	.05	-.08	.01
B4(God Active)	.10	-.01	-.01	.01	-.02
B5(God All Over)	.11	-.03	-.08	.13	.10
S1(Anti Sin/Sal)	-.10	.09	-.04	-.02	.03
S2(Based on Sin/Sal)	.08	-.12	.02	.07	.05
Male	.01	-.07	.04	.06	-.09
Married	.01	.02	-.02	.00	-.03
Children	.29*	.33*	-.49*	.00	.11
Employed	.14	.08	.19	.06	.06
Retired	-.25*	-.18	.35*	.02	-.05
Homemaker	.03	.04	-.06	-.03	.10
Attendance	.09	-.03	-.06		
Positions	-.17	.08	.09	.37*	

\* significant at the .001 level(two-tail)

attendance: average attendance at worship in past year

positions: total number of board, task force, or teaching positions

In examining relationships with the three cohort variables we find limited relationships. In fact, all of the relationships that we do find are related to age, children, and retirement as expected. There are no relationships with any of the dimensions and we do not see our theory of "cohorts" being supported with these results as they show no significant relationship to any variance.

These results suggest several possible options. First, even though the church image has changed over the years, individual needs in the past are similar to those today. Second, the needs of people in Cohort3 may have been different in the past, but have changed with the past decade of conservatism. Third, as the church offered a new and more conservative religiosity in the decade prior to the survey, only those in the older cohort who are comfortable with the new focus have remained. Lastly, peoples' needs may have been different in the past, but have changed with the aging of the church population. However, we don't observe much variance in the population on the basis of age. This might be interesting to pursue in further research.

### **3G. Analysis of Participation**

We will start with an overview of the participation section. See Appendix C for details in response rates. From the frequencies we see that most of the people who responded are active members. With nearly 80% attending worship at least twice a month and about

68% putting in at least some hours outside of worship, we have a congregation which is actively engaged in the activities offered by Mychurch. There appears to be more of a decrease in worship participation and about the same level of increase and decrease in other participation. There is also a significant number of people involved in church positions which is also an indication of congregational involvement. The impression is that many people are involved at least to some degree. However, with only 13% of the respondents spending over 11 hours per month on church activities, it is clear that a relatively few people are doing a lot of the work. This is probably true for many congregations across the country.

While it seems that the congregation is a relatively active one, this may be an indication of response bias. It is conceivable that active members are over-represented in our 56% response rate. Those who are not so active may have been less inclined to participate in the survey. While we have a wide range of people with different preferences in the church, we might lose some insights of those people who are unhappy with the direction or current emphasis of the church and thus no longer participate. It is our hope that they were inclined to respond in an attempt to bring about change in the church.

In looking at relationships between variables of participation and the dimensions, we do obtain some results. There is a positive relationship between frequency of worship attendance and devotionism (0.26) and ritualism (0.24). This suggests that people



with these priorities might be more inclined to regularly attend worship. There are no other relationships with this variable.

We also examined the total number of positions that respondents held. This variable only correlates with fellowship orientation (0.29) and frequency of worship attendance (0.37). The fellowship relationship may explain why people are involved in different positions. The total number of hours outside of worship is a related variable which only correlated with the frequency of worship (.27). It is apparent that people come to Mychurch and are involved regardless of lifecycle, beliefs, SES, employment status, or religious orientation. We also venture that those 13% who put in the most time probably have the most time available.

### **3H. Summary of Results**

From the scale construction analysis, along with the factor analysis, we established a series of nine religious dimensions which are relatively distinct and autonomous. Of those, the ritual, personal support, intellectual, and fellowship scales had the highest support in this congregation. In the open-ended responses social action, intellectual quest, and a category of openness and diversity were the most mentioned and most important items. Based on our importance ratings, interscale correlations, and the open-ended responses we found four clearly distinct and relatively autonomous modes of

religiosity which are incorporated in these nine dimensions. They are as follows:

1. belief/devotional/experiential/ritual or "other-worldly"
2. fellowship/personal support
3. intellectual quest
4. social action

Given these groupings within the response population, we did not find adequate explanation of this religious diversity from the predictor variables. We found no support from the length of attendance or participation variables. We found weak support from the SES variables and have concluded that the classical Weberian theory does not work well within this homogenous population.

The only source of variation that we found with any significance is in the prediction of the "other-worldly" grouping by social deprivation or marginality. This was evident in combinations of being female, single, and childless. Being single and childless tends to suggest a need for devotionism and ritual. Being female also points toward personal support and experiencing the Holy. At this point, we need further study to look at combinations of these three demographic variables.

#### 4. Conclusion

In conclusion, we have found this study to be quite interesting. Our population is a United Church of Christ congregation, "Mychurch," which is in a Midwest university town. The church was founded in the 1960's with a strong image of social action, intellectual quest, openness, and diversity. The congregation was and still is a relatively homogenous population on most demographic variables, with a majority of people in the upper levels of education, occupation, and income. To date, Mychurch has been able to keep its image of a social action, intellectual, and open congregation. However, things have also changed over the years and not everyone is in agreement about the life and mission of the church.

One source of change has been in the pastoral leadership of the congregation. While the previous leadership was focused on social action and learning, the most recent leadership has a more mainstream agenda with a focus on pastoral care, personal support, and beliefs. In addition, some of the people in the congregation have changed as they have moved through different stages in the lifecycle. Their values and agendas have shifted over the years. Also, people's political agendas, value systems, and lifestyles have changed with the American conservatism of the last two decades.

Another source of religious diversity has to do with the diversity of history of the people in the UCC and in this congregation.

Some have grown up in the UCC while others have come for refuge from more evangelical and/or traditional styles of Christianity. This historical diversity has created a range of expectations and desires.

In addition, we have reviewed Weber's classical approach of social class and religious needs, as well as Martin Marty's "Two-Party" theory based on differing historical trends in the U.S.. We have tested our results to these theories to see if they are relevant to this congregation.

To study the religious diversity and its possible sources at Mychurch, we developed nine distinct theoretical dimensions of religiosity with a series of items to measure them, some better than others. We find support for a multi-dimensional approach to religiosity, as all of the dimensions were found to be independent of each other. Those with the highest support are ritual, personal support, intellectual quest, and fellowship. In the open-ended questions the most mentioned were social action, intellectual quest, and openness and diversity. We also find four distinct religious groupings which are as follows:

1. belief/devotional/experiential/ritual or "other worldly"
2. fellowship/personal support
3. intellectual quest
4. social action

This gives us clear differentiation within our sample population. Of these, the "other worldly" grouping is the most contradictory of the image and mission of Mychurch. Until the arrival in the mid-1980's of a more traditional and belief oriented pastor, this church had a history of a low emphasis on beliefs and

doctrine. We found this to be true as we even had resistance to beliefs in sin and salvation. However, we still find here a distinct, yet minority, group of respondents who are "other worldly" in orientation. They place greater emphasis on devotionism, beliefs, experiences of the holy, and ritual, all of which correlate with each other.

With these groupings established, we tried to explain this variance and in particular this "other-worldly" group with the survey data. We found no support from our length of attendance or level of participation variables and only weak support from the SES variables. Basically, the classical Weberian theory does not work well within our homogenous population. It does fit better if we think of the congregation as a representation of the intellectual elites. As a whole the congregation fits the "this-worldly" focus with the exception of the minority "other-worldly" group. We do have some resemblance to both of Marty's Public and Private Protestants, although his explanation of this split does not seem to apply to this congregational situation.

The best source of this "other worldly" grouping that we found has to do with a sense of social marginality. This was most evident in respondents who are female, single, and/or childless. In different combinations these have an affinity with devotionism, ritual, personal support, and experiencing the Holy. At this point, we need further study of these three demographic variables.

In addition, other sources of religious diversity need to be explored further in this context. While we did not find much

val

cha

ha

the

att

ad

cha

at

if

It

div

rev

lea

for

our

res

the

stu

pos

rang

corr

we

Tab

either

variance in needs with length of attendance, we do believe that the change in leadership has some effect. Perhaps some people who have been there for years themselves have changed and welcomed the change in leadership. New people coming in might also be attracted to this new and more traditional style of ministry. In addition, we might examine changing political views as well as changes throughout the lifecycle. Also, it may be interesting to look at the religious histories of respondents to see which type of church, if any, they were socialized.

Clearly, we need to give greater attention to social marginality. It is here that we have the strongest evidence of a source of diversity and also possibly the strongest theoretical grounding. In reviewing Weber's analysis, he theorized that people who had the least social status and economic resources would have the most need for an "other worldly" orientation. While this was not the case in our population, we did find that people with the least social resources had "other worldly" needs. Perhaps social marginality has the same effect in this congregation as low social class did in Weber's studies. It might prove fruitful to further develop this theoretical position and then study marginality in this congregation.

Lastly, it is clear that we have a congregation that likes a broad range of program opportunities. While we did not have strong correlations between and with most of our dimensions of religiosity, we did find strong support for most all of the dimensions. From Table 3 we note that about three-quarters of the population marked either "Very Important" or "Important" for each of the fellowship,

intellectual, and personal support dimensions. In addition, two-thirds gave devotion, ritual, and social action the same higher rankings. Even belief, which has the lowest preference in this community, got high rankings by half of the people surveyed.

It is apparent that people might be religious on all of our religious dimensions with some of them more salient than others. Clearly, people in this population like a balanced mix, even though they might press different issues. Given the lack of definitive relationships between the dimensions and socio-economic status, lifecycles, and so on, this may indeed be the most notable finding in our study. Within this homogeneous population it is important for people to have balanced religious opportunities despite their own issues and preferences that they might push.



## **APPENDICES**

## APPENDIX A

Questions from sections A, C, and F and the corresponding code for each question.

A. What is important to you personally to you at Mychurch?

How do you rate the importance of these emphases to you personally?

<i>Very</i> <i>important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Somewhat</i> <i>important</i>	<i>Not so</i> <i>important</i>	<i>Not at all</i> <i>important</i>
4	3	2	1	0

- Aa. TDEVOTN helping me seek a more spiritual life through prayer, meditation, devotions.
- Ab. TFELLOW offering me fellowship and social relationships with others.
- Ac. TINTELL assisting me in my intellectual quest for truth, meaning, or Christian perspectives.
- Ad. TBELIEF strengthening belief in the biblical and theological teachings of the Christian faith.
- Ae. TRITUAL joining in the ritual of congregational worship services.
- Af. TSUPPORT caring for personal needs and crises of individuals and families in the congregation.
- Ag. TEXPERI providing experience of God or the sacred.
- Aj. TAESTHE experiencing the aesthetics of spiritual expression through music, architecture, other.
- Ah. TADVOCA providing ways for me to work for justice and peace at home and abroad.
- Ai. TSERVIC offering me ways to respond to the needy in our community/ world through service.

Now, among these statements above, write the letter of the one that to you is:

\_\_\_ most important                      \_\_\_ next most important                      \_\_\_ least important

## Appendix A (cont'd)

C. How important is each of the following aspects for the kind of church you believe Mychurch should be?

<i>Very</i> <i>important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Somewhat</i> <i>important</i>	<i>Not so</i> <i>important</i>	<i>Not at all</i> <i>important</i>	<i>Not</i> <i>Sure</i>
4	3	2	1	0	N
Ca. IWORSH	experiencing a meaningful Sunday morning worship service.				
Cb. ICHNED	offering a high quality religious educ. for K-8.				
Cc. ICHSED	offering a high quality religious educ. for high schoolers.				
Cd. INEWMEM	bringing new members into the church fellowship.				
Ce. ISERMON	listening to challenging and insightful sermons.				
Cf. IBELIEF	learning about the biblical teachings of the Christian church.				
Cg. ICIVILR	working in the society for the civil rights of all groups.				
Ch. IDEVOTN	finding a deeper spirituality through devotion and prayer.				
Ci. IENABLE	enabling members to minister to one another's needs.				
Cj. IENVMT	understanding and acting on our responsibility for environment as God's creation.				
Ck. IYTHGRP	providing young people with a meaningful social group within the church.				
Cl. IPLURAL	encouraging respect for differing opinions and beliefs in the congregation.				
Cm. INEEDY	taking action to help the needy in our community.				
Cn. IJPREF	offering reflection and study on key issues of justice and peace.				
Co. ITHEOLO	studying the theology of the Christian faith.				
Cp. ISUPPRT	offering pastoral counseling and support in times of personal and family crisis.				
Cq. ILAITY	encouraging and training laity to take leadership				
Cr. IGENDER	using gender-neutral and inclusive language in worship				
Cs. ISOACT	acting with others in the congregation to change unjust social conditions.				
Ct. IFELLOW	providing active social programs.				
Cu. ISPGROW	inspiring and assisting persons in their spiritual growth.				
Cv. IAESTHE	experiencing music, art, and architecture in the worship of God.				
Cw. IUCCMIS	supporting the wider missions of the UCC.				
Cx. ISMGRUP	providing small groups for study, prayer, or mutual ministry.				

Now, please review this list and circle the letters of the five items that you believe are most important for what Mychurch should be.

## Appendix A (cont'd)

## F. Roles of the Mychurch Clergy.

How do you personally rate the importance of the following responsibilities of the ordained clergy?

	<i>Very important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Somewhat important</i>	<i>Not so important</i>	<i>Not at all important</i>	<i>Not Sure</i>
	4	3	2	1	0	N
Fa. PSPIRIT	counsels people in the congregation about their spiritual growth and religious life.					
Fb. PDEVOTN	offers programs on spirituality through prayer, meditation, and devotion.					
Fc. PFELLOW	encourages fellowship among people in the congregation.					
Fd. PINTELL	offers programs on challenging and thought-provoking topics.					
Fe. PBIBLTH	leads biblical and theological programs on the Christian faith.					
Ff. PCOUNSL	provides pastoral counseling.					
Fg. PSICKDY	ministers to the sick, dying, and bereaved.					
Fh. PCALLS	makes pastoral calls in the homes or offices of members.					
Fi. PEXPERN	assists people in the congregation to experience God or the holy.					
Fj. PENCJP	encourages people to work for justice and peace at home and abroad.					
Fk. PLEAJP	assumes leadership role in congregation and community on justice and peace issues.					
Fl. PWORSHP	encourages creativity of expression in worship.					
Fm. PBOARDS	provides resources and organizes staff support to boards.					
Fn. PMANAGR	manages the use and maintenance of the grounds.					
Fo. PNEEDY	seeks to involve people to respond to the needy in community and world.					
Fp. PVISION	provides a vision for the direction of the congregation.					
Fq. PNEWMEM	seeks and visits new members.					
Fr. PCHSCH	works with church school.					
Fs. PCONFIR	conducts confirmation and new members' classes.					
Ft. PDENOM	promotes participation in denominational and ecumenical act.					
Fu. PYOUTH	works closely with youth and young adults.					
Fv. POTHER	any activity not mentioned.					

**Appendix A (cont'd)**

Now, among these clergy activities above, write the letter of the one that to you is:

\_\_\_ most important

\_\_\_ next most important

\_\_\_ least important

## Appendix A (continued)

### Religious Beliefs (with respondent choice percentages)

1. Which of the following best expresses your belief about God?
  - 1.0% a. I do not believe in God.
  - 12.3 b. I really don't know what to believe about God.
  - 14.4 c. I do not believe in a creating and saving God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind.
  - 5.1 d. God is the creator of an orderly world, but does not now guide it or intervene in its course of affairs or the lives of individuals.
  - 7.7 e. Although God has and can act in history and communicate with persons directly, it is not something that happens very often.
  - 13.8 f. God is constantly at work in the world from "above" directing people, nations, and events.
  - 45.6 g. God is the world and is in every person, thing, and event.
  
2. Which of the following best expresses your belief about sin and salvation?
  - 10.8% a. Sin and salvation really don't have much meaning to me personally.
  - 23.6 b. Sin is a helpful way of talking about people's capacity to harm themselves and others, and salvation is a helpful way of talking about hope for a better future.
  - 38.9 c. I believe all people are inherently good, and to the extent sin and salvation have meaning to all, it has to do with people realizing or not realizing their human potential for good.
  - 6.9 d. Although people are sinful, all people participate in God's salvation regardless of how they live their life, even if they do not believe in God.
  - 17.2 e. All people are sinful but need only to believe in and ask for God's forgiveness to be saved.
  - 2.5 f. All people are sinful and if they are to be saved they must earn it through living a good life, devoted to God.

## Appendix A (cont'd)

### Open-ended questions

What attracted you to Mychurch?

Do you feel Mychurch has a distinctive identity. If so, what is it?

What strengths of Mychurch do you most want to see enhanced in the years ahead?

What changes are most needed in Mychurch's programs, worship, and activities?

Are there aspects of your life that are not now given attention at Mychurch. If so, what are they?

If your attendance at worship has changed in the last few years, why?

If your involvement in church activities has changed in the last few years, why?

## APPENDIX B

Table 13  
Demographic Characteristics

1. age (in years)						
15-19	4.4 %	40-49	25.4 %	70-79	12.8 %	
20-29	2.4 %	50-59	18.5 %	80-86	2.0 %	
30-39	9.2 %	60-69	20.9 %			
2. gender	female	60.8 %	male	39.2 %		
3. marital status						
single	13.3 %	separated/divorced	8.0			
widowed	5.8	married/with partner	72.6			
4. members of household in age groups						
0-4 years	8.5 %	middle school	10.6	18-25 yrs	16.1	
elementary	21.2	high school	17.0			
5. highest level of formal education						
less than high school	3.3 %	college degree	12.8			
high school grad	1.2	some post-grad	10.3			
trade or vocational	0.0	masters/prof	36.8			
some college	11.6	doctorate	23.6			
6. principal employment						
retired	23.0 %	full-time employed	48.0			
full-time homemaker	4.1	part-time employed	14.3			
full-time student	5.7	laid off/unemployed	1.2			
part-time student	1.2					
7. occupation						
(NORC Occupational Prestige scores were used)						
8. approximate household income (before taxes)?						
under \$15,000	4.9 %	50,000-74,999	23.9			
15,000-24,999	7.5	75,000-99,999	19.5			
25,000-34,999	11.9	100,000-124,999	4.4			
35,000-49,999	19.9	125,000 or more	4.0			



## APPENDIX C

Table 14  
Marginal Frequencies of Participation Variables

1. attendance

2. member            yes 82.7%            no 17.3%

3. frequency of worship attendance(per year)

none(0)	0.8%	once a month(9)	8.7
once or twice/yr(2)	4.6	2 or 3 times a mo(23)	28.2
once/twice 3 mo(5)	6.6	every week(39)	51.0

(The per year numbers do not add up to a full year. This is because we subtracted for lower summer attendance.)

4. worship attendance changed?

increased 15.3%	same 56.8%	decreased 28.0%
-----------------	------------	-----------------

5. church positions in past 2 years:

elected or appointed board/committee	43.3%	Sunday school youth program	18.6%
voluntary task force work group/other	32.3%		

6. time per month on all church activities(excluding worship) in  
hours/month

0 hrs	32.0%	5-10hrs	31.2	31 or more	1.6
1-4hrs	23.5	11-30hrs	11.6		

7. participation increased or decreased?

increased 24.4%	remained the same 54.4%	decreased 21.2%
-----------------	-------------------------	-----------------

## APPENDIX D

Table 15  
Item to Item Correlations in Each Religiosity Scale

(See Appendix A for descriptions of the variables.)

### Social Action

	TADVOCA	ICIVILR	INEVMNT	IJPREF	ISOCACT
TADVOCA	1.00				
ICIVILR	.64	1.00			
IENVMNT	.33	.45	1.00		
IJPREF	.60	.52	.47	1.00	
ISOCACT	.67	.68	.48	.62	1.00
PENCJP	.64	.57	.39	.52	.57
PLEAJP	.54	.51	.41	.49	.58
TSERVIC	.50	.55	.30	.37	.48
INEEDY	.44	.56	.34	.38	.46
PNEEDY	.40	.45	.36	.41	.41

### Social Action (continued)

	PENCJP	PLEAJP	TSERVIC	INEEDY	PNEEDY
PENCJP	1.00				
PLEAJP	.60	1.00			
TSERVIC	.32	.28	1.00		
INEEDY	.39	.31	.55	1.00	
PNEEDY	.46	.37	.38	.47	1.00

### Aesthetics

	TAESTHE
IAESTHE	.73

### Belief

	TBELIEF	IBELIEF	ITHEOLO	PBIBLTH
TBELIEF	1.00			
IBELIEF	.54	1.00		
ITHEOLO	.41	.61	1.00	
PBIBLTH	.39	.44	.49	1.00

## APPENDIX D (CONT'D)

Table 15 (cont'd)

**Devotion**

	TDEVOTN	IDEVOTN	ISPGROW	PDEVOTN
TDEVOTN	1.00			
IDEVOTN	.51	1.00		
ISPGROW	.35	.42	1.00	
PDEVOTN	.40	.49	.25	1.00

**Fellowship**

	TFELLOW	IYTHGRP	IFELLOW	PFELLOW
TFELLOW	1.00			
IYTHGRP	.33	1.00		
IFELLOW	.54	.43	1.00	
PFELLOW	.30	.27	.36	1.00

**Experiential**

	TEXPERI
PEXPERN	.51

**Personal Support**

	TSUPPORT	IENABLE	ISUPPRT	PCOUNSL	PSICKDY
TSUPPORT	1.00				
IENABLE	.46	1.00			
ISUPPRT	.22	.19	1.00		
PCOUNSL	.14	.21	.50	1.00	
PSICKDY	.20	.21	.29	.37	1.00

## APPENDIX D (CONT'D)

Table 15 (cont'd)

**Intellectual**

	TNTELL	ISERMON	PINTELL
TNTELL	1.00		
ISERMON	.30	1.00	
PINTELL	.34	.25	1.00

**Ritual**

	TRITUAL
IWORSH	.35

## APPENDIX E

Table 16  
Results of Religiosity Scale Factor Analyses

Using the Principal-Components Analysis (PC) and the Varimax Rotation.

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Eigenvalue</u>	<u>Pct. of Var.</u>	
1	5.60	17.0%	
2	4.37	13.2	
3	3.10	9.4	
4	1.93	5.8	
5	1.80	5.5	
6	1.43	4.3	
7	1.21	3.7	
8	1.10	3.3	
9	1.02	3.1	Total: 65.4%

## APPENDIX E (CONT'D)

Table 16 (cont'd)

Variables by thematic groupings	Factor (minus sign indicates a negative loading)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
TDEVOTN	.22-	.38	.16-	.30	.01	.21	.14-	.21	.34-
IDEVOTN	.01	.60	.12-	.39	.06	.31	.13-	.30	.13-
ISPGROW	.08	.28	.10	.32	.17	.30	.04	.62	.01
PDEVOTN	.06	.56	.01	.22	.08	.15	.08	.02	.30-
TFELLOW	.09	.05	.77	.01	.05	.12	.10	.06	.07
IYTHGRP	.11	.05	.67	.09	.05	.07	.04	.17	.11
IFELLOW	.08	.05	.79	.01	.08	.07	.09	.05	.16
PFELLOW	.05	.02	.63	.06	.09	.18	.03	.12-	.37-
TINTELL	.05	.18	.15-	.06	.07	.12-	.62	.52	.05
ISERMON	.03	.06	.12-	.02	.01	.04	.76	.07	.09
PINTELL	.11	.11	.18	.16-	.08	.04	.66	.05	.42-
TBELIEF	.05	.69	.17-	.18	.07	.01	.02	.14-	.08
IBELIEF	.00	.80	.00	.19	.03	.09	.04	.04	.03
ITHEOLO	.18	.78	.11	.09	.04	.03	.14	.13	.01
PBIBLTH	.08	.73	.07	.04	.03	.06	.11	.01	.20
TRITUAL	.06	.29	.17-	.18	.40	.13	.10-	.42-	.25
IWORSH	.03	.25	.30-	.40	.12	.02	.33	.40-	.11
TSUPPORT	.07	.11	.20	.02	.02	.70	.08	.06	.16
IENABLE	.07	.09	.30	.15	.01	.68	.12-	.21	.03
PSICKDY	.12-	.09	.22	.05	.15	.21	.02	.03	.70
TEXPERI	.14	.16	.10	.79	.02	.10	.08	.00	.01
PEXPERN	.03	.30	.02	.73	.02	.04	.13-	.10	.04
TAESTHE	.15	.06	.14	.06	.88	.00	.06	.07	.05
IAESTHE	.07	.02	.13	.02	.88	.01	.02	.11	.12
TADVOC	.82	.00	.15-	.04	.08	.03	.03	.07	.11-
ICIVILR	.82	.02	.00	.01	.06	.19	.01	.00	.09-
IJPREF	.73	.18	.03	.01	.15	.02	.13	.28	.10-
ISOCACT	.84	.09	.07	.05	.08	.02	.06	.10	.01
PENCJP	.77	.06	.03	.28	.05	.14-	.11	.06	.04
PLEAJP	.73	.01	.07	.05	.11	.28-	.04	.02	.03
TSERVIC	.64	.04	.04	.11	.06	.43	.09	.02	.01
INEEDY	.67	.00	.04	.05	.06	.41	.11-	.02	.01
PNEEDY	.62	.03	.12	.07	.14	.11	.09	.06	.09

## APPENDIX F

Table 17  
Frequencies of Section C (Program Preferences)

### Section C

Note: To simplify this table we only report the frequencies of the items circled "most important", those marked "most important," "very important," and "not so or not at all important." Also, we report the weighted means for each variable.

<u>Question</u>		<u>Most</u> <u>important</u>	<u>Very</u> <u>important</u>	<u>Not so/</u> <u>Not at</u> <u>all</u> <u>important</u>	<u>Weighted</u> <u>Mean</u>
Ca.	IWORSHP	50.4%	67.8%	1.7%	4.2
Cb.	ICHNED	36.8	60.3	2.2	3.9
Cc.	ICHSED	22.5	53.2	2.2	3.6
Cd.	INEWMEM	8.2	22.9	6.5	3.0
Ce.	ISERMON	30.6	52.3	1.3	3.8
Cf.	IBELIEF	5.2	19.8	12.5	2.7
Cg.	ICIVILR	10.0	30.3	9.1	3.0
Ch.	IDEVOTN	7.7	24.5	9.8	2.8
Ci.	IENABLE	15.6	34.2	5.6	3.2
Cj.	IENVMNT	10.7	32.0	6.6	3.1
Ck.	IYTHGRP	21.6	42.2	2.2	3.4
Cl.	IPLURAL	24.9	52.8	9.0	3.7
Cm.	INEEDY	20.9	42.1	2.1	3.6
Cn.	IJPREF	8.6	22.4	7.8	2.8
Co.	ITHEOLO	3.0	16.5	12.5	2.6
Cp.	ISUPPRT	23.8	48.9	1.3	3.7
Cq.	ILAITY	1.8	17.0	11.6	2.6
Cr.	IGENDER	6.0	17.7	42.2	2.0
Cs.	ISOACT	10.4	24.8	9.1	2.9
Ct.	IFELLOW	10.8	22.8	9.1	2.9
Cu.	ISPGROW	13.0	29.6	5.7	3.2
Cv.	IAESTHE	8.5	23.0	8.5	2.9
Cw.	IUCCMIS	5.8	12.4	11.9	2.5
Cx.	ISMGRUP	5.6	22.1	6.5	2.8

## APPENDIX F (cont'd)

Table 18  
Frequencies of Section F (Clergy Roles)

Note: In this table we include the categories "most/next most important," "very important," "not so/not at all important," and the weighted means.

Question		Most/ Next Most Important	Very Important	Not at All Important	Not so/ Weighted Mean
Fa.	PSPIRIT	11.5%	38.5%	3.5%	4.3
Fb.	PDEVOTN	6.5	26.2	4.4	4.0
Fc.	PFELLOW	7.7	32.9	3.4	4.2
Fd.	PINTELL	13.0	32.3	6.0	4.2
Fe.	PBIBLTH	5.6	24.5	6.0	3.9
Ff.	PCOUNSL	10.7	51.3	2.2	4.5
Fg.	PSICKDY	15.1	66.5	0.0	4.8
Fh.	PCALLS	1.3	16.7	19.3	3.3
Fi.	PEXPERN	19.0	26.2	11.3	4.1
Fj.	PENCJP	10.4	27.0	6.9	4.0
Fk.	PLEAJP	5.7	20.5	10.5	3.6
Fl.	PWORSHP	5.6	24.8	14.4	3.6
Fm.	PBOARDS	3.2	17.6	8.6	3.7
Fn.	PMANAGR	0.9	4.5	42.8	1.9
Fo.	PNEEDY	12.9	29.6	4.3	4.1
Fp.	PVISION	37.4	59.5	3.4	5.0
Fq.	PNEWMEM	3.0	18.8	10.0	3.7
Fr.	PCHSCH	0.8	19.0	6.9	3.7
Fs.	PCONFIR	1.3	34.2	3.5	4.0
Ft.	PDENOM	2.2	22.8	8.4	3.6
Fu.	PYOUTH	3.5	26.0	4.3	3.9



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Babbie Earl

1989 The Practice of Social Research. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Berger, Peter et. al

1986 Liberal Protestantism. New York: The Pilgrim Press.

Bhormstedt, George W., and David Knoke

1988 Statistics for Social Data Analysis. Itasca, IL: Peacock Publishers.

Carroll, Jackson W., and Carl Dudley, and William McKinney

1985 Handbook for Congregational Studies. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Carmines, Edward G., and Richard A. Zeller

1979 Reliability and Validity Assessment. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Clayton, Richard R., and James W. Gladden

1974 "The five dimensions of religiosity: Toward demythologizing a sacred artifact." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 13:135-143.

Cornwall, Marie, and Stan Albrecht

1986 "The Dimensions of Religiosity: A Conceptual Model With an Empirical Test." Review of Religious Research 27:226-243.

Davidson, James D.

1975 "Glock's model of religious commitment: Assessing some different approaches and results." Review of Religious Research 16:83-93.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (cont'd)

Davidson, James D., and Dean D. Knudsen

1977 "Socio-economic Status and Ten Dimensions of Religious Commitment." *Sociology and Social Research* 61:462-485.

1977 "A New Approach to Religious Commitment" *Sociological Focus* 10:151-173.

Faulkner, J.E., and Gordon DeJong

1966 "Religiosity in 5-D: An empirical analysis." *Social Forces* 45:246-254.

Glock, Charles Y., and Benjamin Ringer, and Earl Babbie

1967 *To Comfort and To Challenge*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Glock, Charles Y., and Rodney Stark

1965 *Religion and Society in Tension*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

1968 *American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hoge, Dean R., and Jeffrey L. Faue

1973 "Sources of Conflict Over Priorities of the Protestant Church" *social Forces* 52:178-194.

Hoge, Dean R.

1976 *Division in the Protestant House*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Kerlinger, Fred N.

1986 *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. New York: CBS College Publishing.

Kersten, Lawrence K.

1970 *The Lutheran Ethic*. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (cont'd)

King, Morton B

- 1967 "Measuring the Religious Variable: Nine Proposed Dimensions." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 6:173-185.

King, Morton B., and Richard A. Hunt

- 1972 "Measuring the Religious Variable: Replication." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 11:240-251.

- 1975 "Measuring the Religious Variable: National Replication." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 14:13-22.

Lenski, Gerhard

- 1963 *The Religious Factor*. (revised edition) Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Marty, Martin E.

- 1970 *Righteous Empire*. New York: The Dial Press.

McAllister, Ian

- 1983 "Religious Commitment and Social Attitudes in Ireland." *Review of Religious Research* 25:3-20.

Mueller, G. H.

- 1980 "The Dimensions of Religiousity." *Sociological Analysis* 41:1-24.

Niebuhr, Richard H.

- 1929 *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*. New York: Works Publishing.

Norusis, Marija J.

- 1988 *The SPSS Guide to Data Analysis for SPSS*. Chicago: SPSS Inc.

Singleton Royce Jr.

- 1988 *Approaches to Social Research*. Oxford University Press.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293014051837