

**Author(s):** Leege, David C., Lyman A. Kellstedt, and Kenneth D. Wald

**Title:** Religion and Politics: A Report on Measures of Religiosity in the 1989 NES Pilot Study

**Date:** February 1990

**DataSet(s):** 1988 National Election Study, 1989 Pilot Study

**Keywords:** Participation, Political Information, Religion

---

## **Abstract**

Leege, Kellstedt, and Wald discuss the 1989 Pilot Study experimental measures of religiosity. The authors find that the branching scheme used to measure denominational affiliation in the Pilot Study seems to make interviewers more sensitive to distinctions within religious sects, resulting in more accurate religious classifications than traditional measures. In addition, the authors' analysis indicates that the experimental measures uncover a connection between religion and partisanship that is disguised by the imprecision of the traditional NES measure. Leege, Kellstedt, and Wald also examine the Pilot Study and 1988 NES items designed to assess a respondent's level of commitment to organized religion. They find that the traditional measures overstate attachment to religious institutions. Moreover, the additional Pilot Study questions allow for much greater sensitivity of measurement of the relationship between religion and political participation. The Pilot Study also included measures of cue-giving by denominational leaders. Leege, Kellstedt and Wald find that perceptions of cue giving differ by issue, denominational family, and frequency of presence at religious services. The information obtained through the Pilot Study, however, is not complex enough to determine whether cue giving affects the political attitudes of religious adherents. The authors recommend retaining the cue-giving sequence, but argue that measures of cue direction should be added. Finally, Leege, Kellstedt, and Wald examine and rank a number of other items relating to religious exposure and participation, such as measures of church attendance and self-identification as a "Born Again" Christian. The authors prepared a supplemental report, which provides further support for adopting the experimental Pilot Study measures of religious preferences. Leege, Kellstedt, and Wald find that the new codes and "religious family" designations more accurately reflect modern religious affiliation patterns. These more sensitive measures can better uncover different patterns of political behavior, both within and across denominations. Moreover, the Pilot Study filters reduce error in the measurement of the proportion of people who claim a religious preference. The authors conclude by proposing specific question formats and coding schemes for the 1990 National Election Study.

**RELIGION AND POLITICS:  
A Report on Measures of Religiosity  
in the 1989 NES Pilot Study**

by

**David C. Leege  
University of Notre Dame**

**Lyman A. Kellstedt  
Wheaton College**

**Kenneth D. Wald  
University of Florida**

An early version of this paper was prepared for the National Election Studies Board of Overseers and presented at its meeting on March 1-3, 1990 in Phoenix, AZ. The revisions reflected in the current paper have been prepared for the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 5-7, 1990. Since the process of developing appropriate measures of religiosity for research on political behavior is continuous, discussion and comments are welcome.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

<u>Variable Number and Name</u>	<u>Discussed in Report, Page</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1989: V8205-V8222 and Religious Preference Master Code (current denominational affiliation) 1988: V1211	Pp. 2-10	Retain the 1989 branching scheme for 1990 and biennial studies, continue to modify it and train interviewers/coders in it. Delete the 1988 version.
1989: V8202, V8223-V8224, V8301-V8354. (multiple denominational affiliation/attendance)	P. 11	Do not retain this sequence.
1989: V8134-V8151 (childhood denominational affiliation)	Pp. 12-14	Retain the 1989 branching scheme and apply it to childhood denominational affiliation.
1989: V8152-V8160, V8225-V8228, V8233-V8238, V8229-V8232, V8238-V8242 (church trait classification and self-identification on traits)	Pp. 15-21	Less is learned from these measures. May provide new politically-relevant information for Catholics, but the strength of the branching scheme and retention of cue-giving items could render them less essential for Protestants. Retain in 1990 only if space permits. Research community may want to reopen issue in 1992.
1989: V8201-V8204 V8356-V8358, V8360-V8362 1988: V1214-V1215 (frequency of attendance, other church activities)	Pp. 21-32	Retain V8201, V8203, & V8204 as filters, V8356 & V8358 to gauge attendance, and V8360-V8362 to measure other activities, but modify the last (see below).

<u>Variable Number and Name</u>	<u>Discussed in Report, Page</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1989: V8243 1988: V1213 (born again)	Pp. 33-34	Retain V8243, if only one measure can be retained. If two are permissible, use V8243 in pre and V1213 in post.
1989: V8645 1988: V5937 (Biblical literalism)	Pp. 35-36	Retain V8645. Do not use V5937.
1989: V8356/V8358 V8357(experiment) 1988: V1214/V1215 (church attendance)	Pp. 36-38	Retain V8356/V8358 or V1214/V1215. Do not use V8357.
1989: V8359 (membership)	P. 38	Retention of V8359 is a lower priority than retention of V8201, V8202, V8204, and V8360.
1989: V8360-V8362 (participation in other religious organizations)	Pp. 38-39	Retain V8360-V8362 but modify wording.
1989: V8646-V8650 (non-institutional religious devotionalism: private prayer, monitoring religious print news, Bible reading, evangelicalism, religious TV watching)	Pp. 39-40	Retain V8646-V8650 but contract categories differentially on each, incorporating some features of the 1988 wording (see below)
1988: V1216 (religious radio/TV) V5938 (private prayer)		

<u>Variable Number and Name</u>	<u>Discussed in Report, Page</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1989: V8648/V8651 1988: V1216/V1217 (religious TV)	Pp. 40-41	Retain V8648/V8651 in package of private devotional items, but reduce the number of response categories.
1989: V8646 1988: V5938 (private prayer)	P. 41	Retain the 1988 version (V5938), but insert "on your own" before response categories.
1988: V5935/V5936 (religious salience)	Pp. 41-42	Retain both items.
1989: V8637-V8644 (cue-giving)	Pp. 42-47	Retain the cue-giving items, but consolidate V8638 and V8640, and add directionality to it and V8639.

## Introduction

As the scholarly field of survey measurement and public opinion polling developed, researchers conventionally collected face sheet information -- age, sex, race, education, urban-rural locale, occupation, religion, etc. Essentially pre-theoretical, the inclusion of face sheet variables was apparently based on the assumption that such sociocultural classifications would prove useful, whatever the research endeavor (Converse, 1968). Indeed as Converse's Strathclyde paper points out, four of them -- social status, religion, urban-rural residence, and region -- formed the basis of the critical socio-political cleavages in the Western democracies analyzed comparatively in Party Systems and Voter Alignments (Lipset and Rokkan, 1967). In the field of American voting behavior, by default three of them -- social status, religion, and urban-rural residence -- formed a useful predictive measure for voter choice in the 1940 election study (Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet 1948). Based on the 1960 NES, Converse (1966) showed that a clever juxtaposition of such variables, particularly several measures of religion reinforced by ethnicity, could untangle support and opposition to Sen. Kennedy's presidential bid.

Since then, varying numbers of religiosity items have appeared on NES instruments. The research community, however, has never made a strong argument to the principal investigators or the Board of Overseers for the utility, modification, addition or deletion of batteries of religiosity items. A classification scheme for denominations has survived from the early 1960's at the same time that there has been massive segmentation and accretion in churches. While sociologists stressed the multidimensional nature of religious commitment, suggesting different modes of religious influence on secular behavior (Glock and Stark 1965; King and Hunt 1972), the NES largely equated "religiosity with church attendance. In a period of extraordinary dynamism marked by unprecedented levels of religious switching and apostasy, questions about religious preference were keyed only to respondents' identity at the time of the survey. In short, there were problems with the measures of religiosity.

Most importantly for the NES, both sociologists of religion and political scientists were developing experience with many measures of religiosity -- an agenda set already by Converse in his 1968 Strathclyde working paper -- and were able to assess the consequences of alternate measures. A brief memorandum from Leege to the NES Board of Overseers (January 27, 1989) chronicled advances by the research community in relating religiosity measures to political outcomes. The Board and staff had earlier shown their receptivity to this line of inquiry when (1) the Board encouraged experimentation with what has come to be known as the "moral traditionalism" index (Conover and Feldman 1986), and (2) staff expressed concern over the increasing inability to classify respondents' denominational affiliations. The Board commissioned a Working Group on Religious Measures including the three authors of this report and Wade Clark Roof (then of University of Massachusetts). The Working Group met with Santa Traugott to develop measures for the 1989 Pilot Study, made the case for such measures with the Pilot Study Committee, and once most were adopted, has worked with Traugott and Giovanna Morchio on instrumentation, field, and coding problems.

This report differs from the usual format of pilot study reports because its tasks were broader than devising a new scale or modifying stimuli. The Working Group sought (1) to provide greater precision in the measurement of religiosity, (2) to compare the utility of alternate measures of religiosity, both in terms of their measurement properties and their ability to provide new information relevant to understanding political behavior and attitudes, and (3) to provide early reconnaissance of the "translation mechanisms" that enhance or diminish the linkage between religious commitment and political behavior. The last task is grounded in a state-of-the-discipline piece that uses religion as an illustration for cultural theories of American political behavior (Leege, Lieske, Wald 1990).

The 1989 NES pilot survey provided a welcome opportunity to test new variables, to introduce refinements, and to experiment with variations on traditional measures. The results of these experiments will be of great interest to members of the research community who work on religion and politics. Though NES data have permitted some scholarly work (Lopatto 1985; Miller and Wattenberg 1984; Knoke 1974, 1976), gaps in the measurement of religion have forced many to explore their interests either by collecting original data (e.g., Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life, Evangelical Voter Survey, Connecticut Mutual Survey, Times-Mirror surveys, congregational surveys in Oregon, Florida and Indiana, surveys of PAC contributors) or by relying on data in surveys with minimal political content (such as the GSS and specially commissioned Gallup polls on evangelicalism). The payoff for these new measures will also be felt by scholars of political behavior who wish to utilize religion as a way to understand such disparate theoretical approaches as reference groups, contextual effects, ethnocultural models, symbolic politics, social influence processes, social identification theory and the like. Finally, new information yielded by this experiment will enhance the work of those who wish to understand the place of confessional influences in the formation of mass political coalitions (Lipset and Rokkan 1967; Petrocik 1981). As Leege stressed in his initial memorandum seeking formation of the Working Group, the new measures must be judged not by their contributions to the sociology of religion, but by how well they address concerns common to students of American political behavior. That has been the standard guiding our evaluation of the new religion items included on the 1989 Pilot Study.

The format of this report typically is to identify a problem, assess alternate religious measures and their political implications, and offer a recommendation for future NES instruments. By far the most nagging problem in the research community is the measurement of denominational affiliation. Experience with a new branching scheme is described. That clean classification has consequences for politics is shown in two case studies and a series of analyses of variance. Efforts to enhance the meaning of denominational affiliation through a series of church traits and self-identifications, however, show mixed utility. The report then turns to measures of religious involvement, offering a more precise estimate of the extent of secularism, and capturing an extended range of religious commitment through a scale. Next the consequences of a variety of wordings for items is reviewed. These include doctrinal, devotional and exposure measures. Finally, we examine altogether new measures on political cue-giving by local religious leaders.

### Measuring Denominational Affiliation

Our primary objective in devising the 1989 Pilot Study denominational branching scheme and mastercode was to maximize specificity. If the denomination is recorded and coded accurately, the scholar can later impose whatever combinations are appropriate to the analysis. For a variety of reasons to be elaborated below, we believe that the new method of eliciting religious identification and the associated mastercode of religious preference are the most valuable innovations introduced on the Pilot Study. We recommend their retention on future NES waves.

By 1987, building pressures from sociologists of religion encouraged the General Social Survey to expand the range of categories and probes that could capture identification with new religious groups, especially in the evangelical sector and in community churches. The Working Group sought the same objective in the 1989 Pilot Study, but with important differences from the GSS approach. Our instrumentation for the measurement of denominational affiliation is illustrated in the filter sequence V8201-V8204, the specific denomination questions and probes V8205-V8221, and the summary mastercode V8221 (Religious Preference Mastercode appended, demonstrating the differences between 1988 and 1989; 1988 mastercode also appended, as well as other 1988 religiosity measures).

A number of contrasts between GSS since 1984, NES 1988, and NES 1989 Pilot Study can be drawn. GSS offers three religious preference codes to the analyst; we offer one, but ours has all the level of generality in their three codes, avoids perhaps more misclassification of religious families (Baptists, Lutherans, and the like), and yields an accurate and unique code for the specific denomination (Southern Baptist Convention, Cumberland Presbyterians, etc.). GSS codes Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, other, and none as one variable; then, the major Protestant denominations are a second variable; and the smaller Protestant and non-traditional Protestants are coded in a third (Smith 1986). The result, while improved over pre-1984 GSS codes, is still a substantial amount of error; for example, the "non-denominational Protestant" churches, a major growth category, still mix Heinz 57-variety Christians (e.g., "Protestants" who attend no church and have no religious preference) with charismatics and evangelicals, and Mormons are classified as fundamentalists. When contrasted with pre-1988 NES, our new code offers a wider range of specific denominations, sorts through independent local churches and larger denominations, groups families according to current beliefs and practices, thereby avoiding a classification scheme rooted either in 16th century schisms or unidimensional assumptions about 20th century fundamentalism.

By pursuing a unique classification through branching questions that tease out both differences in local/national affiliation and orientation of the local congregation, we can offer analysts the kind of case classification that is more sensitively matched to political differences. This point is illustrated in a moment with Lutherans and Pentecostals. Further, when a respondent is unable to specify beyond, for example, a generic religious family like Lutheran or Presbyterian to Missouri Synod Lutheran or Cumberland Presbyterian, she is assigned to the generic religious family code. Although at this point we have not completed the analysis, our hypothesis is that "generic" respondents, regardless of religious family, are likely to be only nominally involved with religion; they attend church



at lower rates than other respondents (Chi-square significant at  $<.05$ ).

In some of our analyses, we have gone beyond the precise denominational categories (Augustana Lutheran, Reformed Zion Union Episcopal, Church of God-Cleveland, TN) and recombined them by religious denominational family (e.g., Lutheran, Methodist, Pentecostal, etc.), and by religious tradition (e.g., within Protestantism, the categories Evangelical, Moderate, and Liberal, the latter two of which are often called non-Evangelical or Mainline).

When we compare the 494 individuals who were interviewed in Wave 2 of the Pilot Study with their responses ten months earlier in 1988, a number of interesting findings emerge. It is very difficult to estimate the discrepancies between 1988 and 1989 in terms of the specific denominational codes. Much of the earlier code did not provide the kind of specificity desired. However, the case studies on Lutherans and Pentecostals show that there is a great deal of difference in the way individuals were coded in 1988 and 1989. Most of these differences, we feel, can be attributed to problems with probing and later attendant coding errors, rather than changes in religious affiliation from 1988 to 1989. We have quite useful evidence for this conclusion, because in 1989 we used the new branching scheme not only to capture current affiliation but also the kind of church in which the respondent was raised. Going through each of the inconsistencies by hand (using the PRINT sub-routine in SPSSX) shows that more often than not there was consistency between responses on the church raised (V8151) and on the church now attended (V8222), when there was an inconsistency between the 1988 and 1989 religious preference variables (V1211 and V8222 respectively).

In the denominational family classification (Baptist, Methodist, Catholic) 13.6 percent of the respondents were in a different category in 1988 than in 1989. That is well beyond the pace at which people change religious affiliations (Roof 1989). If Protestants only are examined, the 13.6 figure increases to 14.3 percent. Making an evangelical/non-evangelical distinction in religious tradition, we find that 9.0 percent of respondents moved from one of these categories to the other between 1988 and 1989, again change that seems too great to be simply changes in affiliation. We feel that the improved coding categories represented in the 1989 code, along with better follow-up questions, resulted in more reliable data in 1989. Now to two specific denominations to illustrate the point and show the political consequences.

### Denominational Classification: The Case of the Lutherans

Within some denominational families there is a great deal of religious and political heterogeneity among the members. Within the classification "Lutherans," there are two major groups. For our purposes, Group A will consist of mainline Lutherans (American Lutherans, Lutheran Church in America, the newly-merged Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, and Lutherans not specifically classified). For our purposes, Group B will consist of evangelical (and even fundamentalist) Lutherans (Missouri Synod, Wisconsin Synod, and various small splinter groups). There were 49 Lutherans from the 1988 NES who were drawn for Wave 1 of the 1989 Pilot Study. In 1988, one was classified as

Missouri Synod and the remaining forty-eight were classified simply as Lutherans. According to the Yearbook of America and Canadian Churches, 1989, there are nearly 8.4 million Lutherans in the United States; 63% of them are located in our Group A and 37% are in Group B.

When we examine the 1989 Pilot Study Wave 2 data, which encouraged interviewers to probe for the specific Lutheran body, we get closer to the Yearbook results:

- (1) the one respondent classified in Group B in 1988 has now moved to Group A in 1989;
- (2) there were twelve people classified in Group A in 1988 who have now moved to Group B in 1989; eight of them grew up as Group B (and were highly likely to have been misclassified in 1988), one grew up in Group A, two grew up as other Protestants and one as a Catholic (these four may or may not have been misclassified);
- (3) there were twenty-five people classified as Group A both in 1988 and 1989; eleven grew up in Group A, two grew up in Group B, and twelve grew up in other Protestant bodies;
- (4) two people were classified in other Protestant bodies (one in the code adjacent to Lutherans) in 1988 but are now listed as Group A in 1989;
- (5) finally, nine people classified in Group A in 1988 and drawn for the Wave 1 sample did not appear in Wave 2.

The Wave 2 mode of eliciting denominational affiliation suggests that the classification problem was most acute in Group B. According to empirical findings in previous studies (cf. Kersten, 1970), the evangelical Lutherans are theologically and politically more conservative than the mainline Lutherans. In data runs based on recent NES surveys, however, Kellstedt and Noll (1990, p.360) have been unable to find significant differences in means for Lutherans and Missouri Synod Lutherans (codes 111, 141). We suspect many of the latter have been mingled in the former. In 1988 alone, we have reason to believe that a minimum of 20% and a maximum of 33% of all Lutherans have been misclassified, with the attendant imprecision in estimation of the impact of religious denomination on political values.

If we use what appears to be the proper classification of the twelve people in Group B (#2 above) the findings of Kersten are indeed sustained; the two groups of Lutherans are religiously and politically different. Since the sample is so small, we will treat any finding significant at .10 or greater as suggestive; greater significance is noted. Tau b and tau c statistics are reported as appropriate. First, evangelical Lutherans are more likely to have voted Bush in 1988 (tau b = .24) and to be Republican (tau c = .22). Although they are more likely to call themselves conservatives (tau c = .11), the relationship is not significant. Perhaps stemming from their immigrant roots in opposition to the Prussian military draft, however, evangelical Lutherans are more likely to oppose defense spending (tau c = -.22). Looking even more like evangelicals again, they are more restrictive on abortion (tau c = .28, significant < .043), but there is little difference on school prayer, in large part because evangelical Lutherans run parochial schools. They are more likely to react negatively to

social change ( $\tau c = .19$ ), but the relationship is not quite significant. (We measured reactions to social change by a scale constructed of items including feeling thermometers on antibortionists, homosexuals, and feminists, and positions on school prayer, women in the home, and homosexual rights.) There is little question that evangelical Lutherans score higher on moral traditionalism ( $\tau c = .50$ , significant  $< .001$ ). On two central religious measures, evangelical Lutherans are more likely to attend religious services ( $\tau c = .27$ , significant  $< .045$ ) and are far more likely to treat their religious beliefs as important in their everyday lives, perhaps including politics ( $\tau c = .40$ , significant  $< .008$ ).

To summarize, there are substantive consequences noted on both religious and political variables that result from having an accurate classification of one's Lutheran denomination. The 1989 branching scheme seems to make interviewers more sensitive to those differences, resulting in more accurate classifications.

### Denominational Classification: The Case of the Pentecostals

Growth of Pentecostal denominations in the United States in the past generation has been very rapid. This increase in size may make this denominational family more important politically in the future than in the past. In 1988 we were alerted to that potential when Pentecostals, not evangelicals or fundamentalists, became the political base for Pat Robertson (Smidt, 1989); current and future candidates at all levels of the ticket may come from this religious tradition. Yet, in comparison with other denominational families (Lutherans, Methodists, etc.), they are under-politicized. For example, their turnout rates in general elections rank at or near the bottom among denominational families in both 1984 and 1988; earlier research (Kellstedt and Noll 1989) suggests that this pattern goes back to 1960. Low turnout is accompanied by a tendency to avoid identification with the two major political parties (over 60 percent are Independents), low levels of interest in politics, and negligible rates of campaign activity.

Low levels of activity are not simply a function of downscale socioeconomic status but are related to their intense involvement in religious activity. Among denominational families, Pentecostals rank either first or second in the perceived guidance received from their faith, born-again identification, belief in a literal Bible, Bible reading, prayer and witnessing to others. In terms of political attitudes measured in 1988 and 1989, this highly religious but under-politicized group holds "religious right" viewpoints: of all religious families they have the strongest identification with Pat Robertson (thermometer rating), strongly "pro-life" on an abortion measure, very high on the moral traditionalism index, high identification with evangelical and fundamentalist groups, and very strongly conservative views on the social change measure.

In sum, Pentecostals hold religious and political views that are associated with the "religious right," but they are much less involved in politics than other evangelical groups (for example, turnout rates among Baptists in 1988 were approximately 73 percent, while for Pentecostals they were below 60 percent). Nonetheless, the potential for mobilizing the Pentecostal family is great, given their greater propensity to accept the legitimacy of cues from their pastor. (Cue-giving is discussed in the final section of the report.)

One of the many difficulties in studying Pentecostals is identifying them as such; the number of denominations in this family is very high. The codes developed for the 1960 NES and thereafter to identify Pentecostal denominations have a number of problems. Most important, they seem to underestimate the number of Pentecostals. Of the 26 Pentecostals identified through the 1989 Pilot Study branching scheme, only 19 were coded in a Pentecostal category in 1988, for an error rate of almost 25%. In addition, at least three non-Pentecostals were coded in a Pentecostal category in 1988. In the old code, three numbers could be used to designate a member of this religious family:

- 1) Assemblies of God/Pentecostal (135) -- this category includes a specific denomination as well as the general designation. 1989 Pilot Study data suggest that 9 of the 14 respondents who were coded 135 in 1988 are affiliated with the Assemblies of God, while five are associated with other denominations.
- 2) Church of God; Holiness (131) -- This code would seem inapplicable for Pentecostals, and yet four individuals with 1989 Pilot Study codes in Pentecostal denominations were coded in this category in 1988. The problem is that there are many Churches of God; some are Pentecostal and others are Holiness. (Holiness churches derive from a perfectionist lifestyle in the Wesleyan tradition; Pentecostals share this lifestyle but stress gifts of the Spirit, including speaking in tongues, healing and miracles.)
- 3) Church of God in Christ (133) -- here is a very specific code of the largest black Pentecostal denomination in the United States, and the type of coding category that we would like to encourage in the future.

In sum, with a more detailed branching scheme and the tutoring of coders regarding Pentecostals, we feel that this religious family will be more accurately measured and will become a focus of examination by political scientists.

### The General Utility of the Branching Scheme for Theories of American Political Behavior

While the case studies of Lutherans and Pentecostals demonstrate that greater precision in coding from the additional probes yields new information relevant to politics, it is important to demonstrate the consequences of aggregating up from specific denominations to the more general conceptual category we have called religious tradition. It is here that we feel increased precision in denominational coding yields a payoff for electoral analysis and helps to clarify the role of cultural factors in mass political behavior.

Cultural theories of American political behavior (Leege, Lieske, and Wald 1990; Brady and Sniderman 1985; Wildavsky 1987; implicitly Ornstein, Kohut, and McCarthy 1988) argue that relatively enduring political commitments derive from cultural identities. To be a member of a religious group is oftentimes a shorthand for being a member of a political group (Fee, et al, 1976). The earliest discussions of the concept 'party

identification' were couched in reference group language (Campbell, et al. 1960).

Using the new religious preference master code in Wave 2, dummy variables were created to represent Roman Catholics (RC), Southern white evangelical Protestants (SEV), Northern white evangelical Protestants (NEV), black evangelical Protestants (BEV), all evangelical Protestants (AEV), and mainline Protestants (ML). South is operationalized as Alabama, Arkansas Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia. Members of other bodies (a heterogeneous mix of non-traditional Protestants, Jews, Greek Rite Catholics, the Eastern Orthodox) were excluded from the analysis. The comparison group consisted of respondents who indicated they never attended religious services (n=77) on question C4.

These variables were entered into a regression to predict partisanship on the standard 7-point party identification scale (K1x in the preelection wave). Partisanship was coded so that high scores indicated Republican identification. The possibility of spurious relationships warranted the inclusion of several control variables. To control for socioeconomic traits that might be correlated with both religious identification and partisanship, the equation included variables representing age, education and gender (a dummy variable where 1 = female). Anticipating that denominational effects might simply reflect conservative social values, the equation also included the moral traditionalism scale (alpha = .62) created from four questions devised by Conover and Feldman (1986). To guard against confusing religious intensity with denominational identification, a possibility suggested by the work of Petrocik and Steeper (1987), we also entered a religious involvement measure described elsewhere in this report.

TABLE 1

Regression of Partisanship on  
Denominational Identification  
Analysis

<u>Variable</u>	1	2	3	4	5
Age	-.02	-.02	-.04	-.05	-.05
Gender	-.06	-.06	-.01	-.03	-.03
Education	-.01	-.00	.01	.02	.02
Moral traditionalism	.16***	.16***	.10*	.13***	.13***
Religious involvement	-.02	-.03	.04		
SEV	-.09*	-.05	-.16**	-.11*	-.07
RC	-.13**	-.12**	-.22**	-.13***	-.13**
BEV	-.25***	-.23***	-.27***	-.26***	-.24***
ML	.13**	.14**	.09	.09*	.09*
AEV	.06		.05	.06	
NEV		.07			.06
SEV+				.01	.04
RC+				-.01	-.01
BEV+				-.02	-.02
ML+				.11**	.11**
AEV+				.06	
NEV+					.04
R <sup>2</sup>	.13	.13	.15	.14	.14
Stand.Error	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0

\*p < .10  
 \*\*p < .05  
 \*\*\*p < .01

Entries are standardized regression coefficients.

(See text for explanation of variables)

The inclusion of so many control variables correlated with religious affiliation sets up a very rigorous test of the new measure. The non-normal distribution of partisanship, measurement error in denominational identity, and the arbitrary decision rules inherent in the creation of the dummy variables also make this a stringent exercise. Nonetheless, as is apparent from the first two columns of Table 1, religious variables exert a strong impact on partisan identification ( $n = 463$ ). None of the demographic controls attains even minimal levels of significance. Even after the inclusion of moral traditionalism and religious involvement, denominational affiliation contributes significantly to party choice. Based on the beta weights in column 1, black evangelicalism is the principal predictor of partisanship, followed by Catholicism and mainline Protestantism, and then Southern evangelicalism. Of the religious groups, only the "generic" evangelical category did not differ substantially in party identification from the religiously non-affiliated. All the coefficients are in the predicted direction of the New Deal party configuration with blacks, Catholics and Southern evangelicals relatively more Democratic, and mainline Protestants more Republican than the non-religious.

The analysis in column 2 substituted Northern evangelicals for the generic evangelical group with which it was highly correlated. This variation made no difference except slightly to diminish the coefficient for Southern evangelicals, reducing it to a level slightly below statistical significance.

The third column of Table 1 is a replication of the equation in column 1 for the 293 respondents who reported casting a presidential vote in both 1984 and 1988. Based on the unstandardized coefficients (not shown), this variation sharpens religious group differences. Among voters, identification with black evangelicalism, Catholicism, and Southern evangelicalism moves respondents, respectively, 3.0, 1.2, and 1.1 points away from the non-religious who are anchored at about the midpoint of the seven-point scale. Only mainline Protestant voters do not differ significantly from the comparison group in this analysis.

The final two columns add another set of dummies to identify the most regular churchgoers with each broad religious family ( $n = 427$ ). (Because church attendance is a major component of religious involvement, the latter variable was excluded from this analysis.) This refinement makes no difference in the interpretation of findings from the simpler model. Only among mainline Protestants do the most regular churchgoers differ from all members of that category. The effect, as one would predict, is to intensify Republican orientations.

Limited though it is, this analysis offers some confirmation for the cultural foundations of American partisanship, a pattern that is currently partially disguised by the imprecise measures of religious commitment that have been included in the traditional religious preference series. Thus, both the analyses of the two denominations and the general analysis of partisanship demonstrate the utility of the 1989 branching scheme and offer a strong rationale for its retention in the biennial studies. *We feel this branching scheme and mastercode is among the highest priority religious items on the NES.*

### Multiple Attenders

On the basis of evidence turned up in the Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life that a number of Catholics attended more than one church (Leege and Welch, 1990), the 1989 Pilot Study questionnaire asked respondents whether they attended more than one church. Respondents were coded in terms of most and less frequently attended churches. 45 of the 494 respondents indicated that they attended more than one church, a sizable number, particularly if projected onto a standard national sample.

Our assumption was that these "multiples" might be either: (1) individuals who are intensely religious, who attend the denominational church in which they were brought up out of loyalty to family, neighborhood, or ethnic group, but who also attend another church (often of another religious tradition) for more "spiritual" reasons, or (2) they are also attending a spouse's church simply to satisfy family obligations.

Although the Pilot Study data do not allow us to test these questions of intent, there is some interesting evidence available. Of the 45 individuals who attend multiple churches, 17 were raised in the identical denomination of the church that they attend most frequently now. In addition, six more respondents were raised in the same denominational family (Lutheran, Baptist, etc.), if not identical denomination, of the church that they attend now; six more were raised in the same general religious tradition (evangelical, moderate, or liberal Protestantism) of the church they attend now. Hence, 29 of the 45 "multiples" are most frequently attending churches within the same tradition in which they were raised. In addition, nine of the remaining "multiples" attend churches within the same general tradition in which they were raised, although less frequently than another church that they attend. This might well be the "spouse" factor referred to above. Hence, only seven of the 45 "multiples" do not attend churches within the same tradition in which they were raised. Yet, four of these seven are currently attending two churches from the same general tradition, even if both are different from childhood.

The picture for the multiple attenders, then, is one of remaining in the religious tradition in which raised. We do not find, for example, a large number of Catholics who attend the Lutheran or Pentecostal church at other times in the week. In fact, in contrast to expectations, the "multiples" are characterized by sporadic attendance. Only 13 of the 45 attend church "most weeks" or more. For the most part, then, this group attends infrequently, meaning they are receiving no sustained bombardment of religiously-based stimuli. These 32 respondents appear to be nominal religious believers at best. In conclusion, one of our initial expectations that multiple attenders would be extremely involved in religious institutions is not borne out in the data. In addition, in analyses using political variables, the "multiples" do not exhibit political attitudes or behaviors that significantly differentiate them from other groups of respondents. As a result, *we conclude that the items concerned with multiple attendance (V8202, V8223-V8224, V8301-V8354) be given lowest priority in future NES surveys.*



### Childhood Church and Current Church

The argument is often made that childhood impressions fix deep orientations toward religious phenomena, even when the institutional context changes later in life (Greeley 1982). The Working Group felt it was useful to ask for childhood affiliation both for substantive reasons and as a methodological point of reference in assessing the accuracy of current denominational affiliation. The previous pages demonstrate the yield of the latter. What follows shows some of the substantive political results associated with religious switching and standpatting.

V8151 asked respondents about the religious tradition in which they grew up. In the accompanying table, respondents were classified into the religious traditions in which they grew up (Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Protestant, Catholic, and none) and their current tradition. Most individuals remain in their childhood tradition. However, some individuals change. Across the top of the table are a series of variables that allow us to compare the individuals who remained within the tradition in which they were raised as opposed to those who changed. For each group, we find deviations from the overall mean scores that we see at the top of the table; they are derived from multiple-classification analysis tables.

TABLE 2

TABLE 2

## RELIGIOUS TRADITION RAISED, TRADITION NOW AND POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

TRADITION:		N	Party ID	Abortion	Church Attendance	Religion As Guide	Social Policy	Traditional Morality	Vote Turnout	Vote Choice
RAISED	NOW									
			$\bar{x} = 2.98$	$\bar{x} = 2.78$	$\bar{x} = 3.13$	$\bar{x} = 2.76$	$\bar{x} = 2.64$	$\bar{x} = 1.54$	$\bar{x} = 1.96$	$\bar{x} = 1.47$
Evang.	Evang.	118	- 38	- 36	- 42	+ 61	+ 49	+ 21	- 02	- 06
Non-Evan.	"	18	+ 46	0	- 52	+ 74	+ 42	+ 57	- 08	- 24
Cath.	"	13	- 52	+ 06	- 28	+ 55	+ 67	+ 23	59	15
Nothing	"	8	- 48	- 28	0	+ 37	+ 1.24	- 04	54	- 07
Non-Evan	NonEvan	120	+ 58	+ 18	+ 30	+ 06	- 20	+ 13	- 26	- 03
Evang.	"	18	+ 85	- 23	+ 26	+ 52	- 08	+ 79	- 08	- 04
Cath.	"	8	+ 27	+ 47	+ 13	- 51	- 01	+ 33	+ 04	- 14
Nothing	"	4	+ 1.27	+ 47	+ 87	- 76	+ 61	- 29	+204	- 47
Cath.	Cath.	74	- 82	- 14	+ 13	- 18	- 24	- 26	- 37	+ 22
Evang.	"	2	NO DATA	AVAILABLE						
Non-Evan.	"	12	- 06	- 03	- 05	- 09	- 14	- 37	- 30	+ 08
Nothing	"	3	+ 02	+ 55	+ 54	- 09	+ 36	- 87	- 96	+ 20
Nothing	Nothing	11	+ 38	+ 82	NA	- 1.3	- 64	- 54	+ 1.94	+ 20
Evang.	"	19	+ 33	+ 38	NA	- 1.07	- 27	- 91	+ 72	- 07
Non-Evan	"	29	- 02	+ 50	NA	- 1.17	- 81	- 33	+ 14	+ 06
Cath.	"	22	+ 29	- 01	NA	- 1.0	- 32	- 45	+ 49	- 19

Read entries as decimal point deviations from mean.

Party ID is measured on a 0 to 6 point scale with 0 as Strong Democrat and 6 Strong Republican.

Abortion attitudes run from "never" (1) to "always" (4).

Low scores on the church attendance measure equal high attendance.

The religion as guide measures ranges from "no guidance" (1) to "great deal of guidance" (4).

High scores on the social policy measure are the most conservative.

High scores on the moral traditional measure are the most traditional.

Low scores on the vote turnout measure indicate high turnout.

Low scores on the vote choice measure indicate support for Bush.

The yield from data regarding childhood and current church is quite interesting. On some religious or political variables, switchers look more like their old tradition than the new. For example, persons raised non-Evangelical who switched to Evangelical now, are considerably more likely to be Republicans than are other Evangelicals, and both Catholics and the Nothing group who became Evangelical are more likely to be Democrats than are even Evangelical standpatters. On the other hand, Non-Evangelicals who switched to Evangelical are more frequent church attenders than even Evangelical standpatters, and more likely to use religion as a guide in daily life, score higher in moral traditionalism, are more likely to vote, and are much more likely to vote Bush (which might be expected from their party affiliation). In some respects, then, switchers look even more like the central characteristics of the new group than does that group's lifetime members. Homans' (1950) work on anticipatory socialization suggests that recruits often take on the new group's characteristics and then some. The important point from the data in Table 2, however, is not whether the old characteristics or the new predominate but that (1) it is now possible using NES data on childhood and adult affiliation to test such propositions and to show their political correlates and (2) the new branching questions and resultant mastercode provide more accurate measures for aggregating specific denominations into religious traditions.

Generating sensitive data on both childhood (V8151) and current (V8222) denominational affiliation has both a substantive (religious and political) and methodological payoff. NES staff indicate that when the branching scheme is used for both variables only about ten additional seconds are added to the length of the total interview; the respondent and interviewers have by now learned to think specifically about denominations. *Retain the application of the 1989 branching scheme and mastercode to questions about childhood denominational affiliation (V8134-V8151).*

### The Future of the Branching Scheme and the Mastercode

Obviously we feel the new measures of affiliation justify the estimated twenty to thirty additional seconds in interviewing time, when contrasted with the 1988 and earlier questions. When the initial denomination is coded precisely and accurately, entirely new questions involving religion and politics can be addressed. Denomination matters. Sensitive aggregation to religious tradition is possible. The segmentation and accretion of new religious bodies is monitored, as well as their consequences for understanding American political behavior.

Yet there is a great deal more to do if the new branching scheme and mastercode are to be placed on the 1990 and 1992 schedules:

- (1) the CATI-screen follow-up questions must be translated into a face-to-face interview schedule;
- (2) even with frequent consultation on troublesome cases between the Working Group and NES staff, we later found 51 cases that needed to be reclassified; we now have better experience with the measures and can provide special training/orientation to interviewers/coders on the nuances of pluralistic

American religion;

- (3) since part of the reason for the new branching scheme was to sort out the rapidly growing Evangelical and Pentecostal sectors, we have relied heavily on the advice of faculty associated with the Center for the Study of American Evangelicals; through this report and a series of roundtables and papers at both political science and sociology of religion meetings, we hope to enlist the advice and experience of a wider range of scholars; while our current experience will have to suffice for 1990, we feel we can have an even better set of guidelines and specifications for mastercode judgments by 1992;
- (4) although beyond the responsibilities of the NES Board of Overseers, it may be desirable to seek funding for an "Apalachin meeting" involving the relevant scholarly community and appropriate staff from NES (SRC), GSS (NORC), and Gallup so that the experience with new measures and codes for denominational affiliation can be addressed and the strengths and weaknesses of each inform the other.

#### Measuring Denominational Traits and Self-Identifications

Previous research beginning with Glock and Stark's Bay Area studies (Glock and Stark 1965, Stark and Glock 1968) and culminating in recent interpretive works of General Social Survey data (Roof and McKinney 1987, Wuthnow 1988) suggest that denominational classifications deriving from 16th century schisms are of less usefulness in understanding current American religion than are classifications based on recent segmentation and accretion of denominations and their current stances toward the world. Social ethics becomes the denominational cutting edge.

At the same time, those who have used both older denominational classification schemes from general population surveys and the newer forms of religious self-identification argue that the latter provide substantial additional information for understanding the social and political consequences of one's religiosity (Wilcox 1986, Guth and Green 1986, Rothenberg and Newport 1984). Studies based on self-classifications, however, have been concentrated on the growing evangelical sector of the religious population. They assess, for example, whether a respondent's self-classification as fundamentalist, evangelical or pentecostal, liberal or conservative, tells anything more than denominational affiliation. Such a measurement scheme allows for the possibility that a local church may have a different orientation than a national body, and the individual may have a different orientation than her local church.

Building on a summary of such arguments (cf. Guth, et al. 1988), we applied trait measures to three forms of religious identification -- respondent's church while growing up (V8152-V8160), respondent's current church (V8225-V8228, V8233-V8238), and respondent's self-classification (V8229-V8232, V8238-V8242). The frame of reference, particularly for current church, is the local religious community. For Protestants, five traits

were measured -- fundamentalist, evangelical, pentecostal or spirit-filled, conservative, and liberal. For Catholics, four traits were measured -- traditionalist, post-Vatican II, ethnic, and charismatic or spirit-filled. A four-point response range was used, going from "very well" to "not well at all." Estimated additional interviewing time is about fifteen seconds for the lead and six seconds per trait, per respondent. Our analyses to date are sometimes promising, sometimes mixed. Table 3 offers the basic measurement characteristics associated with the trait identifications.

TABLE 3  
MEASUREMENT PROPERTIES OF RELIGIOUS TRAIT IDENTIFICATIONS

<u>Religious Tradition</u>	<u>Trait</u>	<u>Current Church/Self Pearson r</u>	<u>Unable to Rate Church On Traits(%)</u>	<u>Unable to Rate Self On Traits(%)</u>	<u>Apparent Response Set Church (%)</u>	<u>Apparent Response Set Self (%)</u>	<u>Missing Cases Total(%)</u>	<u>Missing Cases Church(%)</u>	<u>Missing Cases Self(%)</u>
Catholics (n=91)	Traditionalist	.46					30	30	4
	Post-Vatican II	.27	26*	0*	11+	3+	35	33	12
	Ethnic	.28					30	31	1
	Charismatic	.19					31	31	10
Evangelical Protestant (n=156)	Fundamentalist	.70					32	28	21
	Evangelical	.77					35	33	23
	Pentecostal	.75	13	1	4	9	24	19	12
	Conservative	.60					20	18	6
	Liberal	.69					22	20	10
Mainline Protestant (n=151)	Fundamentalist	.81					34	30	15
	Evangelical	.80					34	30	15
	Pentecostal	.89	19	3	5	5	33	30	15
	Conservative	.55					26	25	6
	Liberal	.66					27	27	7

\*Measured by a string of four (five) values of "0" on the traits.

+Measured by a string of identical entries across traits -- e.g., 1111--or the occasional inclusion of an 8 -- e.g., 18111.

First, we will address the respondents' ability to use the traits for classification purposes. Routinely we find that it is more difficult to classify a parish/congregation than to classify oneself. That would seem to be a reasonable finding: churches are heterogeneous and more distant than oneself. Catholics have more difficulty using the traits to classify their parishes, mainline Protestants are in between, and evangelical Protestants are most able to classify their congregations. Further, Catholics show more apparent response set, again in the same descending pattern for church. We interpret these findings not as measurement artifacts based on the clarity of the trait, but as real phenomena. The average Catholic parish contains 2330 members; that is eight times the size of the average Protestant church (Leege 1989). Each parish incorporates many styles of religiosity in its membership, liturgical and devotional celebrations. That 37% of Catholics either cannot rate the parish or rate it identically across all traits may reflect the pluralistic nature of their parish. At the same time it suggests that trait classifications for parishes are less effective at discriminating, that is, providing useful additional information about the Catholic religious context within which the respondent is embedded.

Evangelical Protestants, on the other hand, are more able than either Catholics or mainline Protestants to use the trait measures to classify their congregations. We think this reflects the greater ideological clarity within evangelical churches.

The pattern is reversed, however, in using the traits to classify oneself. Inability to use the measures is minimal among Catholics, greater among mainline Protestants, and greatest among evangelical Protestants. We suggest that this finding relates to education, Catholics having a higher level of education than mainline Protestants, and evangelicals having the least. The mainline figure may also reflect lack of ideological clarity and weaker group integration, as measured by frequency of attendance.

All four Catholic traits are surrogates for religious values or community social characteristics. Missing cases for parishes are distributed in a fairly narrow range (30-33%). The five Protestant traits include three that reference religious phenomena (fundamentalist, evangelical, pentecostal) and two that may reference religious phenomena but are also used as social/economic/political classifications. Missing cases for congregations appear over a wider range for evangelicals (18-33%) than for mainliners (25-30%). With the exception of one trait among evangelicals, there are more missing cases among Protestants on the peculiarly religious words than on the mixed religious/political words. At the same time, when missing cases are excluded, the correlations between church and self-classifications are considerably higher on the peculiarly religious words than on the mixed words.

For scholars interested in cultural theories of American political behavior, the church/self correlation data are of special interest. Cultural theories are built around three reinforcing sets of norms: identity (who I am), responsibility (what am I to do), and boundary maintenance (who and what is beyond us and the acceptable) (Wildavsky 1987; Leege, Lieske, and Wald 1990). Catholic parishes may be so heterogeneous that they do not reinforce or propagate these unique self-identifications among Catholics; they may be less effective mechanisms for political cue-giving (note the product-moment correlations

ranging from .46 to .19). For Protestants, on the other hand, the three peculiarly religious variables yield congregation/self correlations of .70 to .77 and .81 to .89; even the mixed religious/social words yield correlations in the range of .60-.69 and .55-.66. The smaller and ideologically clearer Protestant churches are better suited to voluntaristic mobility in church-selection, and indeed have more sect-type than church-type characteristics (cf. Troeltsch 1931; Weber 1946). Self and congregation offer identities that are more reinforcing and there is probably greater opportunity for religious and social cue-giving.

Additional analyses of these data, then, may prove highly suggestive to sociologists of religion and to political scientists formulating cultural theories of American political behavior. Yet is there an immediate pay-off in understanding election outcomes and vote choice through the additional information these traits yield? There, the results are mixed, but many are less than satisfying.

Extensive efforts to extract underlying structure in each set of traits flounder on the large proportion of cases where there is either missing data or apparent response set. For example, when listwise deletion of cases was used, two interpretable factors for Catholic parishes emerged but only one pluralistic factor for self emerged; one should have expected the opposite. When listwise deletion of cases was used for Protestants, two nicely interpretable factors emerge for both congregation and self, and they reinforce each other. Yet, when pairwise deletion is used in either Catholic or Protestant subsamples, whatever factors emerge are unintelligible. The data simply do not offer properties that yield defensible structures. Thus, factor scores could not be used in regression equations involving an array of political dependent variables or in procedures using other religious variables to mediate effects of the trait identification.

Finally, efforts to measure simple relationships between the traits and the political or other religious dependent variables followed. We ran cross-tabulations and product-moment or tau correlations between the Catholic traits and thirteen political or attitudinal dependent variables (party identification, liberal-conservative (old), liberal-conservative (experimental), Reagan retrospective economic assessment, candidate preference, turnout, affirmative action/Blacks, defense spending, abortion, capital punishment, a contrived index of attitudes toward social change, and the moral traditionalism index) and two religious variables (an index of involvement, and an index of the extent to which religion offers guidance in daily life). To know the degree to which one's parish was viewed as traditionalist yielded significant differences (at  $< .10$ ) on eight of the thirteen political variables (five at  $< .05$ ); three -- liberal-conservative (new), candidate preference, and death penalty are high (high .30s). For post-Vatican II there are three significant political differences; one is high -- liberal-conservative (new) is .41. For ethnic there are no political differences and one religious. For charismatic there are three political differences and one religious; defense spending is high at .50.

To know the self classifications for Catholics also yielded some political information. Traditionalist self-classification offered two significant differences on political variables and one on religion; defense spending was high at .36. The post-Vatican II self-classification yielded four political differences and two religious; it was a good predictor of Reagan economic retrospective assessment and religious involvement. Ethnic yielded five significant



political and one religious difference, again working well on the retrospective economic judgment. Charismatic also yielded five significant political and one religious difference, the highest being liberal-conservative (new) at .33.

For Protestants, we were able to use the same dependent variables against the five traits, but the classification into evangelical and mainline allowed us to use even more sensitive ANOVA techniques incorporated into multiple-classification analysis. Often the multiple r-squareds were very large; yet inspection across the response categories of the trait showed them to be non-linear. If we set three criteria, fairly stringent to be sure -- linearity for the trait, a beta exceeding .20 for the trait, and  $r^2$  exceeding .300 for the table -- we see disappointingly few findings of political interest: on congregation classifications, both the traits conservative and liberal yield political information on moral traditionalism, both fundamentalist and evangelical yield political information on liberal-conservative (old) and fundamentalist on liberal-conservative (new), and evangelical yields new information on Reagan retrospective economic assessment. When self is the object of religious trait classification, knowing the extent to which one classifies herself on evangelical or pentecostal yields new information on party identification, religiously liberal yields new information on moral traditionalism, religiously conservative on school prayer, social change, and abortion, and evangelical yields new information on both liberal-conservative (old) and Reagan economic retrospective assessment.

Is there a political pay-off in retaining the religious trait measures, beyond a sensitive set of branching questions to capture current denomination? That is difficult to assess from samples as small as we had on the 1989 Pilot Study. For Catholics, with the relaxed standard of a .10 level of significance and lacking the requirement of linearity, there were fourteen of fifty-two possible political findings affected by having access to parish trait classifications. That is, an explanatory model that built in not only denominational classification but a Catholic's assessment of the orientation of her parish would have yielded politically-relevant information about one-fourth of the time. Knowing a Catholic's self-identification on the traits was potentially useful in sixteen of the fifty-two times. Thus, even though Catholic parishes are pluralistic and analysis of Catholics as individuals does not yield interpretable underlying structures according to the traits, we are learning something -- but not a stunning amount -- through the traits.

For Protestants the criteria are more stringent and far fewer politically-relevant findings pass the threshold. In this instance, we are inclined to conclude that the new branching questions for denominational affiliation, coupled with attention to interviewer and coder training, and joined with various measures of religious involvement -- will yield sufficient new political information, thus rendering the identifications interesting but perhaps redundant.

One final kind of analysis was completed on the Catholic traits. Since they are potentially attractive and proved suggestive in a cultural theory of American political behavior, we compared parish traits with the likelihood of cue-giving on political issues. Here both the small sample size and the observed pluralism of each parish's orientations makes analysis exceedingly difficult. We did find seven instances in a 36-cell table where

the perception of whether or not local religious leaders had spoken out was statistically significant, usually at  $< .01$ , with a parish trait. These concerned the legitimacy of speaking out, candidate endorsements, homelessness, nuclear disarmament, and school prayer. Substantively, the correlations make sense and do not appear to be artifactual.

Knowing the linearity problem with the traits among Protestants and the degree of precision derived from the new branching and coding scheme for Protestants, we did not run similar analyses with the cue-giving variables. As noted elsewhere in this report, however, local Protestant religious leaders are far more likely to give political cues than are Catholic priests, and greater legitimacy is attached to their cue-giving, especially among evangelicals and pentecostals.

*A large research agenda with the trait identifications remains. It may well be that there is already sufficient evidence to retain them on the 1990 instrument, or findings will emerge in time, arguing for their inclusion in 1992. Until then, however, we cannot attach the "essential" classification to these religious variables in explanatory models of voting behavior. In a world of priorities and scarce instrument space, others stand out. But the research community may want to reopen the matter.*

*One direction for that inquiry might explore alternate question formats. Studies cited earlier have generally used check-off (dichotomous response) questions about the trait. They have often been placed on mail-out questionnaires; several studies have addressed elite samples. The NES Pilot, on the other hand, uses four response categories and is derived from a telephone interview; the sample, of course, is general population. We do not yet know whether differences in utility result from different measures and samples but the research community could address the issue.*

### Measures of Religious Involvement

The 1989 NES Pilot Study included a series of new items designed better to assess respondents' level of commitment to organized religion. In the 1988 NES pre-election survey, religious affiliation was gauged by question Y43, "Is your religious preference Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish or something else?" This question followed abruptly after an inquiry about social class identification (Y42d/f) and was followed by a sequence of three religiosity measures, including two questions about church attendance.

Question Y43 and the associated church attendance series have a number of flaws that grow out of the inherent complexity of religious attachment in modern society. The initial question virtually demands that respondents declare a religious preference by requiring that they volunteer "no preference." In light of the positive valuation of religion by the public, the question is surely contaminated by social desirability and probably overestimates the extent of religious commitment. When the General Social Survey confronted this measurement problem by adding the category "none" to the options offered the respondent in 1980, immediately the largest increase in apostasy ever noted in a religion time-series ensued. The second flaw is inherent in the vague wording of "religious preference," which is likely to be interpreted in very different terms by respondents. Religious preference might equally well connote a residue of childhood socialization, a

personalized sense of the sacred (e.g., "Sheilahism" in Bellah et al., Habits of the Heart), a nodding acquaintance with a particular church, or formalistic membership in a sectarian tradition. A respondent who darkened a church door only for rites of passage like marriages, baptisms, or funerals could similarly claim a religious preference. This is unfortunate because of mounting evidence that it is the institutional expression of religious faith -- the congregation -- that most directly links religion with politics (Wald, Owen and Hill 1988, 1990). Taken together, these features of Y43 are likely to inflate the extent of religious commitment in the American public.

The Pilot Study contained a number of new items intended to correct these flaws. To get a more accurate reading on the extent of commitment to religious institutions, the religious preference question (C6) was preceded by a series of four items intended to sharpen the focus of the inquiry and to purge the question of some of its social desirability. The major innovations were a statement that seemed to excuse non-involvement ("Lots of things come up that keep people from attending religious services even if they want to."), language cuing respondents that attendance at rites of passage did not constitute church attendance, a screening question about psychological self-identification for persons who never attended religious services (C5), and a follow-up to determine if habitual non-attenders had any sense of religious identity (C5a). The preference question itself, like the four screening items preceding it, was reworded to emphasize organized religion.

These revisions appear to have screened out a significant number of respondents who claimed a denominational identity in answer to question Y43. In 1988, 39 (8%) of the 462 respondents from Wave 2 answered the religious preference question by volunteering "no preference" or "atheist" or "agnostic." That question indicates a 92% rate of religious attachment among the sample. By contrast, the 1989 Pilot Study identified 77 respondents who never attended church (or attended only for rites of passage), nor thought of themselves as part of any church or denomination. An additional four respondents volunteered "no preference" after passing the screens in C4 and C5/5a -- a total of 81 non-religious respondents (17.5%). Based on the Pilot Study questions, then, the rate of religious attachment drops from 92% to 82%. In practice, the 1989 screens enable us to separate out a substantial number of respondents who indicated a "preference" for religion but who exhibited neither exposure nor even a cognitive commitment to any religious institution. They probably should have constituted almost 18% of respondents in 1988, since apostasy is not likely to rise that quickly in ten months. On the likelihood that these respondents were induced to claim a preference by the defects in Y43, they can be treated as "false positives."

An even more substantial disparity is evident when comparing the church attendance items in the 1988 and 1989 waves of the NES. In 1988, 67 of 457 respondents indicated they "never" attended church or synagogue in response to question Y44. Using the C4 screen that contained softening language and the cues to those who attended only rites of passage, 118 of those 457 indicated in 1989 that they never attended religious services. The rate of non-attendance was less than 15% with the 1988 question wording but jumped to just under 26% with the addition of question C4. Just as Y43 overstates the extent of religious identity, so too, Y44 seems to inflate the level of churchgoing in the United States.

If the traditional means of soliciting religious preference distorted the attachment to religious institutions and the extent of group worship, they have also erred at the other extreme by putting a ceiling of "more than weekly" on church attendance. In practice, persons with intense religious commitment may go beyond weekly attendance both by attending devotional services or weekday Mass or by participating in religious activities outside church services -- ecumenical missions, supporting religious schools, church-connected service organizations, and the like. Beyond the wording of C21, then, we attempted to identify the "super-actives" by means of question C23, "Do you participate in a religious organization, society, or group outside of (your/a) (parish/congregation/temple/place of worship)?" Approximately 13% of respondents with denominational attachments (as measured by C6) responded affirmatively. Though this inquiry contains some measurement error that we will examine later, it seems to do a good job of identifying respondents with intense religious involvement. Two-thirds of those who offered affirmative responses are drawn from the ranks of weekly church attenders (as gauged by Y44) versus only 5% of those "never" attending services.

These refinements are important to political scientists because they affect the measurement of a variable that has been strongly linked to electoral participation in previous research. Even with primitive measurement techniques, formal religious attachment has been shown to exert a positive impact on levels of turnout (Miller 1952; Lenski 1961; Milbrath and Goel 1971; Brudney and Copeland 1984; Martinson and Wilkening 1987; Hougland and Christensen 1983; Strate et al. 1989). Scholars have speculated about the basis of the connection in terms of religion as a source of community integration (Strate et al. 1989), social and organizational skills (Smith 1980), and a sense of community stewardship (Macaluso and Wanat 1979). The growing politicization of conservative churches and their use as a base for mobilization by conservative candidates may provide yet another mechanism for linkage. Thus we neglect these paths to politicization at our peril.

The 1989 Pilot data against the backdrop of the 1988 questions offer an almost limitless range of options for relating religious involvement to political variables. To show the versatility of data with an expanded range of participation and more accurate estimates of non-participation, we have constructed two indexes: Religious Involvement I and Religious Involvement II.

To construct Religious Involvement I, we have used responses to V8201-V8204 and V8356-V8360. In this index, church attendance was trichotomized between at least weekly, at least monthly but not weekly, and less than monthly; these were equated, respectively, with "regular," "irregular," and "seldom." The weakest involvement is shown by the "irreligious" -- never attended services, disclaimed any religious identity, and indicated they did not think of themselves as religious. The "minimally religious" either never attended services but answered yes to C5/C5a or attended seldom but reported no church membership. The "moderately" religious included (a) non-members who attended irregularly and (b) members who attended seldom or irregularly. "Very" religious respondents were church members who attended regularly. Finally, "highly" religious were respondents who (a) belonged to churches, (b) attended services regularly, and (c) reported membership in a religious organization outside the congregation. The resulting five-point index of Religious Involvement I shows a normal distribution; 472 of the 494 Wave 2 respondents answered all of the necessary items for the index.

TABLE 4

Distribution of Wave 2 Respondents  
on Index of Religious Involvement I

Value	Label	N	%
1	Irreligious	43	9.1
2	Minimally Religious	106	22.5
3	Moderately Religious	167	35.4
4	Very Religious	120	25.4
5	Highly Religious	36	7.6

As expected, the measure was strongly validated by its relationship to subjective measures of religious commitment included in the 1988 interview schedule. The five categories of religious involvement were sharply differentiated on V5935, the importance attributed to religion ( $\eta^2 = .36$ ), and V5936, guidance received from religion ( $e\text{-}sq = .20$ ). Similarly, formal involvement in church was strongly correlated (Pearson  $r = .52$ ) with a scale composed of the five new religious devotionism measures included in the Pilot Study and placed apart from the church involvement measures on the questionnaire (V8646 to V8650).

A major payoff of this new measure on a political variable is evident from Table 5 below.

TABLE 5

Relationship Between Turnout (V5601)  
and Religious Involvement I

Value	Label	% Reporting Having Voted for President in 1988
1	Irreligious	60.5
2	Minimally Religious	66.0
3	Moderately Religious	78.4
4	Very Religious	82.5
5	Highly Religious	91.7

While the well-documented proclivity of respondents to exaggerate participation should prevent us from accepting the absolute figures as gospel truth, the relative variation between categories is striking and suggests a straightforward linear relationship between church involvement and turnout. The differences at the extremes suggest that relatively fine discriminations are not only appropriate in terms of religious activity but have electoral

consequences. There was a 5.5% difference in turnout between those who have absolutely no contact or commitment with organized religion and those whose religious involvement met at least a minimal threshold. Similarly, over 9% separated regular church attenders and those who attended regularly, plus had some involvement in religion outside the congregation.

By comparison, the church attendance measure constructed from the traditional items in the 1988 interview schedule (Y44 and Y44a) does not discriminate nearly so cleanly:

TABLE 6

Relationship Between Turnout (V5601)  
and Church Attendance (V1214/15)

Value	Label	% Reporting Having Voted for President in 1988
1	Never Attends	59.8
2	A Few Times/Year	71.7
3	Once/Twice per Month	75.9
4	Almost Every Week	76.5
5	Every Week	88.9
6	More Than Once a Week	83.5

Overall, the turnout rates from 1988 questions vary within a much narrower range and the pattern deviates significantly from linearity. While time did not permit the analysis, it is also likely that church attendance by itself is more strongly a function of education and social status than are the other measures of religious commitment included in the 1989-based religious involvement measure.

All in all, the additional questions asked in the 1989 Pilot provide much greater sensitivity to the relationship between religion and participation. The value of involvement measures is evident across a wide range of attitudinal and behavioral variables as can be seen in our second illustration.

Religious Involvement II sought to use some other information from the 1988 NES not incorporated into Religious Involvement I. Although it has different decision rules, it again demonstrates the importance of including in NES items that filter out social desirability responses and that go beyond the limitations of attendance at services. At the same time, it builds heavily on attendance.

In developing both measures of religious involvement, our guiding hypothesis is that highly involved individuals are likely to behave in a "religious" fashion on a series of other variables. To show that Religious Involvement II has utility across either data set it is

validated by variables in the 1988 survey that have a direct religious content: frequency of prayer and religious television viewing, religious tradition (evangelical/non-evangelical), the guidance provided by religion, beliefs in a literal Bible, and self-identification as a born-again Christian. The hypotheses are straightforward: the greater the involvement, the greater the frequency of prayer and religious television, the greater the likelihood of being an evangelical, to receive a great deal of guidance from one's faith, to believe in a literal interpretation of the Bible and to identify as born again.

As for the Religious Involvement II, its low end consists of respondents who claimed no religious preference in answer to the religious preference item (V1221) in the 1988 survey. Next are respondents who have a 1988 preference but who do not consider themselves religious in answer to a Pilot Study question (V8204). Next are respondents who also have a 1988 preference (as do all remaining respondents), consider themselves religious, but do not identify with a church or denomination (V8203). Fourth are respondents who identify with a church or denomination but do not attend church (V8201). Fifth is a perplexing group: they say they attend church on one variable (V8201) but claim not to attend on another variable (either V8356 or V8357), or attend no more than once or twice per year. Next on the index are individuals who attend church only once or twice per month. Finally, the seventh and eighth categories are respondents who attend "most" weeks (nearly every week or weekly) or greater than once per week.

#### TABLE 7

TABLE 7

## RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT BY OTHER RELIGIOUS VARIABLES

Religious Involvement:	Prays GT Sev Times Per Day	Watches Relig TV GT Wkly	Percent Evang'l Denoms.	Great Deal of Guidance from Relig.	Literal Bible	Born Again	N
1. No Relig. Pref.	14.3%	0	0	6.9%	10.7%	0	32
2. Does not consider self religious	0	10.0	30.0	0	27.8	6.3	20
3. No I.D. with church or denomination	0	4.0	32.0	16.7	26.1	22.7	25
4. Identifies but does not attend	9.0	12.9	22.9	23.5	30.9	22.7	70
5. Attends on one variable/does not attend on other variable	6.8	10.2	18.4	18.2	37.2	17.1	49
6. Attends 1-2 Times per month	16.3	17.5	35.1	10.2	44.9	29.8	57
7. Attends Nearly Every week or weekly	40.0	16.6	29.9	45.6	47.8	37.4	157
8. Attends Greater than weekly	76.9	38.2	61.8	78.5	72.3	67.2	76
Tau C	.36	.15	NA	.36	.16	.21	

Chi-Square significant at  $\leq .05$  for all variables.



Configured this way, the results on a couple of variables of Table 7 suggest that a threshold in religious involvement is reached above attendance once or twice per month (category 6). At that level or below, on the prayer measure there is little difference among the lower categories; on guidance the pattern is nonlinear but also suggests a threshold. The threshold on religious television is between categories 7 and 8, however; perhaps that is because non-evangelical Protestants offer few opportunities for attendance greater than weekly, and evangelicals are those most likely to watch religious television. Similar massive jumps are seen on Biblical literalism, born again, guidance, and prayer -- all of which have affinities with evangelicalism.

There is a strong temptation to reduce the eight-category Religious Involvement II index into three categories with cutpoints at 6, 7, and 8. It is highly unlikely that the lowest category, perhaps they could be called nominal religionists, would make political decisions on issues based on their religion. Yet, as we saw earlier, if their denominational affiliation is a cultural reference group, it is still important to retain distinctions as we have in Religious Involvement I. On the other hand, it is much more likely that those in category 8 would act politically on their faith. Yet, there may be a confounding of evangelicalism and non-evangelicalism in Religious Involvement II.

For that reason, we have isolated Protestants by their evangelical or non-evangelical denominational affiliation as measured in V8222. Table 8 shows vast differences between the two, in terms of political variables, religious variables, social attitudes and reference groups. The first three columns are for white non-evangelicals with the second and third differentiated by frequency of attendance. The second four columns are for white evangelicals, and the latter three are differentiated by frequency of attendance. When refined in this manner, oftentimes the most notable differences derive from the greater than weekly columns for evangelicals; the n is too small to have such a column for non-evangelicals.

TABLE 8

EVANGELICAL AND NON-EVANGELICAL PROTESTANTS AND RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL ATTITUDES:  
THE IMPACT OF RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT

	Non-Evangelicals			Evangelicals			
	All	White Nominal*	White Regular**	All	White Nominal	White Most***	White Wkly
	N= 151	71	64	157	41	33	39
Strong/Weak Democrat	23.1%	21.2	17.2	40.1	31.7	39.4	23.1
Independent leaning Dem.	9.9	12.7	6.3	7.6	4.9	9.1	10.3
Independent	9.9	8.5	10.9	14.6	17.1	15.2	15.4
Independent Leaning Rep.	13.2	14.1	12.5	14.0	22.0	15.2	12.8
Strong/Weak Republican	42.4	42.2	51.6	22.9	22.0	21.2	38.5
Conservative Ideology	50.4	45.0	56.0	53.4	40.9	45.8	71.0
Voted Bush 1988	57.3	53.7	68.5	59.8	69.2	50.0	82.1
Vote Turnout 1988	79.5	76.1	87.5	74.5	65.9	81.8	74.4
Campaign Index 1988	19.9	15.5	25.0	12.1	12.2	9.1	12.8
GT 50 Bush Thermometer	62.4	57.1	73.4	68.2	75.6	63.6	82.1
Receive Great Deal of Guidance from Religion	38.4	18.3	56.3	59.9	29.3	54.5	79.5
Percent Born Again	24.8	23.5	34.4	77.3	41.0	75.0	92.1
Percent Literal Bible	32.4	23.2	43.8	68.2	51.2	69.7	78.9
Pray GE Sev. Times a Day	33.1	12.9	50.0	51.3	15.0	40.6	76.9
Daily Bible Reader	17.6	11.8	22.2	38.2	4.9	33.3	69.2
Witness at least Some- times to Others	12.1	2.9	15.9	42.3	22.0	29.0	75.0
Pro-Life Abortion	31.8	18.5	42.2	52.6	30.0	56.3	82.0
Pro-Choice	41.9	50.0	34.4	27.3	40.0	25.0	7.7
Identify with Evangl/ Fundamentalist Groups	34.4	29.6	34.4	66.7	43.9	66.7	82.1
Favor Conserv. Social Policy	20.8	12.6	25.0	36.8	39.0	33.3	61.6
Favor Traditional Morality	29.8	18.3	40.6	34.4	17.1	24.2	69.2

\*Nominal Evangelicals and Non-Evangelicals attend church once or twice per month or less (categories 1 thru 6 in Table 7).

\*\*Regular attenders, Non-Evangelicals attend church most weeks or more (categories 7 & 8 in Table 7).

\*\*\*Most Evangelicals attend most weeks or weekly (category 7 in Table 7).

While there is much to mine in the table, there are several conclusions that bear on the utility of not only the expanded involvement items but other religious variables:

- (1) clean classifications deriving from the new branching questions once again show important differences in the political attitudes and behavior of evangelical and non-evangelical Protestants; it is worth the modest investment in time for the branching scheme;
- (2) the new Bible reading item (V8649) and witnessing the faith item (V8650) clearly differentiate by religious tradition and religious involvement and are likely to be part of the calculus reflected in the political items;
- (3) whatever decision rules are followed in configuring religious involvement, a measure that extends both ends of the 1988-and-earlier measures has a high payoff.

In still another way, we can show that religious tradition and religious involvement (based on Religious Involvement II) are politically-relevant variables that can play in the big leagues. Table 9 stacks the deck against them by introducing social class and liberalism/conservatism into analyses of variance; study after study considers social class and political ideology as relevant variables in political behavior. For a sample of this size let us treat Betas of over .10 as the equivalent of the .05 level of significance and anything over .15 as the rough equivalent of .001. Table 9 offers eight political or politically relevant variables within which to measure the difference of categories of religious involvement, religious tradition, social class, and political ideology.

TABLE 9

RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT, RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION, SOCIAL CLASS, AND LIBERALISM CONSERVATISM:  
 PREDICTORS OF RELIGIOUS ATTITUDES, POLITICAL ATTITUDES AND POLITICAL BEHAVIOR (AN MCA ANALYSIS)

	Party ID Mean=3.16		Abortion Mean=2.9		Turnout Mean=1.79		Vote Choice Mean=1.46		Social Policy Mean=2.67		Traditional Morality Mean=1.65		Religion as Guide Mean=2.70		ID w. Ev/ Fund. Gps. Mean=0.71	
Religious Involvement:																
LE 1-2 X Month	.01	.04	.38	.32	.21	.10	.01	-.01	-.33	-.18	-.47	-.39	-.60	-.44	-.31	-.18
Most Weeks	-.29	-.31	-.23	-.15	-.23	-.14	.08	.08	-.03	-.09	.18	.15	.45	.35	-.03	-.05
GT Weekly	.52	.45	-.78	-.71	-.22	-.06	-.18	-.15	1.10	.75	1.12	.93	1.02	.71	1.02	.65
	Eta 12 Beta 12		E 42 B 36		E 14 B 07		E 17 B 15		E 34 B 23		E 42 B 35		E 55 B 40		E 44 B 28	
Relig. Tradition:																
Evangelical	-.12	-.27	-.29	-.05	-.08	-.09	-.07	-.01	.74	.47	.40	.08	.67	.42	.76	.56
Non-Evangelical	.53	.41	.09	.06	-.11	-.08	-.04	.00	-.16	-.16	.15	.15	.10	.12	-.15	-.12
Catholic	-.69	-.42	-.17	-.19	-.25	-.17	.18	.09	-.33	-.18	-.30	-.24	-.14	-.20	-.39	-.33
None	-.01	.17	.52	.18	.61	.48	-.03	-.09	-.58	-.31	-.63	-.15	-1.16	-.72	-.58	-.36
	Eta 20 Beta 16		E 27 B 11		E 18 B 14		E 19 B 10		E 34 B 21		E 28 B 11		E 52 B 34		E 49 B 35	
Social Class:																
Working	-.24	-.17	-.10	-.12	.35	.31	.05	.04	.15	.16	-.11	-.05	-.01	.02	.04	.03
Middle	.02	.03	.04	.07	-.29	-.27	.02	.01	-.13	-.14	.12	.08	.06	.01	.02	.00
Upper Middle	.63	.40	.19	.17	-.26	-.19	-.15	-.13	-.12	-.10	-.01	-.08	-.13	-.10	-.16	-.10
	Eta 14 Beta 09		E 10 B 11		E 20 B 18		E 14 B 12		E 09 B 10		E 08 B 05		E 05 B 04		E 07 B 04	
Liberalism/ Conservatism:																
Liberal	-1.44	-1.40	.47	.39	-.20	-.25	.39	.39	-.87	-.77	-.77	-.63	-.33	-.13	-.32	-.20
Moderate	-.18	-.12	-.06	-.08	.35	.32	-.03	-.05	-.11	-.07	-.20	-.16	-.05	-.01	-.21	-.16
Conservative	.78	.73	-.18	-.13	-.14	-.09	-.17	-.16	.48	.40	.49	.40	.19	.07	.28	.20
	Eta 40 Beta 38		E 24 B 20		E 15 B 14		E 45 B 44		E 35 B 30		E 37 B 30		E 17 B 06		E 25 B 18	
Multiple R	.458		.481		.300		.507		.510		.534		.637		.584	
R Square	.210		.231		.090		.257		.260		.285		.405		.341	

Column a = analogue of single regression, e.g. involvement against party I.D.

Column b = multiple regression, e.g., involvement against party I.D. controlling for effects of religious tradition, social class, liberalism-conservatism.

For direction of dependent variables, see Table 2.

The results offer a fascinating picture of the American electorate:

- (1) differences in categories of religious involvement reach significance against seven of the eight political or politically relevant variables; differences in religious tradition are significant in all eight;
- (2) if we exclude the final two columns of politically relevant variables from the comparisons for social class and political ideology (no one should expect these two to predict religion as a guide and affinity with fundamentalists), we find that categories of social class are significant five of six times, and liberalism/conservatism is significant all six times;
- (3) on party identification and social policy, liberalism/conservatism is clearly highest, but religious involvement and religious tradition are more important than social class; religious involvement leads all others on abortion and traditional morality and, while trailing liberalism/ conservatism by a great distance on vote choice, it is modestly higher than social class.
- (4) not surprisingly, turnout is best predicted by social class, but religious tradition matches liberalism/conservatism.

The reader can properly point out that religious differences ought to be most evident on political variables such as abortion, moral traditionalism, and social policy. We must turn to more complex models than we have yet attempted with the 1989 Pilot Study data to see whether a substantial segment of the American electorate considers such issues important in their vote calculus. We think they do for two reasons: (1) the Times-Mirror study, if it has validity, notes the relevance of such issues to its typology of the American electorate (Ornstein, Kohut, and McCarthy 1988), and (2) the relevance shows on vote choice. One may still contend that vote choice is heavily constrained by party identification; yet even with the difference in means, the patterns of variance suggest differently. Further, our earlier discussions suggest that party identification itself is highly responsive to religious tradition.

*We conclude this section by strongly encouraging retention, with slight modifications to be discussed in the next section, of the 1989 Pilot Study items that screened denomination and attendance (V8201-V8204) and extended the degree of involvement (V8356-V8358, V8360). The former not only controlled for response biases but extended substantive understanding and the latter also extended an involvement scale in useful ways.*

### Potpourri of Alternate Wordings

Here, we examine measures that have been used in previous studies such as the born-again, Bible, church attendance, prayer, religious television, and religious salience (importance of religion plus the guidance it provides) items. Comparisons are made between 1988 and similar 1989 Pilot Study measures. In addition, some attention is given to new non-institutional religious activity measures created for the Pilot Study: reading

about religion through newspapers, books, and magazines; reading the Bible; witnessing to others about one's faith; and church membership.

### Born Again

The National Election Studies have included a born-again item in each of the presidential election surveys beginning in 1980. This item has demonstrated analytical utility as one item in a composite measure distinguishing evangelical from nonevangelical Protestants, a distinction with considerable significance in electoral choice (summarized and demonstrated by Smidt 1989). We suspected that the measure could further be purified.

Wording has been different in all three of the surveys. The Pilot Study wording is different yet. In 1980, V1175 asked respondents: "Some people have had deep religious experiences which have transformed their lives. I'm thinking of experiences sometimes described as 'being born again in one's life.' There are deeply religious people who have not had an experience of this sort. How about you; have you had such an experience?" On grounds of face validity, this item was far from ideal -- it was worded in an awkward fashion, and it never mentioned Jesus Christ. 26.5 percent of the sample responded affirmatively. In 1984, the question was altered somewhat. Instead of "being born again in one's life," the item read "being born again in one's faith or discovering Jesus Christ in one's life." Otherwise, the wording remained the same. 27.9 percent of the sample responded positively in 1984. In both 1980 and 1984, if respondents had not indicated that religion was important in their lives, the born-again questions were not asked. In 1988, a different strategy was used: respondents were asked, "Do you consider yourself a born-again Christian?" Individuals who declared no religious preference or whose faith was not "Christian" were not asked the question. 32.4 percent of the sample identified themselves as born again.

Two different approaches were implied in the 1980 to 1988 born-again questions. The 1980 and 1984 items implied that the critical element in a born-again measure was "experiential." It was a kind of religious experience that some people had, while others (including deeply religious folk) did not. Conceptually, James Hunter (1983) has argued that a central feature of evangelical religion is a conversion experience, a point (or period) in the life of an individual where there is a conviction of one's sinfulness and a turning to God, through Christ, for forgiveness. In American religions in the "revivalist" tradition, this conversion experience is commonly called a "born-again" experience. Both 1980 and 1984 items were at least pointed in this direction. In 1988, however, the item was worded in a different manner. In the latter year, it was phrased in terms of self-identification, much like partisan identification. 32.4 percent responded affirmatively. A self-identification approach supplies no content to the born-again phenomenon (at least as asked in 1988).

The 1989 Pilot Study used an item that combined the experiential and self-identification approaches by asking, "Would you call yourself a born-again Christian -- that is, have you personally had a conversion experience related to Jesus Christ?" 33 percent of the sample said "yes." We feel on grounds of face validity that the Pilot Study item is far superior to its predecessors in 1980, 1984, and 1988, and should be continued in the future. However, there are empirical grounds for reaching the same conclusion. In Table

10, we compare evangelical and non-evangelical Protestants in terms of their responses to both the 1988 question and the 1989 Pilot Study item. If the 1989 version is a better measure, then evangelicals should increase their positive responses to this item, while non-evangelicals should not. That is exactly what happens.

TABLE 10

Comparison on 1988 and Pilot Study Born Again Measures: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Protestants Only

	Evangelicals	Non-Evangelicals
Positive Responses 1988	68.4%	26.9%
Positive Responses 1989 Pilot	82.4	27.1

There is evidence, however, that suggests that the 1988 and 1989 Pilot Study items are tapping somewhat different religious traditions. The evidence is presented in Table 11. First, the two measures are crosstabulated to produce four groups: "yes" to both items; "yes" to one and "no" to the other; and "no" to both. Second, these four groups are then related to the three major religious traditions: evangelical and non-evangelical Protestant and Catholic. The results are suggestive.

TABLE 11

Born-Again Groups and Religious Traditions: A Comparison of Measures

	Evangelical	Non-Evangelical	Catholic	n
Yes in 1988 - Yes in 1989	75.8%	21.0%	3.2%	124
Yes in 1988 - No in 1989	16.7	72.2	11.1	18
No in 1988 - Yes in 1989	37.4	31.3	31.3	32
No in 1988 - No in 1989	10.2	48.1	41.7	187

Evangelical Protestants predominate in the first group; they appear comfortable with the language of both self-identification and conversion. In contrast, those respondents who are willing to self identify as born again but not to claim a born-again experience are predominantly non-evangelical Protestant, although the group size is small enough to suggest caution in interpretation. The third group, no to self-identification but yes to a born-again experience, is fairly evenly divided among the three religious traditions; while the fourth group, whose respondents said "no" to both 1988 and 1989 items, is predominantly Catholic and non-evangelical Protestant in makeup. These findings in Table 11 suggest that self-identification and experiential measures of the born-again phenomenon have different meanings to individuals in different religious traditions, and that *both measures may be useful in future research. If we must opt for a single measure, however, it is clearly V8243 from the 1989 Pilot Study, rather than V1213 from 1988.*

## Biblical Literalism

Measures of Biblical inerrancy or Biblical literalism have also proven useful in previous studies (Smidt 1989). The 1988 item measuring attitudes toward the Bible (V5937) continued use of a question begun in the 1980 survey and repeated in 1984. The item asks respondents to choose from four alternatives: 1) "The Bible is God's word and all it says is true." 2) "The Bible was written by men inspired by God, but it contains some human errors." 3) "The Bible is a good book because it was written by wise men, but God had nothing to do with it." 4) "The Bible was written by men who lived so long ago that it is worth very little today." An "Other, specify" alternative was also offered. The 1989 Pilot Study, in contrast, offered three alternatives (V8645): 1) "the Bible is the actual word of God and is to be taken literally, word for word." 2) "The Bible is the word of God but not everything in it should be taken literally word for word." 3) "The Bible is a book written by men and is not the word of God." Table 12 compares the responses of four religious traditions in the 1980, 1984, 1988, and 1989 Pilot Study surveys.

Note the different response pattern to the Pilot Study question in contrast to the earlier studies. Particularly disturbing about the findings in 1980, 1984 and 1988 is that the group which professed no religious preference had a fairly high "inerrantist" response. How can a group with no religious affiliation have so many with a "high" view of scripture? This finding is hardly surprising because the essential "truth" of the Bible, especially its ethical content, could well be conceded by those, such as Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, who would never construe it as a literal or accurate history of humankind. In contrast, in responses to the Pilot Study item this same group almost completely disdained the "extreme" category. Item wording seems to be the likely reason. These data alone suggest continuing the 1989 Pilot Study item in future surveys. In relating the 1988 and 1989 Bible items to a series of political attitudes and behaviors, the 1989 measure showed stronger relationships with 1988 vote choice, social policy attitudes, and the moral traditionalism index than did the 1988 item (in terms of the chi-square test of statistical significance). In 1989, literalists were somewhat more likely to have voted for Bush, to hold conservative social policy positions, and to favor traditional morality than inerrantists using the 1988 item. *These findings support the same overall conclusion: keep the 1989 Pilot Study measure (V8645).*

## Church Attendance

While we have already shown the utility of church attendance measures in alternate indexes of religious involvement, the appropriate wording is yet to be resolved. The NES surveys have included an attendance item since the beginning of the series in the post-World War II period. A change occurred in the 1988 survey in terms of the attendance measure that seems trivial on its face. Respondents who claimed weekly attendance on V1214 were asked if they attended just once a week or more often than that (V1215). The latter group, or "hyper-attenders," would no doubt be the most susceptible to both overt and covert political cues, and, in fact, this is exactly what the data seem to suggest. The practice of seeking to identify the "hyper-attenders" continued in the 1989 Pilot Study.



TABLE 12

RESPONSES TO THE BIBLE ITEMS OVER TIME FOR VARIOUS RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS				
	Evangelical	Non-Evangelical	Catholic	No Affil.
<b>1980:</b>				
Inerrant	71.8%	40.1%	35.7%	28.0%
Inspired	25.6	50.6	57.5	36.4
All Other Responses	2.5	9.2	6.8	35.5
<b>1984:</b>				
Inerrant	75.2	44.2	37.4	22.3
Inspired	21.0	48.9	55.9	39.6
All Other Responses	3.8	6.9	6.1	38.1
<b>1988:</b>				
Inerrant	75.5	41.5	33.3	15.6
Inspired	20.4	51.2	57.8	51.1
All Other Responses	4.1	7.3	8.9	33.3
<b>1989 Pilot Study:</b>				
Literal	68.5	31.3	21.7	2.6
From God but not Literal	23.5	55.4	63.2	42.1
Not from God	8.1	13.3	15.1	55.3

Differences between groups in all four studies are statistically significant at the .001 level using the Chi Square test.

Before comparing the 1988 and 1989 results, we first examine the approaches used to measure attendance in the Pilot Study. After asking about the religious tradition in which the respondent grew up but before seeking information about present affiliations, individuals were asked if they "ever attend religious services, apart from occasional weddings, baptisms, or funerals?" 68.8 percent said "yes." This item was followed by a series of questions concerning the identification, or lack of same, with religion. As a result, 77 individuals who said they did not attend church (V8201) and professed no identification with a church or denomination (V8203) were not asked the more detailed questions about attendance that were placed much further along in the questionnaire.

These latter questions included an experiment in which one half of the remaining 417 respondents were asked, "How often do you attend religious services?" No response categories were provided -- respondents provided their own. The remainder of the sample were asked, "Would you say you go to (church, synagogue) every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never?" For those who said "every week," a followup question asked: "Would you say you go to (church/synagogue) once a week or more often than once a week?" Table 13 presents the response frequencies to these

TABLE 13  
CHURCH ATTENDANCE PERCENTAGES: 1989 PILOT STUDY

V8356/V8358 Response Categories Provided						V8357 No Response Categories Provided							
GT	Most	1-2X	FewX			GT	Most	2-3	Once	SevX	1-2		
<u>Wkly</u>	<u>Wkly</u>	<u>Weeks</u>	<u>Month</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Wkly</u>	<u>Wkly</u>	<u>Weeks</u>	<u>Month</u>	<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Never</u>
24.1	13.3	14.8	23.2	18.7	5.9	13.1	32.4	1.9	14.6	8.9	10.8	9.9	8.5

questions in the accompanying table. Where response frequencies are provided by the respondent (the right of the table), the greater than weekly response is seriously under-represented. That is the most serious discrepancy, although there are others. The combination of V8356 and V8358 (the left side of the table) leads to significant results when related to external variables. Greater than weekly attenders are likely to be Republican in party identification and in vote choice (when whites only are examined) when compared with those who attend less frequently. Not surprisingly, they are disproportionately evangelical Protestant, likely to read the Bible daily, to witness to others about their faith, and to perceive a great deal of guidance by religion in their daily lives. They also hold social attitudes consistent with the above pattern: they are very conservative in terms of social policy issues (abortion and the like) and also favor traditional moral values. All of these differences between greater than weekly attenders and others are statistically significant at the .01 level or better.

Findings from the 1988 study are comparable. A similar pattern of relationships holds when the attendance measure is related to external variables -- the greater than

weekly church attenders tend to be vastly different from less frequent attenders. The pattern is similar despite the fact that the 1988 item had fewer respondents at the high end of the measure and more individuals at the low end. This is due to the fact that many "non-religious" respondents had been weeded out prior to asking the attendance questions in the Pilot Study.

We feel that the Pilot Study confirms the importance of obtaining information concerning greater than weekly attendance. As for question wording, *either the 1988 measure V1214/1215) or the Pilot Study measure (V8356/8358) where response categories are provided would suffice*. As noted above, they are almost identical. *The item which provided no response categories (V8357) should not be used in the future.*

The key to constructing response categories for church attendance is to focus on clear differentiation at the high end of the continuum. "Greater than weekly" and "once each week" are clear and unambiguous, but as we go beyond these it is less clear what to use. How different are "almost every week" and "once or twice a month?" Would it make sense to ask the respondent to specify the exact number of times per month? Probably not, but with hindsight, it would have been a good idea to have tried it out on the Pilot Study. Why this attention to responses between the "every week" and "once a month or less" possibilities? Our hunch is that at some point between these two possibilities the person becomes a "nominal religionist" who is basically unresponsive or unaware of religious stimuli. We must leave it to future research to explore this area.

### Church Membership

Because the practices of various denominations differ greatly in classifying people as "members," we included an item (V8359), that asked: "Are you officially a member of a parish, congregation, temple, or other place of worship?" Although the membership item is related to political variables like turnout, the item does not hold up when subjected to multivariate controls. The item does appear in Religious Involvement I but it is conceivable that it could be replaced by another item, e.g., religious salience; only further play with variables will resolve the matter. We do not know whether it belongs in a package involving group memberships. Regardless, *we do not at this point feel that V8359 offered a great deal of new knowledge, and recommend that its retention have lower priority than the filters (V8201, V8202, V8204) or the other church activities (V8360).*

### Participation in Other Religious Organizations

We had a serendipitous finding with an item that asked respondents: "Do you participate in a religious organization, society, or group outside of (your/a) (parish/congregation/temple/place of worship)? 13% of the respondents with a denominational affiliation said they did. But that is where the first surprise came.

We had included the item because we thought it might tap religious activity (other than church attendance) outside the setting of one's own church. Further it might note participation with a quasi-religious activity (e.g., church soup kitchen) by people with no church affiliation, or who avoided the "institutional church." The latter proved futile when

the Working Group failed to instruct staff/interviewers to use the item on all respondents. *Mea culpa!* The former proved surprising when 62% of all mentions were inside one's church. Only 38% of the mentions were actually in extra-congregational, civic, or ecumenical theaters. It would have been tempting to say that the item was laden with measurement error -- which it clearly is, given the intent.

But then the other surprise came. The item entered nicely into the scale called Religious Involvement I, described earlier. It is particularly useful in picking up hyper-activity within non-evangelical bodies, where there is not the range of non-Sunday religious services to be attended. People are obviously immersed with co-religionists in religious activity but it is not classified as a service/mass.

*Just as we argue for the retention of V8358 for more frequent attendance, we argue for retaining V8360-V8362 for additional religious activity in public settings.* The analyst is free to compose a religious involvement index with either or both items since each has shown great utility against political variables.

The item itself should probably be reworded as follows -- (For those who answer "yes" on V8201) "Do you participate in any additional religious organization, society, or group within or outside your (parish/congregation/temple/place of worship)?" specify \_\_\_\_\_; or (For those who answer "no" on V8201) "Do you participate in any activity sponsored by a religious organization, society or group -- e.g., soup kitchen, charity, social or athletic club, literary society -- even though you are not affiliated with that religious body?" specify \_\_\_\_\_. Such modification in wording will get at both our original intent and capitalize on the structural equivalent of hyper-involvement outside religious services.

### Non-Institutional Religious Devotionalism

The two religious involvement measures indexed exposure to cultural (religious) values in an institutional context. Another battery of items (V8646 to V8650) tap the devotional life of respondents away from that institutional context. The items deal with praying privately, monitoring religious news in print media, watching religious programs on television, reading the Bible privately, and seeking to evangelize others. The item format offered eight response categories -- daily to never. The item means ranged from a high of 2.126 for prayer to a low of 6.846 for evangelizing.

While the response categories for the non-institutional religious practice items (V8646-8650) ranged from "daily" at one extreme to "never" at the other, in retrospect, there are too many response categories. How does "several times a year" differ from "hardly ever?" The reduction of response categories to a maximum of five would appear in order. In addition, and in contrast to the above recommendation, the prayer item needs a category at the "heavy" prayer end of the scale, so that one can distinguish between those who pray on their own "about once a day" and those who do so much more frequently than that. There is some possibility of response set in answers that we have not yet adequately estimated. Nonetheless, the items look promising.

These private devotional items yielded a summated scale ranging from 0 (low) to 35 (high) with a coefficient alpha of .73. While there is very substantial overlap between this scale and Religious Involvement I -- the Pearson  $r = .54$  -- there is still some independence between the two. That is, some people may retain a vigorous private devotional life and, for infirmity or other reasons, be unable to participate in public rituals. And vice versa, some may be regular church attenders but seldom read the Bible or come from a religious tradition that eschews religious television. Thus there is sufficient commonality between the two measures to make us confident of each, but sufficient differences to make each politically interesting.

When run against the familiar battery of political dependent variables the customary pattern occurs -- with some adjustments. This time, turnout does not reach statistical significance although it remains positive -- but we should expect that of a more private kind of religious life. Nor does the Reagan economic retrospective, the new liberalism-conservatism measure, affirmative action for Blacks, and defense spending reach significance, although the last comes closest. The relationship is modest and  $< .05$  on candidate preference (Dukakis) and party identification (Democrat). The relationship is highly significant, near or beyond  $.001$ , on the death penalty (oppose), the old measure of liberalism-conservatism (conservative), the social policy index (conservative), school prayer (support Christian prayer), and especially the index of moral traditionalism (traditional,  $.34$ ) and abortion (restrictive,  $.36$ ).

*In summary, although response categories could easily be contracted on the items that tap non-institutional (private) religious devotionalism, new information is yielded from it and that information is politically relevant. In one way or another, some of these items have appeared on previous instruments through different formats. The new collection (V8646-V8650) of these yields an attractive scale. They are worth retaining since the new format may actually reduce the interviewing time needed to yield more information. Modifications are suggested below.*

### Religious Television Viewing

More attention has been paid to religious television viewing by scholars in recent years than any other form of religious practice or behavior, or so it seems. No doubt this attention is due to the role paid by "televangelists" in the rise of the New Christian Right, and, of course, the recent scandals involving James Bakker and Jimmy Swaggart. Hence, it is not surprising that items appeared in the 1988 NES survey. Respondents were asked, "In the past week did you watch or listen to religious programs on radio or TV?" (V1216/1217). If an individual responded "yes," a followup question was asked, "About how many times (did you watch or listen)?" Note that the initial question asked about both television and radio. 30 percent of the respondents indicated that they had watched at least some religious television or listened to religious radio in the past week. This 30 percent, or 184 respondents, did not spend a great deal of time at it, however; almost 70 percent watched or listened one or two times per week or less. In the 1989 Pilot Study, the question (V8648) focussed exclusively on television viewing. 77 percent of the respondents do not watch religious television at all; 16 percent watch about once per week, and 7 percent watch more than weekly.

In trying to evaluate the 1988 questions in comparison with the 1989 measure, it is somewhat like comparing apples and oranges. *Our own recommendation is to focus on religious television, to place the item in a package of religious practice measures, and to reduce the number of response categories somewhat.* The 1989 item, V8648, does work as expected: greater than weekly religious television viewers support Bush at higher levels than non-viewers. In addition, the heavy television viewers are much stronger supporters of conservative social policy issues as well as traditional morality than the non-viewers (at statistically significant levels).

### Prayer

An item on the frequency of prayer (V5938) was included in the 1988 questionnaire with a similar measure (V8646) included in the Pilot Study. Item wording differed slightly (the Pilot Study focussed on praying "on your own"); in addition, response categories were somewhat different as well, although they can be made comparable by recoding. In Table 14 are the item frequencies.

TABLE 14  
FREQUENCY OF PRAYER: 1988 AND 1989 PILOT STUDY COMPARISONS

	Sev. X per day	Once per day	Few X Week	LE Weekly	Never	N
1988-V5938	30.9%	24.1%	17.6%	17.9%	9.4%	614
1989-V8646	N.A.	63.9	13.1	14.3	8.8	443

Note the similarity in the two years. Relationships with external variables are somewhat better using the 1988 item, probably because of the "several times per day" category in the earlier questionnaire. Those who engage in frequent prayer were more likely to have voted in 1988 and to hold conservative social issue positions and to hold traditional family values than those who do not pray (all statistically significant). *The 1988 prayer measure should be retained in a package of religious practice items, but the words "on your own" should be inserted just before the response categories.*

### Salience of Religion

Since 1980, NES surveys have included two items that have been underutilized by scholars: 1) an importance of religion measure -- "Do you consider religion to be an important part of your life, or not?" (V5935.) 2) A followup question asked only of those who said "yes" to the first item: "Would you say your religion provides some guidance in your day-to-day living, quite a bit of guidance, or a great deal of guidance in your day-to-day life?" (V5936.) When these two items are combined into a "guidance" index (none, some, quite a bit, a great deal), the results are suggestive. Although we did not consider a religious salience measure of this sort for the 1989 Pilot Study, with hindsight, we wish that we had. Data on white respondents only in Table 15 suggest why. Although the guidance index is not significantly related to party identification, there is the tendency for respondents who receive a great deal of guidance from their religion to identify as

Republicans. Not surprisingly, they also were more likely to have voted for George Bush in 1988 (although again the results do not reach levels of statistical significance, in this instance they come very close). However, the greater the salience of religion, the greater

TABLE 15  
RELIGIOUS GUIDANCE AND OTHER VARIABLES: THE 1988 STUDY (WHITES ONLY)

	Religion Provides:			
	No Guidance	Some Guidance	Quite a Bit of Guidance	Great Deal of Guidance
Democratic Party ID	41.5%	41.6%	48.3%	36.8%
Independent	15.4	10.0	9.5	9.3
Republican	41.4	47.5	40.5	53.3
Voted for Bush in 1988	54.5	56.1	48.4	63.4
Vote Turnout in 1988	65.9	69.2	81.9	81.9***
Conservative Social Policy Positions	11.3	16.6	31.1	40.0***
Traditional Morality	7.3	14.1	29.3	39.0***
Non-Evangelical Prot.	19.2	25.4	23.4	31.3
Evangelical Prot.	12.2	16.3	20.4	51.0***
Catholic	20.2	27.9	27.1	24.8

\*\*\*Chi Square significant at the .001 level

the vote turnout, and the greater the likelihood of holding conservative social policy and traditional morality positions. Finally, evangelicals are more likely to attach strong salience to their religion than non-evangelical Protestants and Catholics. *These results are suggestive, and just the tip of the iceberg, and argue for the maintenance of these two salience items (V5935-V5936) in future NES surveys.*

#### Cue-Giving, Social Teaching, or Speaking Out

During the 1970s and 1980s, as the evangelical right was mobilized, and Catholic bishops, concluding four to six years of widely-publicized deliberations, issued pastoral

statements on nuclear disarmament and the economy, both press and the academy began to entertain more seriously the possibility that religion and politics are linked in the United States. Actually they always have been: witness early Northern evangelicalism and abolitionism; later small-town evangelicalism and William Jennings Bryan, prohibition, school curricula, etc.; the mainline bodies and Manifest Destiny, know-nothingism, social reform, Muckraking, women's suffrage, the League of Nations and the United Nations, the Peace Corps; and finally, black churches and civil rights. Mobilization by each religious group differs by time and issue.

Scholarly research has begun to address the mechanisms of religious cue-giving and their effects on political attitudes and behavior. Wald (1987, pp. 24-27) argues that religious effects derive from common creed, institutional status, social group identity and social interaction. In terms of both size and frequency of interaction, religious congregations are, after all, the largest potential interest groups in the country. Roozen, McKinney, and Carroll (1984) offer four typologies of the political and civic involvements of local parishes/congregations. Wald, Owen, and Hill (1988) show that local congregations in Florida exert contextual effects in the shaping of their members' political views well beyond that predicted by members' social and political characteristics. Finally, Newport and Rothenberg (1984) offer an instrument that permits the isolation of specific issue effects from generalized legitimacy.

Having surrogates for religious integration on NES and GSS data sets but lacking specific cue-giving measures, political scientists have never been able to develop reasoned estimates of the extent to which the local religious context affects outcomes in national elections. Yet as Lege, Lieske, and Wald (1990) argue, cue-giving is an essential component of cultural theories of American political behavior because it applies group norms about both responsibility and boundaries to current political and social events.

The 1989 Pilot Study offers the first opportunity to fill this scholarly vacuum through a cue-giving sequence consisting of six issue items, one candidate item, and one legitimacy item. The findings that follow are derived from (1) simple bivariate relationships, using each cue-giving item as an independent variable or a dependent variable, and (2) a composite scale of cue-giving, against the range of political dependent variables used elsewhere in this report. Their relationship to selected variables is seen in Table 16.



TABLE 16  
THE RELATIONSHIP OF CUE-GIVING TO RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL VARIABLES

	Housing, Homelessness	Sexual Behavior	Abortion	School Prayer	The Economy	Nuclear Disarmament	Political Candidates	Legitimate to Speak (Yes,Depends)
Total % Perceive Speaking Out	64.5	64.2	61.1	43.4	39.2	24.8	16.6	51.0
% Unable to Answer Item	4.4	3.5	3.8	2.9	2.9	5.6	3.2	4.0
% Perceive Speaking Out by Religious Tradition & Attendance								
Evangelical								
Regular	64.9	85.7	76.9	66.2	51.3	28.9	31.6	64.7
Irregular	58.5	55.8	53.7	58.1	47.6	22.0	12.2	40.8
Mainline								
Regular	50.9	61.1	51.9	40.7	30.2	26.4	13.0	53.7
Irregular	77.4	46.0	36.1	26.6	32.8	19.7	14.3	50.5
Catholic								
Regular	71.8	73.7	87.5	32.5	45.0	28.2	10.0	62.8
Irregular	73.5	67.6	79.4	42.4	38.2	25.0	15.2	37.1
Jews	57.1	42.9	28.6	-	14.3	14.3	-	81.8
Correlation between Perceive Speaking Out by Religion as Guide (Tau C, Significance)								
	-.076 .090	.146 .005	.106 .035	.209 .000	.077 .092	.068 .123	.101 .011	.045 .133
Selected Correlations								
Feeling Thermometer: Anti-Abortionists			.167 .002					
Attitude on Abortion			.277 .000					
Feeling Thermometer: Homosexuals		.046 .188						
Attitude on School Prayer				.221 .000				
Cooperation with Russia						.130 .020		
Feeling Thermometer: The Poor	-.048 .213				-.018 .386			
Govt. Assistance to Poor	-.098 .046				-.031 .299			
Cand. Preference							.037 .207	

The range of variance in the issue and candidate items is substantial -- from 64.5% perceived as offering cues on housing and homelessness to just 16.6% reporting cues from the clergy on candidates for office. As will be seen later, the items yield a scale with a coefficient alpha of .74. The items are useful in their own right, however, because some denominational bodies limit their social teaching to selective areas. The items presented no undue burden on respondents, with "don't know" and "not ascertained" accounting for only 2.9 - 5.6% of the appropriate subsample. Finally, the perceived legitimacy of social cues from religious leaders is to some extent independent of cue-giving. Thus, the elements of complex models are present in the data.

The perception of cue-giving differs by issue, denominational family, and frequency of presence at religious services. Generally, the sect-type church leaders are perceived as offering cues by a greater proportion of their adherents on a greater range of issues than are the church-type leaders. And in only 6 of 21 cells are the less-frequent attenders more likely to perceive cues than the more-frequent attenders; usually the difference is small, and half of these instances are among Catholics, a church-type body. According to Hadden's "gathering storm" thesis (1969), declining attendance among mainline Protestants is the result of church leaders' offering social teaching. There may be modest evidence to that effect in the Pilot Study subsample, particularly on housing and homelessness and maybe on the economy, but the sample size for the latter is too small to put any confidence in the observed difference. The difference between regular and irregular attenders' perceptions are greatest among mainline Protestants but they are also very large on sexual issues among Evangelicals. The greatest gap in the legitimacy of cue-giving comes in the two families -- Evangelicals and Catholics -- where the regular attenders accord the highest legitimacy to social teaching. Cue-giving on public issues appears to be part of their regular attenders' expectations of their local church.

The impact of these ministerial cues is likely to be greatest on persons of deep religious faith. This point may be seen by examining the rows of Table 16 which show correlations between cue-giving and the extent to which religion is "taken seriously" and is perceived as a guide for daily life. All but one of the issues -- nuclear disarmament -- is significant at beyond the .10 level and four of the six remaining issues reach levels of significance usually required of much larger samples. The magnitude of the correlation is especially notable on school prayer and sexual behavior. It is also interesting to note the negative relationship between the perception of cue-giving on homelessness and the likelihood that religion is not a guide in daily life; perhaps this is another modest piece of evidence that the "gathering storm" phenomenon still lingers. This finding is also consistent when we examine feelings toward the poor and welfare policy.

Does cue-giving make any difference in the political attitudes of religious adherents? We have not yet estimated complex models that untangle that sequence. The selected correlations toward the bottom of Table 16 suggest that would not be a futile enterprise. Highly significant relationships are shown between the perception of social teaching and one's feelings about anti-abortionists and one's attitudes toward the conditions under which abortion is permissible. The same is true on school prayer and, to a lesser extent, between teaching on nuclear disarmament and cooperation with Russia.

The relationship does not hold, however, between teaching on proper sexual conduct and feelings toward homosexuals, and especially not on teaching on the economy and homelessness and feelings toward the poor and governmental assistance to the poor. We suspect that, where welfare is concerned, the public teaching runs in different directions within different religious families; among Catholics, system-blame and corporate action is taught; among evangelical Protestants, person-blame and individual action is taught; and among mainline Protestant, both system and person-blame are taught but individual action is the customary response. The Working Group on Religious Measures had earlier argued for an item that could sort out these options but did not offer a compelling argument or a good sample item to the Pilot Study Committee. The other option is to ascertain the direction of the teaching, but that is more costly in scarce interview-schedule time.

Although a scale derived from the cue-giving items has nice measurement properties, it may be a case of "more is less" as a discriminating tool. That is, because the direction of the teaching may differ from church to church on an issue, the scale is at its best only when all churches teach in the same direction. Such a finding, of course, reaffirms the central hypothesis about cue-giving but it helps little in untangling the sequence. In the time available we have been unable to estimate models for the latter.

To speak most positively about the scale, then, it does confirm that when public teaching is done across issues, the political viewpoints of church members follow a pattern that is different from churches where cue-giving is not done. And from the standpoint of convergent and discriminant validation, the matrix of product-moment correlations is very appealing. There is no significant relationship between the scale and party identification, liberalism-conservatism (old or new), turnout, candidate choice, and Reagan economic retrospective. If there had been significant relationships we would have suspected confounding factors. On the other hand, there are highly significant relationships ( $< .01$ ) on restricting abortion, school prayer, social policy change, and opposition to the death penalty (part of the Catholic seamless garment). There are also highly significant relationships between the scale and both measures of religious involvement and the private religion scale. Relationships with other measures -- e.g., moral traditionalism -- hover around the .10 level.

The Working Group, at this point, has a dilemma regarding its recommendation. *There is no question that we would like to retain the cue-giving sequence (V8637 to V8644).* It provides rich data about which denominations, religious families, and religious traditions' local leaders are giving political cues; it differentiates these by issue; it assesses the legitimacy of such cue-giving; and there is evidence of the linkage between cue-giving and politically-relevant attitudes and issue positions. At the same time, *it would be very helpful to have the direction of the cue on a couple of issues.* One option would be to combine the housing and economy items with a single item having to do with the plight of the poor, and follow it with a choice of policy directions that is taught (perhaps similar to the stripped/framed) in the church. Another directional item might concern abortion, coupled with language similar to V8534. It is not that the current cue-giving measures are unsatisfactory; quite to the contrary -- once housing and the economy are modified. Rather, we want to close the circle of the cue-giving argument, and do it in a way that does not

monopolize scarce space on the instrument. If churches are potential interest groups, we feel there is no better way to test their place in American electoral behavior than to employ a cue-giving battery.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brady, Henry E. and Paul M. Sniderman. 1985. Attitude Attribution: A Group Basis for Political Reasoning. American Political Science Review 79: 1061-78.
- Brudney, J. L. and G. W. Copeland. 1984. Evangelicals as a Political Force: Reagan and the 1980 Religious Vote. Social Science Quarterly 65: 1072-9.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. The American Voter. New York: Wiley.
- Conover, Pamela J. and Stanley Feldman. 1986. Morality Items in the May 1985 Pilot Study. Ann Arbor, MI: NES Pilot Study Committee.
- Converse, Philip E. 1966. Religion and Politics: The 1960 Election. In Angus Campbell, et al., Elections and the Political Order. New York: Wiley.
- Converse, Philip E. 1968. Some Priority Variables in Comparative Electoral Research. Occasional Paper #3. Glasgow: University of Strathclyde, Survey Research Centre.
- Fee, Joan L. 1976. Party Identification among American Catholics, 1972, 1973. Ethnicity 3: 53-69.
- Glock, Charles Y. and Rodney Stark. 1965. Religion and Society in Tension. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Greeley, Andrew M. 1982. Religion: A Secular Theory. New York: Free Press.
- Guth, James L. and John C. Green. 1986. Faith and Politics: Religion and Ideology Among Political Contributors. American Politics Quarterly 14: 186-200.
- Guth, James L., Ted G. Jelen, Lyman A. Kellstedt, Corwin E. Smidt, and Kenneth D. Wald. 1988. The Politics of Religion in America: Issues for Investigation. American Politics Quarterly 16:357-397.
- Homans, George Caspar. 1950. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Houglan, J. G. and J. A. Christenson. 1983. Religion and Politics: The Relationship of Religious Participation to Political Efficacy and Involvement. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 67: 405-420.

- Hunter, James. 1983. American Evangelicalism. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Kellstedt, Lyman A. and Mark A. Noll 1990. Religion, Voting for President, and Party Identification, 1948-1984. Pp. 355-379 in Mark A. Noll (ed.), Religion and American Politics (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Kersten, Lawrence K. 1970. The Lutheran Ethic (Detroit: Wayne State University Press).
- King, Morton B. and Richard A. Hunt. 1972. Measuring Religious Dimensions: Studies in Congregational Involvement. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press.
- Knoke, David. 1974. Religious Involvement and Political Behavior: A Log-Linear Analysis of White Americans, 1952-1968. The Sociological Quarterly 15:51-56.
- Knoke, David. 1976. Change and Continuity in American Politics: The Social Basis of Political Parties. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet. 1948. The People's Choice. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Leege, David C. 1989. Parish Life. New Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume 18. Palatine, IL; Publisher's Guild, 205-209.
- Leege, David C. and Michael R. Welch. 1989. Catholics in Context: Theoretical and Methodological Issues in Studying American Catholic Parishioners. Review of Religious Research 31: 132-148.
- Leege, David C., Joel A. Lieske, and Kenneth D. Wald. 1990. Toward Cultural Theories of American Political Behavior: Religion, Ethnicity and Race, and Class Outlook. In William Crotty (ed.), Political Science: Toward the Future, volume 3. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Lenski, Gerhard. 1961. The Religious Factor, Garden City, NY: Doubleday-Anchor.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin and Stein Rokkan. 1967. Party Systems and Voter Alignments. New York: Free Press.
- Lopatto, Paul. 1985. Religion and the Presidential Election. New York: Praeger.
- Macalaso, T. P. and J. Wanat. 1979. Voting Turnout and Religiosity. Polity 12: 158-69.
- Martinson, O. B. and E. A. Wilkening. 1987. Religious Participation and Involvement in Local Politics Throughout the Life Cycle. Sociological Focus 20: 309-318.
- Milbrath, L. W. and M. L. Goel. 1977. Political Participation. Second ed. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

- Miller, Arthur H. and Martin Wattenberg. 1984. Politics from the Pulpit: Religiosity and the 1980 Elections. Public Opinion Quarterly 8: 301-317.
- Miller, M. 1954. The Waukegan Study of Voter Turnout Prediction. Public Opinion Quarterly 16: 381-98.
- Ornstein, Norman, Andrew Kohut, and Larry McCarthy. 1988. The People, The Press, and Politics. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Petrocik, John R. 1981. Party Coalitions: Realignments and the Decline of the New Deal Party System. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Petrocik, John and Frederick Steeper. 1987. The Political Landscape in 1988. Public Opinion 10: 41-44.
- Roof, Wade Clark. 1989. Multiple Switching: A Research Note. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 28: 530-535.
- Roof, Wade Clark and William McKinney. 1987. American Mainline Religion. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Roozen, David, William McKinney, and Jackson W. Carroll. 1984. The Religious Presence: Mission in Public Life. New York: Pilgrim.
- Rothenberg, Stuart and Frank Newport. 1984. The Evangelical Voter: Religion and Politics in America. Washington: Free Congress Foundation.
- Smidt, Corwin. 1989. Identifying Evangelical Respondents: An Analysis of "Born-Again" and Bible Quotations Used across Different Surveys. Pp. 23-43 in Ted G. Jelen (ed.), Religion and Political Behavior in the United States. New York: Praeger.
- Smidt, Corwin. 1989. Praise the Lord Politics: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Characteristics and Political Views of American Evangelical and Charismatic Christians. Sociological Analysis.
- Smith, D. H. 1980. General Activity Model. In Participation in Social and Political Activities, ed. D. H. Smith, J. Macaulay and Associates. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Smith, Tom W. 1986. Classifying Protestant Denominations. GSS Technical Report #67. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Stark, Rodney and Charles Glock 1968. American Piety: Patterns of Religious Commitment. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Strate, J., C. J. Parrish, C. D. Elder, and C. Ford. 1989. Life Span Civic Development and Voting Participation. American Political Science Review 83: 443-464.
- Troeltsch, Ernst. 1931. The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, Volume 2. New York: Macmillan.
- Wald, Kenneth D. 1987. Religion and Politics in the United States. New York: St. Martin's.
- Wald, K. D., D. E. Owen, and S. S. Hill. 1988. Churches as Political Communities. American Political Science Review 82: 531-548.
- Wald, K. D., D. E. Owen, and S. S. Hill, 1990. Political Cohesion in Churches. Journal of Politics, forthcoming.
- Weber, Max. 1946. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wilcox, Clyde. 1986. Fundamentalists and Politics: An Analysis of the Impact of Differing Operational Definitions. Journal of Politics 48: 1041-1051.
- Wildavsky, Aaron. 1987. Choosing Preferences by Constructing Institutions: A Cultural Theory of Preference Formation. American Political Science Review 81: 3-21.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 1988. The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since WW II. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

P. 495844

123

Screen 9

VAR #

5935 (A&B) L3./P3. Do you consider religion to be an important part of your life, or not?

---

1. YES, IMPORTANT

5. NO, NOT IMPORTANT

0 in	
5936	

8. DON'T KNOW

9. NA

0. INAP, no post interview and 1 in 5084; 2 in 5901

5936 (A&B) L4./P4. Would you say your religion provides some guidance in your day-to-day living, quite a bit of guidance, or a great deal of guidance in your day-to-day life?

---

1. SOME

2. QUITE A BIT

3. A GREAT DEAL

8. DON'T KNOW

9. NA

0. INAP, no post interview and 1 in 5084; 2 in 5901;  
5, 8-9 in 5935

<p><b>WARNING:</b> Question order experiment. Please see questionnaire and introduction, V5927-V5953, and V6001-V6024 contain answers to same question asked in different contexts.</p>
---



VAR #

5937 (A&B) L5./P5. (RB, P. 7) Here are four statements about the Bible, and I'd like you to tell me which is closest to your own view. Just give me the number of your choice.

---

1. THE BIBLE IS GOD'S WORD AND ALL IT SAYS IS TRUE
2. THE BIBLE WAS WRITTEN BY MEN INSPIRED BY GOD, BUT IT CONTAINS SOME HUMAN ERRORS
3. THE BIBLE IS A GOOD BOOK BECAUSE IT WAS WRITTEN BY WISE MEN, BUT GOD HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH IT
4. THE BIBLE WAS WRITTEN BY MEN WHO LIVED SO LONG AGO THAT IT IS WORTH VERY LITTLE TODAY
7. OTHER, SPECIFY:
8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA
0. INAP, no post interview and 1 in 5084; 2 in 5901

5938 (A&B) L6./P6. About how often do you pray -- several times a day, once a day, a few times a week, once a week or less, or never?

---

1. SEVERAL TIMES A DAY
2. ONCE A DAY
3. A FEW TIMES A WEEK
4. ONCE A WEEK OR LESS
5. NEVER
8. DK
9. NA
0. INAP, no post interview and 1 in 5084; 2 in 5901

**WARNING: Question order experiment! Please see questionnaire and introduction, V5927-V5953, and V6001-V6024 contain answers to same question asked in different contexts.**

VAR #

- 1211 Y43. Is your religious preference Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish or something else?  
 Y43a. (What church or denomination is that?)  
 Y43b. (IF BAPTIST) Is that Southern Baptist or something else?

PROTESTANT, GENERAL

100. Protestant, no denomination given  
 101. Non-denominational Protestant church  
 102. Community church (no denominational basis)  
 109. OTHER Protestant (not listed below)

PROTESTANT, REFORMATION ERA

110. Presbyterian  
 111. Lutheran (exc. Missouri Synod--see 141, or AME--see 121)  
 112. Congregational  
 113. Evangelical and Reformed  
 114. Reformed, Dutch Reformed, or Christian Reformed  
 115. United Church of Christ (not Church of Christ--see 136)  
 116. Episcopalian, Anglican, Church of England

PROTESTANT, PIETISTIC

120. Methodist (exc. Free Methodist--see 132)  
 121. African Methodist Episcopal (AME)  
 122. United Brethren; Evangelical Brethren  
 123. Baptist (exc. 138, 140, or NA type)  
 124. Disciples of Christ  
 125. "Christian"  
 126. Mennonite; Amish  
 127. Church of the Brethren

PROTESTANT, NEO-FUNDAMENTALIST

130. United Missionary; Protestant Missionary  
 131. Church of God; Holiness  
 132. Nazarene; Free Methodist  
 133. Church of God in Christ  
 134. Plymouth Brethren  
 135. Pentecostal; Assembly of God  
 136. Church of Christ  
 137. Salvation Army  
 138. Primitive, Free Will, Missionary Fundamentalist, Gospel Baptist  
 139. Seventh Day Adventist  
 140. Southern Baptist  
 141. Missouri Synod Lutheran  
 149. OTHER Fundamentalists

VAR #

1211 Y43/Y43a/Y43b. Continued

NON-TRADITIONAL CHRISTIAN

- 150. Christian Scientist
- 151. Spiritualist
- 152. Mormon, Latter Day Saints (LDS)
- 153. Unitarian; Universalist
- 154. Jehovah's Witness
- 155. Quaker
- 156. Unity

CATHOLIC

1 in 1212	—	200. Roman Catholic
-----------	---	---------------------

JEWISH

5 in 1212; 0 in 1213	—	300. Jewish
-------------------------	---	-------------

GREEK RITE CATHOLIC

- 700. Greek Rite Catholic

EASTERN ORTHODOX

- 710. Greek Orthodox
- 711. Russian Orthodox
- 712. Rumanian Orthodox
- 713. Serbian Orthodox

- 719. OTHER Eastern Orthodox

NON-CHRISTIANS, OTHER THAN JEWISH

- 720. Muslim; Mohammedan
- 721. Buddhist
- 722. Hindu
- 723. Bahai

*NOTE: The code for Agnostics, Atheists is 800; in previous election studies the code of 728 has been used.
---

- 729. OTHER non-Judeo-Christian religions

- 800. Agnostics, Atheists\*

Make Card	—	790. OTHER religions, including religious/ethical cults
-----------	---	---

0 in 1212-1215	—	996. REFUSED
	—	998. DK; NONE; NO PREFERENCE
	—	999. NA

VAR #

1212 Y43c. (Is that a Christian faith?)

- 1. YES (includes code 200 in 1211)
  - 5. NO (includes code 300 in 1211)
  - 8. DON'T KNOW
  - 9. NA
  - 0. INAP, 996-999 in 1211
- |      |       |
|------|-------|
| 0 in | _____ |
| 1213 | _____ |

1213 Y43d. Do you consider yourself a born-again Christian?

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
- 8. DK
- 9. NA
- 0. INAP, 996-999 in 1211; 5, 8-9 in 1212

1214 Y44. Do you go to a (church/synagogue) every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never?

- 1. EVERY WEEK
  - 2. ALMOST EVERY WEEK
  - 3. ONCE OR TWICE A MONTH
  - 4. A FEW TIMES A YEAR
  - 5. NEVER
  - 8. DK
  - 9. NA
  - 0. INAP, 996-999 in 1211
- |      |       |
|------|-------|
| 0 in | _____ |
| 1215 | _____ |

VAR #

1215 Y44a. Would you say that you go to a (church/synagogue) once a week or more often than once a week?

- 1. MORE OFTEN
- 2. JUST ONCE A WEEK
- 8. DK
- 9. NA
- 0. INAP, 2-5, 8-9 in 1214

1216 Y45. In the past week did you watch or listen to religious programs on radio or TV?

1. YES

5. NO

0 in
1217

8. DK

9. NA

1217 Y45a. About how many times (did you watch or listen)?

Code actual NUMBER OF TIMES (01-96), except:

97. 97 or more times

98. DK

99. NA

00. INAP, 5, 8-9 in 1216

APPENDIX B

1989 PILOT STUDY RELIGIOSITY ITEMS AND RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE MASTERCODE

8134 C1. In what religion were you raised: were you raised Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, no religion at all, or what?

---

- 1. PROTESTANT
- 2. CATHOLIC
- 3. JEW
- 6. Inap, no Wave 2
- 8. NO RELIGION AT ALL; NONE; NOTHING
- 9. NA
- 0. OTHER RELIGION NOT LISTED ABOVE

8135 Cla. Were you raised in the Orthodox, Conservative or Reform tradition?

---

- 1. ORTHODOX
- 2. REFORM
- 3. CONSERVATIVE
- 4. RECONSTRUCTIONIST
- 5. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY
- 8. DON'T KNOW
- 9. NA
- 0. Inap, no Wave 2; 0-2, 8-9 in 8134

8136 Clb. (What denomination was that?) (What kind of place of worship was that?) (What was it called exactly?)

---

THESE RESPONSES WERE LISTED ON CATI SCREEN [1]
---

- |                                       |                  |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| 01. ASSEMBLY OF GOD                   | 09. EPISCOPAL    |
| 02. BAPTIST                           | 10. HOLINESS     |
| 03. CHRISTIAN                         | 11. LUTHERAN     |
| 04. CHURCH OF GOD                     | 12. METHODIST    |
| 05. CHURCH(ES) OF CHRIST              | 13. PENTECOSTAL  |
| 06. UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST           | 14. PRESBYTERIAN |
| 07. CONGREGATIONALIST                 |                  |
| 08. DISCIPLES OF CHRIST               |                  |
| 96. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3, 8-9 in 8134 |                  |
| 99. NA                                |                  |
| 00. NOT GIVEN ON THIS SCREEN          |                  |

8137 Clc. (What denomination was that?) (What kind of place of worship was that?) (What was it called exactly?)

---

THESE RESPONSES WERE LISTED ON  
CATI SCREEN [2]

15. ANGLICAN/CHURCH OF ENGLAND
16. BUDDHIST
17. BRETHREN
18. CHRISTIAN SCIENTIST
19. EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN
20. FRIENDS, QUAKER
21. HINDU
22. ISLAM (MUSLIM)
23. JEHOVAH'S WITNESS
24. LATTER DAY
25. MORMON
26. MUSLIM (ISLAM)
27. NATIVE AMERICAN
28. NON-DENOMINATIONAL PROTESTANT
29. UNITARIAN
95. MULTIPLE DENOMINATIONS
96. OTHER - SPECIFY ON NEXT SCREEN
97. "JUST PROTESTANT"

98. DON'T KNOW
99. NA

00. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3, 8-9 in 8134; 1-14 in 8136

8138 Clf. With which Baptist group was your church associated? Was it the Southern Baptist Convention, the American Baptist churches in the U.S.A., the American Baptist Association, independent Baptists, or what?

---

1. SOUTHERN
2. AMERICAN BAPTISTS U.S.A.
3. AMERICAN BAPTIST ASSOCIATION
4. INDEPENDENT
7. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY

8. DON'T KNOW; JUST BAPTIST
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3,8-9 in 8134; 0-1,3-14 in 8136

8139 Clf(2) Were you affiliated with any larger Baptist group or  
was this strictly a local church?

1. LOCAL
2. AFFILIATED WITH LARGER GROUP
8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3,8-9 in 8134; 0-1,3-14 in 8136;1-3,7-9 in 8138

8140 Clg. Was this the Evangelical United Brethren, the Plymouth  
Brethren, or what?

1. EVANGELICAL
2. PLYMOUTH
7. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY
8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3, 8-9 in 8134; 0,1-14 in 8136; 15,16,18-98 in 8137

8141 Clh. When you say "Christian" does this mean you were "just  
Christian", and didn't think of yourself as a belonging  
to a particular denomination, or did you belong to a  
non-denominational church, or to the Disciples of  
Christ, or what?

---

1. JUST CHRISTIAN
2. NON-DENOMINATIONAL
3. DISCIPLES OF CHRIST
8. DK
9. NA
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3, 8-9 in 8134; 0-2, 4-14 in 8136

8142 Cli. Was this the Church of Christ or the United Church of  
Christ?

---

1. UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST
2. CHURCH OF CHRIST
8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3,8-9 in 8134; 0,1-4,7-14 in 8136



8143 Clj. Can you give me the specific denomination?  
What kind of church was that? What was it called  
exactly?

---

Use Religious Preference Master Code

000. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3, 8-9 in 8134; 1-9,11-12,  
14 in 8136

8144 Clk. Was this church part of the American Lutheran Church,  
the Lutheran Church in America, the Missouri Synod, or  
what?

---

1. AMERICAN LUTHERAN
2. LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
3. MISSOURI SYNOD
7. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY

8. DON'T KNOW; JUST LUTHERAN
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3,8-9 in 8134; 0,1-10,12-14 in  
8136

8145 Clm. Was your church part of the United Methodist Church or  
something else?

---

1. UNITED METHODIST
2. AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPALIAN (AME)
7. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY

8. DON'T KNOW; JUST METHODIST
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3,8-9 in 8134; 0,1-11,13-14 in  
8136

8146 Cln. Which one was most important to you?

---

Use Religious Preference Master Code

000. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3,8,9 in 8134; 1-14 in  
8136; 15-29, 96-99 in 8137

8147 Clp. Was this the United Presbyterian Church or what?

---

1. UNITED
7. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY

8. DON'T KNOW; JUST PRESBYTERIAN
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3,8,9 in 8134; 0,1-13 in 8136

8148 Clq. Was this the Church of God of Anderson, Indiana; the Church of God of Cleveland, Tennessee; or the Church of God in Christ?

1. ANDERSON, INDIANA
2. CLEVELAND, TENNESSEE
3. IN CHRIST

8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3,8,9 in 8134; 0,1-3,5-14 in 8136

8149 Clr. OTHER PROTESTANT: PLEASE SPECIFY.  
USE THESE PROBES: "What kind of church was that?"  
"What was it called exactly?"

Use Religious Preference Master Code

000. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3, 8,9 in 8134; 1-14 in 8136; 15-29, 95, 98-99 in 8137

8150 Clx. Is this a Christian religion?

1. YES
5. NO
8. DK
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 2-3,8-9 in 8134; 1-14 in 8136; 15-29, 95,98-99 in 8137

8151 Clxx. SUMMARY: R Religious Preference when growing up.

Use Religious Preference Master Code

000. INAP, no Wave 2

**"TRAITS" FOR CATHOLIC PARISHES**

8152 C2. I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe a particular church. For each, tell me whether the word or phrase describes the Catholic church you attended. If you don't know a word, just tell me and we'll go on to the next one.

C2a. Thinking about the Catholic church or parish you mostly attended as a child, does the word "traditionalist" describe this church very well, quite well, not too well, or not well at all?

---

- 1. VERY WELL
- 2. QUITE WELL
- 3. NOT TOO WELL
- 4. NOT WELL AT ALL

**USE SAME CODE  
FOR 8153-8155**

- 8. DON'T KNOW
- 9. NA

0. Inap; no Wave 2; 0,1,3,8-9 in 8134

8153 C2b. (How about) supportive of the reforms of Post-Vatican two?

---

8154 C2c. Ethnic, that is, reflects a particular national or cultural tradition such as Polish, Italian, Hispanic or some other nationality?

---

8155 C2d. Charismatic, that is, Spirit-filled?

---

**"TRAITS" FOR PROTESTANT CHURCHES**

8156 C3. I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe a particular church. For each, tell me whether the word or phrase describes the church you grew up in. Just tell me if you don't know a word and we'll go on to the next one.

C3b. Thinking about the church you mostly attended as a child, does the word "fundamentalist" describe this church very well, quite well, not too well, or not well at all?

---

- 1. VERY WELL
- 2. QUITE WELL
- 3. NOT TOO WELL
- 4. NOT WELL AT ALL

USE SAME CODE  
FOR 8157-8160

- 8. DON'T KNOW
- 9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2;2-3,8-9 in 8134;  
16,21-22,26,27,98-99 in 8137

8157 C3b. (How about) Evangelical?

8158 C3c. Spirit-filled or Pentecostal?

8159 C3d. Conservative?

8160 C3e. Liberal?

8201 C4. Lots of things come up that keep people from attending religious services even if they want to. Thinking about your life nowadays, do you ever attend religious services, apart from occasional weddings, baptisms, or funerals?

---

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
  
- 8. DK
- 9. NA
  
- 0. Inap, no Wave 2

8202 C4a. When you are not on vacation or traveling, do you normally attend one place of worship or do you usually attend one place of worship some of the time and a different place of worship at other times?

---

- 1. ONE
- 5. MORE THAN ONE
  
- 8. DK
- 9. NA
  
- 0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5,8-9 in 8201

8203 C5. Regardless of whether you now attend any church, do you ever think of yourself as part of a particular church or denomination?

---

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
  
- 8. DK
- 9. NA
  
- 0. Inap, no Wave 2; 1,8,9 in 8201

8204 C5a. Do you think of yourself as a religious person?

---

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
  
- 8. DK
- 9. NA
  
- 0. Inap, no Wave 2; 1,8,9 in 8201; 1,8-9 in 8203

**DENOMINATION SERIES FOR RESPONDENTS  
CURRENTLY ATTENDING ONLY ONE CHURCH**

8205 C6. What denomination or faith (is the place of worship you attend/do you consider yourself). Is it Roman Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, or what?

---

1. PROTESTANT
2. CATHOLIC
3. JEW
  
6. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5,8,9 in 8203
  
8. NO RELIGION AT ALL; NONE; NOTHING
9. NA
0. OTHER RELIGION NOT LISTED ABOVE

8206 C6a. Is the synagogue you usually attend Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, or what?

---

1. ORTHODOX
2. REFORM
3. CONSERVATIVE
4. RECONSTRUCTIONIST
5. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY
  
8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA
  
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203; 0-2,8-9 in 8205

8207 C6b. (What denomination is that?) (What kind of church is that?) (What is it called exactly?)

---

**THESE RESPONSES WERE LISTED ON  
CATI SCREEN [1]**

- |  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| 01. ASSEMBLY OF GOD  | 09. EPISCOPAL    |
| 02. BAPTIST  | 10. HOLINESS     |
| 03. CHRISTIAN  | 11. LUTHERAN     |
| 04. CHURCH OF GOD  | 12. METHODIST    |
| 05. CHURCH(ES) OF CHRIST                                       | 13. PENTECOSTAL  |
| 06. UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST                                    | 14. PRESBYTERIAN |
| 07. CONGREGATIONALIST  |                  |
| 08. DISCIPLES OF CHRIST  |                  |
| 96. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203; 2-3,8-9 in 8205 |                  |
| 00. NOT GIVEN ON THIS SCREEN                                   |                  |

8208 C6c. (What denomination is that?) (What kind of church is that?) (What is it called exactly?)

THESE RESPONSES WERE LISTED ON  
CATI SCREEN [2]

15. ANGLICAN/CHURCH OF ENGLAND
16. BUDDHIST
17. BRETHREN
18. CHRISTIAN SCIENTIST
19. EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN
20. FRIENDS, QUAKER
21. HINDU
22. ISLAM (MUSLIM)
23. JEHOVAH'S WITNESS
24. LATTER DAY
25. MORMON
26. MUSLIM (ISLAM)
27. NATIVE AMERICAN
28. NON-DENOMINATIONAL PROTESTANT
29. UNITARIAN
95. MULTIPLE DENOMINATIONS
96. OTHER - SPECIFY ON NEXT SCREEN
97. "JUST PROTESTANT"
  
98. DON'T KNOW
99. NA
  
00. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-9 in 8203; 2-3, 8-9 in 8205; 1-14 in 8207

8209 C6d. With which Baptist group is your church associated? Is it the Southern Baptist Convention, the American Baptist churches in the U.S.A., the American Baptist Association, independent Baptists, or what?

---

1. SOUTHERN
2. AMERICAN BAPTISTS U.S.A.
3. AMERICAN BAPTIST ASSOCIATION
4. INDEPENDENT
7. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY
  
8. DON'T KNOW; JUST BAPTIST
9. NA
  
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-9 in 8203; 2-3,8,9 in 8205; 1,3-14,0 in 8207

- 8210 C6e. Are you affiliated with any larger Baptist group or is  
this strictly a local church?
1. LOCAL
  2. AFFILIATED WITH LARGER GROUP
  8. DON'T KNOW
  9. NA
  0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203;  
2-3,8,9 in 8205; 0,1,3-14,in 8207; 1-3,7-9 in  
8209
- 8211 C6f. Is this the Evangelical United Brethren, the Plymouth  
Brethren, or what?
1. EVANGELICAL
  2. PLYMOUTH
  7. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY
  8. DON'T KNOW
  9. NA
  0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203;  
2-3,8,9 in 8205; 1-14 in 8207;15-16,18-99 in 8208
- 8212 C6g. When you say "Christian" does this mean you're "just  
Christian", and don't think of yourself as a belonging  
to a particular denomination, or do you belong to a  
non-denominational church, or to the Disciples of  
Christ, or what?
- 
1. JUST CHRISTIAN
  2. NON-DENOMINATIONAL
  3. DISCIPLES OF CHRIST
  8. DK
  9. NA
  0. Inap, no Wave 2;5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203,  
2-3,8-9 in 8205, 0,1-2,4-14 in 8207
- 8213 C6h. Is this the Church of Christ or the United Church of  
Christ?
1. UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST
  2. CHURCH OF CHRIST
  8. DON'T KNOW
  9. NA
  0. Inap, no Wave 2;5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203;  
2-3,8-9 in 8205; 0, 1-4,7-14 in 8207



8214 C6i. Can you give me the specific denomination? What kind of church is that? What is it called exactly?

Use Religious Preference Master Code

000. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203; 2-3,8,9 in 8205; 0,1-9,11-14 in 8207

8215 C6j. Is this church part of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Missouri Synod, or what?

2. EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA  
3. MISSOURI SYNOD  
7. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY

8. DON'T KNOW; JUST LUTHERAN  
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203; 2-3,8,9 in 8205; 0,1-10,12-14 in 8207

8216 C6k. Is your church part of the United Methodist Church or something else?

1. UNITED METHODIST  
2. AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPALIAN (AME)  
7. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY

8. DON'T KNOW; JUST METHODIST  
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203; 2-3,8,9 in 8205; 0,1-11,13-14 in 8207

8217 C6l. Can you give me the specific denomination? What kind of church is that? What is it called exactly?

Use Religious Preference Master Code

000. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203; 2-3,8-9 in 8205; 0,1-12,14 in 8207

8218 C6m. Is this the United Presbyterian Church or what?

1. UNITED  
7. OTHER - PF10 TO SPECIFY

8. DON'T KNOW; JUST PRESBYTERIAN  
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203; 2-3,8-9 in 8205; 0,1-13 in 8207

8219 C6n. Is this the Church of God of Anderson, Indiana; the Church of God of Cleveland, Tennessee; or the Church of God in Christ?

---

1. ANDERSON, INDIANA
2. CLEVELAND, TENNESSEE
3. IN CHRIST
  
8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA
  
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203;  
2-3,8-9 in 8205; 0,1-3,5-14 in 8207

8220 C6p. OTHER PROTESTANT: PLEASE SPECIFY.  
USE THESE PROBES: "What kind of church is that?"  
What is it called exactly?"

---

Use Religious Preference Master Code

000. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203;  
2-3,8,9 in 8205; 1-3,5-14 in 8207;  
15-29,98,99 in 8208

8221 C6x. Is this a Christian religion?

---

1. YES
5. NO
  
8. DK
9. NA
  
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203;  
2-3,8-9 in 8205; 1-14 in 8207; 15-29,98-99 in 8208

8222 C6xx. SUMMARY: Church R attends

---

Use Religious Preference Master Code

000. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5,8-9 in 8203

8223 C6z. For a variety of reasons, some people attend a place of worship for a religious denomination or faith different than their own. Is your religious preference the same as the denomination of the place of worship you now attend?

---

1. SAME
2. DIFFERENT
  
8. DK
9. NA
  
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5-8,9 in 8201; 5 in 8202

8224 C6zz. What religion is that?

Use Religious Preference Master Code

000. Inap, no Wave 2; 5-8,9 in 8201; 5 in 8202;  
1, 8-9 in 8223

"TRAITS" FOR CATHOLIC PARISH  
R NOW ATTENDS

8225 C7. For each word or phrase I will read, tell me whether the word or phrase describes the Catholic church you now attend. (As before, if you don't know a word, just tell me and we'll go on.)

C7a. Thinking about the Catholic church or parish you mostly attend now, does the word "traditionalist" describe this church very well, quite well, not too well, or not well at all?

1. VERY WELL
2. QUITE WELL
3. NOT TOO WELL
4. NOT WELL AT ALL

USE SAME CODE  
FOR 8226 to 8228

8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8201; 5-8,9 in 8203;  
0,1,3,8-9 in 8205

8226 C7b. (How about) supportive of the reforms of Post-Vatican two?

8227 C7c. Ethnic, that is, reflects a particular national or cultural tradition such as Polish, Italian, Hispanic or some other nationality?

8228 C7d. Charismatic, that is, Spirit-filled?

8229 C8. Now thinking about yourself, how do these words describe your own views?

C8a. Traditionalist?

1. VERY WELL
2. QUITE WELL
3. NOT TOO WELL
4. NOT WELL AT ALL

USE SAME CODE  
FOR 8230-8232

8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203;  
0,1,3,8,9 in 8205

8230 C8b. (How about) supportive of the reforms of Post-Vatican two?

8231 C8c. Do you think of yourself as a Catholic from a particular nationality or group such as Polish, Italian, Hispanic, or some other nationality?

8232 C8d. Charismatic, that is, Spirit-filled?

"TRAITS" FOR PROTESTANT CHURCH  
R NOW ATTENDS

8233 C9. For each word or phrase I will read, tell me whether the word or phrase describes the church you now attend. (As before, if you don't know a word, just tell me and we'll go on.)

C9a. Thinking about the church you mostly attend now, does the word "fundamentalist" describe this church very well, quite well, not too well, or not well at all?

1. VERY WELL
2. QUITE WELL
3. NOT TOO WELL
4. NOT WELL AT ALL

USE SAME CODE  
FOR 8234-8237

8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5-9 in 8201; 5-8,9 in 8203;  
2-3,8,9 in 8205

8234 C9b. (How about) Evangelical?

8235 C9c. Spirit-filled or Pentecostal?

8236 C9d. Conservative?

8237 C9e. Liberal?

8238 C10. Now thinking about yourself, how do these words describe your own views?

C10a. Fundamentalist?

1. VERY WELL
2. QUITE WELL
3. NOT TOO WELL
4. NOT WELL AT ALL

USE SAME CODE FOR 8239-8242
--------------------------------

8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5-9 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203;  
2-3,8,9 in 8205

8239 C10b. (How about) Evangelical?

8240 C10c. Spirit-filled or Pentecostal?

8241 C10d. Conservative?

8242 C10e. Liberal?

8243 C11. Would you call yourself a born-again Christian - that is, have you personally had a conversion experience related to Jesus Christ?

1. YES
5. NO
8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5 in 8202; 5-8,9 in 8203;  
3,8 in 8205; 16,21-22,26-27 in 8208

8347 C18c. Spirit-filled or Pentecostal?

8348 C18d. Conservative?

8349 C18e. Liberal?

8350 C19. Now thinking about yourself, how do these words describe your own views?

C19a. Fundamentalist?

8351 C19b. (How about) Evangelical?

8352 C19c. Spirit-filled or Pentecostal?

8353 C19d. Conservative?

8354 C19e. Liberal?

8355 C20. Would you call yourself a born-again Christian - that is, have you personally had a conversion experience related to Jesus Christ?

---

1. YES

5. NO

8. DON'T KNOW

9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5, 8-9 in 8201; 1,8-9 in 8202; 3,8,9 in 8301 or 3,8-9 in 8319 3,8 in 8205; 0,16,21-22,26-27 in 8304 or 8322

8356 (A,B) C21. Would you say you go to (church/synagogue) every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never?

---

1. EVERY WEEK

2. ALMOST EVERY WEEK

3. ONCE OR TWICE A MONTH

4. A FEW TIMES A YEAR

5. SELDOM OR NEVER

8. DK

9. NA

0. Inap, no Wave 2; 3-4 in 8007; 5,8-9 in 8203

8357 C21. How often do you attend religious services?

(C,D)

[USE CATEGORIES AS PROBES, IF NECESSARY]

1. SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK
2. EVERY WEEK
3. NEARLY EVERY WEEK
4. 2-3 TIMES A MONTH
5. ABOUT ONCE A MONTH
6. SEVERAL TIMES A YEAR
7. 1 OR 2 TIMES A YEAR
8. LESS OR NEVER
  
9. DK, NA
  
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 1-2 in 8007; 5,8-9 in 8203

8358 C21a. Would you say you go to (church/synagogue) once a week or more often than once a week?

(A,B)

1. MORE OFTEN
2. JUST ONCE A WEEK
  
8. DK
9. NA
  
0. Inap; no Wave 2; 3-4 in 8007; 5,8-9 in 8203; 2-9 in 8356

8359 C22. Are you officially a member of a parish, congregation, temple, or other place of worship?

1. YES
5. NO
  
8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA
  
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5,8-9 in 8203

8360 C23. Do you participate in a religious organization, society or group outside of (your/a) (parish/ congregation/ temple/place of worship)?

1. YES
5. NO
  
8. DK
9. NA
  
0. Inap, no Wave 2; 5,8-9 in 8203

8361 C23a. What is it?  
8362 Code 3 mentions

The religious organizations are coded in a two column 8363 field. The first column lists the locus of participation. The second column lists the function or activity in which the respondent participates.

Column 1

1. Within parish, congregation
2. Outside congregation, but within denomination
3. Other denomination
4. Ecumenical
5. Civic
9. NA

Column 2

1. Education
2. Social service
3. Social action
4. Financial support
5. Evangelization, mission
6. Ethnic
7. Marriage or family
8. Worship services
9. NA

00. Inap, no wave 2; 5,8-9 in 8203; 5,8-9 in 8360; no further mention (8362,8363)



8637 K1. Political issues often times reflect moral concerns. Some religious leaders like pastors, rabbis, or bishops speak out on public issues through sermons, newsletters or other public statements. Others feel it is better not to speak out on public issues. How about religious leaders in your place of worship?

K1a. Do they speak out on prayer in public schools?

- 1. SPEAK OUT
- 5. DON'T SPEAK OUT

USE SAME CODE  
FOR 8638-8643

- 8. DON'T KNOW
- 9. NA

0. Inap; no Wave 2; 5,8-9 in 8201

8638 K1b. . . . the economy?

8639 K1c. . . . abortion?

8640 K1d. . . . housing and homelessness?

8641 K1e. . . . proper sexual behavior?

8642 K1f. . . . nuclear disarmament?

8643 K1g. . . . candidates for political office?

8644 K2. In general, do you feel it is alright or not alright for religious leaders like pastors, preachers, rabbis or bishops to speak out on political issues in their places of worship?

- 1. ALL RIGHT
- 3. DEPENDS ON THE ISSUE
- 5. NOT ALL RIGHT

- 8. DON'T KNOW
- 9. NA

0. Inap; no Wave 2

- 8645 K3. Which of these statements comes closest to describing your feelings about the Bible?
1. One, the Bible is the actual word of God and is to be taken literally, word for word, OR
  2. Two, the Bible is the word of God but not everything in it should be taken literally, word for word, OR
  3. Three, the Bible is a book written by men and is not the word of God.
  8. DK
  9. NA
  0. Inap; no Wave 2

8646 K4. People follow their faith in different ways. How often do you do each of the following:

K4a. First: pray on your own?

IWER: USE RESPONSE CATEGORIES AS PROBES.

01. DAILY
02. 2 TO 3 TIMES A WEEK
03. ONCE A WEEK
04. 2 TO 3 TIMES A MONTH
05. ONCE A MONTH
06. SEVERAL TIMES A YEAR
07. HARDLY EVER
08. NEVER
98. DON'T KNOW
99. NA
00. Inap; no Wave 2; 5,8-9 in 8204

USE SAME CODE For 8647-8650
--------------------------------

- 8647 K4b. . . . read about religion through magazines, books or newspapers?
- 8648 K4c. . watch religious programs, other than services of local churches, on TV.
- 8649 K4d. . . . read the Bible on your own?
- 8650 K4e. . . convince others to accept your faith?
- 8651 K4f. What are the main programs you watch?

THESE DATA ARE NOT CODED

## RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE MASTER CODE

The National Election Studies staff, in cooperation with a small working group of interested scholars (David Leege, Clark Roof, Ken Wald and Lyman Kellstedt) is in the process of revising the master code of religious denominations. We have elaborated the code considerably, by adding codes for different affiliations within the major mainline Protestant denominations, and by reworking almost entirely the Pentecostal, Holiness, fundamentalist, and evangelical Protestant denominations.

There are two columns of numbers associated with the code descriptions. The first column is what is recorded for a respondent who mentioned this denomination in the 1989 Pilot Study. The second column displays the code value associated with this response in the 1988 National Election Studies (and in all earlier elections studies using the religion code).

The asterisk in the second column means that there is no specific category associated with this response in the original code. In some cases, it is clear from the context what number would have been assigned to this response. For example, a respondent who said he/she was "Norwegian Lutheran" would almost certainly have been coded 111, Lutheran, Not Further Specified. In other instances, how the response would have been coded is not so clear. An inter-denominational church might have been coded 100, 101, or 102, for example. The \*\*\* indicate that there is no category in the 1988 version of the code which exactly matches the 1989 category.

**NFS** means "Not Further Specified"

1989 1988  
PILOT NES

### GENERAL PROTESTANT

010	100	Protestant, no denomination given
020	101	Non-denominational Protestant
030	102	Community church
035	***	Inter-denominational church
040	109	Other Protestant:
		New Testament Christian
		Eden Evangelist
		First Church
		Disciples of God
		Federated Church
		Christ Cathedral of Truth
		Chapel of Faith
		Faith Gospel Tabernacle
		Chinese Gospel Church

1989 1988

PILOT NES

**INDEPENDENT FUNDAMENTALIST/EVANGELICAL**

050 \*\*\* Christian Catholic  
051 \*\*\* Evangelical (NFS)  
052 \*\*\* Independent Bible; Bible  
053 \*\*\* Independent Fundamental Churches of America  
054 134 Plymouth Brethren  
055 \*\*\* The Way International  
056 \*\*\* Grace Brethren  
099 149 Other Fundamentalists

**PRESBYTERIANS**

100 \*\*\* Prebyterian Church in the USA  
101 \*\*\* United Presbyterian Church  
102 \*\*\* Presbyterian Church (USA)  
108 \*\*\* Other Presbyterians, e.g.:  
    Presbyterian Church in America  
    Orthodox Presbyterian Church  
    Cumberland Presbyterian Church  
    Evangelical Presbyterian Church  
    Associate Reformed Prebyterian Church  
109 110 Presbyterian (NFS)

**LUTHERANS:**

110 \*\*\* American Lutheran Church  
111 \*\*\* Lutheran Church in America  
112 141 Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod)  
113 \*\*\* Lutheran Church (Wisconsin Synod)  
114 \*\*\* Evangelical Lutheran Church of America  
115 \*\*\* Norwegian Lutheran  
116 \*\*\* Swedish Lutheran (Augustana)  
117 \*\*\* Other Ethnic Lutherans:  
    Danish (AEC)  
    Latvian  
    Finnish (Suomi)  
118 \*\*\* Other splinter Lutherans, e.g., Church of the Lutheran  
    Brethren  
119 111 Lutheran (NFS).

**CONGREGATIONAL:**

120 112 Congregational  
121 113 Evangelical and Reformed  
122 \*\*\* Reformed United Church of Christ  
123 115 United Church of Christ; United Church of Christianity

**REFORMED:**

130 114 Christian Reformed Church  
131 114 Dutch Reformed  
132 114 Reformed Church in America  
133 \*\*\* Protestant Reformed  
139 \*\*\* Other Reformed, e.g.:  
    Hungarian Reformed  
    First Reformed

1989 1988  
PILOT NES

**EPISCOPAL:**

140 116 Episcopal  
141 116 Anglican; Church of England

**METHODIST:**

150 \*\*\* United Methodist Church  
151 121 African Methodist Episcopal  
152 \*\*\* AME Zion  
153 122 Reformed Zion Union Apostolic  
168 \*\*\* Other (Non-Holiness) Methodists:  
122 Evangelical United Brethren  
\*\*\* Zion Union; Zion Union Apostolic  
\*\*\* Christian Methodist Episcopal Church  
\*\*\* Southern Methodist Episcopal Church  
\*\*\* Union AME Episcopal Church  
\*\*\* Church of the United Brethren in Christ  
\*\*\* Evangelical Congregational Church  
169 120 Methodist (NFS)

**BAPTISTS:**

170 \*\*\* American Baptist Assoc.  
171 \*\*\* American Baptist Churches in the USA  
172 \*\*\* National Bapt. Convention of America  
173 \*\*\* National Baptist Convention of the USA  
174 140 Southern Baptist Convention  
175 138 Free Will Baptists  
176 138 Primitive Baptists  
177 \*\*\* Missionary Baptists  
178 \*\*\* Independent Baptist (local church)  
185 \*\*\* Fundamentalist Baptists, e.g.:  
General Assoc. of Regular Baptists  
Fundamental Baptist Fellowship  
World Baptists Fellowship  
Southwide Baptist Fellowship  
188 \*\*\* Other affiliated Baptists, e.g.:  
Progressive National Baptist Convention  
Conservative Baptists  
Baptist General Conference  
189 123 Baptist (NFS)

**CHRISTIAN RESTORATIONISTS:**

190 125 Christian;  
124 Disciples of Christ;  
\*\*\* Christian Disciples;  
\*\*\* First Christian Disciples of Christ  
\*\*\* First Christian  
191 136 Churches of Christ

1989 1988  
PILOT NES

**PENTACOSTAL:**

201 135 Assemblies of God  
202 \*\*\* Apostolic Faith (Pentecostal Apostolic)  
203 133 Church of God in Christ  
204 131 Church of God (Cleveland, TN)  
205 \*\*\* Four Square gospel  
205 \*\*\* Full Gospel  
207 \*\*\* International Pentacostal Holiness Church  
208 \*\*\* International Convention of Faith Churches and Ministers  
(Word of God, Faith movements)  
238 \*\*\* Other Pentacostal denominations, e.g.:  
    Open Bible  
    Church of Living God  
    House of Prayer  
    United Pentacostal Church  
    Association of Vineyard churches  
239 135 Pentecostal (NFS)

**HOLINESS:**

240 132 Nazarene  
241 131 Church of God (Anderson, IN)  
242 \*\*\* Christian Missionary Alliance  
243 137 Salvation Army  
244 \*\*\* Sanctified; Sanctification  
245 \*\*\* Wesleyan  
246 130 Missionary Church (Old United Missionary, Missionary  
Prot)  
247 \*\*\* Church of Christ (Holiness) USA  
248 \*\*\* United Brethren; United Brethren in Christ  
250 \*\*\* Methodist Holiness denominations, e.g.:  
    132 Free Methodists  
    \*\*\* Methodist Protestant Church  
    \*\*\* Primitive Methodists  
    \*\*\* Evangelical Methodist Church  
    \*\*\* Congregational Methodist Church  
268 \*\*\* Other Holiness denominations, e.g.:  
    Evangelical Congregationalists  
    Witness Holiness  
    Christ in Christian Union  
    Pilgrim Holiness  
    United Holiness  
    House of God  
    Church of Daniel's Band  
    Bible Fellowship  
269 \*\*\* Holiness, Church of Holiness (denomination not specified)

1989 1988  
PILOT NES

**EUROPEAN FREE CHURCH TRADITION:**

270 126 Amish  
271 \*\*\* Apostolic Christian  
272 127 Brethren  
Church of the Brethren  
Brethren in Christ  
273 \*\*\* Covenant  
\*\*\* Evangelical Covenant  
\*\*\* Mission Covenant  
\*\*\* Swedish Covenant  
274 \*\*\* Evangelical Free Church  
275 126 Mennonite  
276 \*\*\* Moravian  
288 \*\*\* European Free Churches, other, e.g:  
Christadelphians  
Swedish Mission

**ADVENTISTS:**

290 139 Seventh Day Adventists  
291 \*\*\* Advent Christian  
298 \*\*\* Other Adventists

**NON-TRADITIONAL PROTESTANTS**

300 150 Christian Scientists  
301 \*\*\* Religious Science, Mind Science  
302 152 Mormons, Latter Day Saints, Church of the First Born  
303 \*\*\* Reorganized Church of the Latter Day Saints  
304 151 Spiritualist  
305 153 Unitarian, Universalist  
306 154 Jehovah's Witnesses  
307 155 Quakers, Friends  
308 156 Unity, Unity Church, Christ Church Unity  
319 \*\*\* Other non-traditional Protestants: Worldwide Church of  
God, Church Universal and Triumphant, Church of God,  
Saints and Christ

**ROMAN CATHOLIC:**

400 200 Roman Catholic  
401 \*\*\* Other Catholic Churches in Western Roman tradition:  
Polish National Church  
450 \*\*\* Uniate (Ukranian Orthodox)

**JEWISH:**

500 300 Jewish, no preference  
501 \*\*\* Orthodox Jewish  
502 \*\*\* Conservative Jewish  
503 \*\*\* Reform Jewish  
504 \*\*\* Reconstructionist Jewish

1989 1988  
PILOT NES

**GREEK RITE CATHOLIC AND EASTERN ORTHODOX**

700	700	Greek Rite Catholic
710	710	Greek Orthodox
711	711	Russian Orthodox
712	712	Rumanian Orthodox
713	713	Serbian Orthodox
714	***	Syrian Orthodox
715	***	Armenian Orthodox
716	***	Georgian Orthodox
719	719	Other Orthodox

**NON-CHRISTIAN/NON-JEWISH**

720	720	Muslim; Mohammedan; Islam
721	721	Buddhist
722	722	Hindu
723	723	Bahai
724	***	American Indian Religions
729	729	Other non-Christian/non-Jewish
790	790	Religious/ethical cults

**OTHER/NO RELIGION/MISSING DATA**

800	800	Agnostics
801	800	Atheists
995	998	None, no preference
997	998	Don't know preference
998	996	Refused, DK
999	999	NA