

NOTES

Chapter One

Denominations Grow as Individuals Join Congregations

1. The extent to which membership growth is indicative of denominational vitality is, of course, arguable on both organizational and theological grounds. But because the very concept of "membership" is more vague in Roman Catholicism than it is within most of denominational Protestantism, the relationship is especially tenuous within Roman Catholicism.
2. For those interested in broader historical interpretations of American religion in the last half of the twentieth century, there are many to commend, including: *American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandary of Modernity* (Hunter, 1983), *The New Charismatics II* (Quebedeaux, 1983), *Understanding American Jewry* (Sklare, 1983), *Bible Believers: Fundamentalism in the Modern World* (Ammerman, 1987), *American Mainline Religion* (Roof and McKinney, 1987), *The Restructuring of American Religion* (Wuthnow, 1988), *The Changing Parish: A Study of Parishes, Priests and Parishioners After Vatican II* (Hornsby-Smith, 1989), *Between the Times* (Hutchison, 1989), *The Catholic Myth* (Greeley, 1990), and *The Black Church in the African American Experience* (Lincoln and Mamiya, 1990).
3. Appendix Table A1.1 shows the individual membership trends for the three liberal and five moderate denominations included in the family aggregates. They are the only denominations in these families for which membership figures across the forty-year span are readily available.
4. The term "evangelical" figures prominently in most recent scholarly treatments of the increasing diversity within "conservative" Protestantism. Unfortunately, different scholars use the term in different ways, and these differences confound the term's usefulness as a label for either of our two families. Some scholars use it as a theological descriptor of a moderated fundamentalist adaptation to modernity (e.g., Hunter, 1983; Ammerman, 1987; Wuthnow, 1988). Other scholars, drawing heavily on the work of Marsden (1984) use it as an organizational descriptor of those denominations that emphasize parachurch networks over denominational centralization. Although there is some relationship between the two, it is far from perfect. Denominations that stress authoritative doctrine have a predisposition toward organizational centralization, especially as they get large. Denominations that emphasize the present-day operation of the Spirit tend to have loose national denominational organizations. Many smaller denominations that stress authoritative doctrine, however, are not organizationally centralized. Indeed, many identify themselves as "fellowships" rather than denominations.

In addition, in neither of the scholarly delineations of "evangelicalism" noted above is the critical issue "evangelism" in the sense of witness. Evangelism in this latter sense remains a strong characteristic of all denominations typically identified with the broader stream of conservative Protestantism. We therefore do not feel it appropriate to use the label "evangelical" for either of our two "conservative" Protestant families.
5. Appendix Table A1.1 lists the nine conservative and six Pentecostal/Holiness denominations included in the families, and shows their individual membership trends.
6. That the relationship between membership growth and denominational vitality within Roman Catholicism is more tenuous on conceptual grounds than it is within most of Protestantism has already been noted. Particularly in the Roman Catholic case, therefore, worship attendance (or some other direct measure of involvement in the life of the institutional church) presents a more accurate gauge of denominational vitality. Empirically, this is suggested in the fact that there is a much greater discrepancy between membership trends and worship attendance records for Roman Catholics than for Protestants. National survey trend data shows that Roman Catholic worship attendance declined sharply in the late 1950s and early 1960s, *declined moderately through the 1970s, and changed little during the 1980s.*
7. Chapter 12 includes a more detailed discussion of the dynamics of cohort replacement in relationship to changes in religious participation during the 1980s.

PART ONE
DENOMINATIONAL GROWTH AND DECLINE

1. The conservative and mainline denominations are the same as those used in the chapter by Marler and Hadaway.
2. The fourteen denominations are the same as those used in the chapter by Marler and Hadaway to estimate the “period effect.” The white birthrate is the number of births per 1,000 persons in the white population.

Chapter Two
New Church Development and Denominational Growth (1950–1988):
Symptom or Cause?

*This chapter appeared earlier in Monty L. Lynn and David O. Moberg, eds. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 4* (Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press), pp. 29-72. It is reprinted here in slightly altered form with the permission of JAI Press, Inc.

1. Aggregate membership data and new church development data were obtained from 1950 to 1988 for five denominations: The United Methodist Church, the Southern Baptist Convention, the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), and the Assemblies of God. For years prior to the Presbyterian merger in 1983, data are combined for the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the Presbyterian Church (US). New church data were obtained through correspondence with church extension executives and denominational researchers over the past fifteen years.
2. Denominational reporting is notoriously problematic—for example, many ethnic congregations typically go unreported or report irregularly. Still, for most denominations the problems have remained relatively constant. For this reason, membership curves are quite smooth for most periods. When they are not the reasons can be found in mergers, schisms, and changes in counting procedures. Adjustments have been made for major changes in denominational trend data when such events occurred. For additional discussion of problems with denominational data see “Methodological Issues in Congregational Studies” (1989).
3. The Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod is viewed as a conservative denomination. It is not generally seen as evangelical, and from a cultural perspective it would seem closer to the American mainstream than the Southern Baptist Convention or the Assemblies of God.
4. The Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod had begun to plateau in membership prior to the relatively minor schism that occurred in the late 1970s. This conflict cost the denomination 100-130 congregations and around 100,000 baptized members. Following rather abrupt losses in 1977 and 1978, the denomination once again settled onto a plateau.
5. According to a research representative for the Assemblies of God, in 1971 the denomination changed its reporting to the National Council of Churches from full members to Sunday school enrollment. Membership and “the numbers game” have been less important for Assemblies of God churches than for most other Protestant denominations (no individual church listing of membership is permitted), so Sunday school enrollment was typically higher than full membership. In 1979, the denomination began systematic data collection on “inclusive” membership. At this time the inclusive membership figure (which is similar to the adherent concept) replaced Sunday school enrollment in reporting to the *Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches* (see Jacquet, 1991).
6. The rate of SBC growth is now at its lowest point in terms of a sustained pattern of membership change. Actual declines were experienced in the mid-1800s, but there was no period of sustained loss or even very slow growth.

7. This estimate was made by a research representative of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod.
8. The percentage change for 1950 reflects change from 1949 to 1950.
9. Denominations included the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana), the Church of the Brethren, the Church of the Nazarene, the Episcopal Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Reformed Church in America, the Seventh-day Adventists, the United Church of Christ, the Assemblies of God, the Southern Baptist Convention, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), The United Methodist Church, and the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod. Each denomination contributed equally to the average membership change for each year.
10. Although the shift in values was not consistent (in some ways the public is now more liberal than it was in the 1960s), there was a definite conservative shift in many areas. Further, anything that was labeled "liberal" became suspect as fewer and fewer Americans were comfortable with using that term to describe themselves.
11. For instance, it has been suggested that the recent slowdown in membership growth experienced by the AOG resulted (at least in part) from the Jim Bakker/Jimmy Swaggart scandals.
12. Data are for reporting churches only. No adjustments have been made for churches that are listed as Southern Baptist churches, but have not reported membership statistics in several years.
13. Membership data supplied to the authors for this project was full membership for each church. These figures are much lower than those reported to the National Council of Churches.
14. Older churches were those organized in 1983 or earlier.
15. Expected frequencies are based on the proportion of the U.S. population residing in those states in 1980.
16. "Where they are not" refers to states where the SBC has a low proportion of its churches relative to the proportion of the U.S. population in those states.
17. States are shaded from lowest to highest, according to levels on the criterion variable. For older church concentration, the percent of a denomination's churches in a state is compared to the percent of the U.S. population in that state. States where the denomination has a larger percentage of members than would be expected (given the concentration of the U.S. population) are shaded. Levels vary according to the magnitude of the difference. Shading for new church rates vary for each denomination. To receive shading on a new church map a state must have had at least two new churches formed from 1983 to 1988, and have a NCD rate that is greater than the mean for all states. Darker shadings reflect larger deviations (positive) from the national mean for the denomination.
18. This state has relatively few ABC churches, so even a small number of new churches produces a high NCD rate.
19. Demographic data for each church were available at the zip code level through a tape from CACI. However, this data set lacked the 1980 census variable for population mobility (percent of persons who lived in a different state in 1975). Still, as noted in the text, the average new church tends to have a larger proportion of renters in its zip code territory than does the average older church. Areas with a larger proportion of renters tend to have a higher rate of population mobility than areas that are overwhelmingly owner-occupied.
20. Many African-American congregations have affiliated (joined) the ABC rather than having been started as ABC congregations. In this chapter we deal only with churches with recent dates of organization (rather than recent dates of affiliation). Thus, whether the churches were started as ABC churches or affiliated shortly after organizing, all are new congregations.
21. Data from the 1990 Uniform Church Letter reveals that ethnic and black SBC churches were considerably more likely to grow than Anglo churches between 1985 and 1990.

22. Due to missing values on the race/ethnicity variable it is not possible to directly compare these percentage gains and losses to those for the entire denomination reported earlier. This is true for the American Baptist Churches, as well.
23. The Assemblies of God are the youngest denomination in terms of the average age of churches. Age of denomination can also be measured by the date that the churches in the denomination coalesced as a group apart from other churches in the United States. In the case of the UCC, two traditions are involved—one with direct links to the Pilgrims, the other much more recent.
24. Additional analysis (not shown here) was conducted on the percentage of churches with growth between 1983 and 1988 among those churches reporting at least one member in both years (this excluded new churches, nonreporting churches, and churches that died, merged, or left the denomination).
25. This analysis does not focus on shifts in policy, priorities, denominational organization, or funding committed to new church development. In addition, differences in theology are not addressed. More information on how the denominations vary and/or are similar on these points would shed light on the statistical patterns presented in this chapter.

The issue of local congregational initiative versus denominational initiative in new church starts also is important. However, we are unable to examine this issue with the data provided. There is some suggestion in the literature that congregational initiative is a "livelier" option for successful new church development. In the past, there has been some tendency away from local initiative to national (or regional) initiative. In recent years the pendulum may have swung back toward local initiative.

In addition, the relationship between "adoption" of existing (older) congregations versus new church starts is not explored. Denominational data, again, is not available for this level of analysis and comparison. The issue, however, is important as growing numbers of ethnic and independent congregations venture into "dual alignment" and "affiliation." Is the relationship to overall denominational growth and resilience similarly affected by these kinds of churches? These and other issues remain to be explored.

Chapter Four **Growth and Decline in an Inclusive Denomination:** **The ABC Experience**

1. A comparison of American Baptist, Assemblies of God, Disciples of Christ, Presbyterian, Southern Baptist, United Church of Christ, and United Methodist denominations (Roy Howard Beck, *The United Methodist Reporter*, February 14, 1986) documented that numbers and percentages of ethnic minorities were greater in the ABC than the other denominations studied. Also see chapter 2 in this volume.
2. Although the ABC was not included, a comparison of growth and decline (up to 1980) for other denominations can be found in *American Mainline Religion* (Roof and McKinney, 1987).
3. The counts of churches reported in this research are those certified by Regional Executive Ministers as churches in good standing in each region. The racial/ethnic category for each church is represented by the currently reported racial or ethnic majority of the congregation. The method of coding this factor in the data base precludes more definitive distributions of membership, worship attendance, and giving among the racial/ethnic groups. It has also not been possible to account for the racial/ethnic transitions that some congregations have experienced. It has been necessary to credit the data to the same racial/ethnic grouping that characterized the congregation's majority in 1990 (or the last such recorded category for deceased churches.)
4. Roughly two-thirds of ABC African-American churches are aligned with one or more other denominations. Four percent of white ABC churches are aligned with another denomination. For all ABC churches, 16% are dually aligned.
5. This economic benefit is attractive to all pastors and churches, but the effect of the attractive-

ness on whites is to keep them in the denomination when other factors would cause them to leave. The benefit is not great enough to attract independent Baptist churches if moderate to liberal theological stands and social justice issues are not attractive.

6. Data used in this study were analyzed for each of the thirty-five "Regions" that make up the middle level administrative units of the denomination. Data were summed from these "Regions" to produce data for sections of the U.S. that generally coincide with the regional designations of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. In this study, reference will be made to differences for those broad sectional areas, but not to the "Regional" units of the denomination.
7. The ABC has a continuing problem with nonreporting churches, and with churches skipping reporting years. This situations calls for estimating procedures. Resident membership for nonreporting churches is estimated by regional executives. This is carried forward in subsequent years with adjustments taking place at five-year intervals.
8. Because of the need to estimate membership for nonreporting churches, the "stable" category is probably overrepresented in Figure 4.3 for each racial/ethnic cohort, but to a greater degree for African-American and other churches.
9. Worship attendance for nonreporting years by churches providing some attendance data has been calculated by averaging. Where there was insufficient worship attendance data reported to establish a meaningful trend, worship attendance was calculated at 50% of resident membership for white and most African-American congregations, at 150% for Hispanic and some other ethnic congregations, and at 33% to 40% for exceptionally large African-American congregations. It is believed that the resulting data tends toward "reality" in a way that is far superior to any other methodological approach to the problem of nonreporting.

PART TWO

THE GROWTH AND DECLINE OF CONGREGATIONS

Chapter Five

A Short History of Church Growth Research

1. This conceptual approach to studying congregations—looking at both contextual and institutional factors—was introduced by Dean R. Hoge and David Roozen, *Understanding Church Growth and Decline, 1950-1978*.
2. Other factors are also important. For example, most of these researchers were trained as sociologists and their professional predisposition was to look first to the social context for causal explanations.

Chapter Seven

The Effect of a Church Growth Strategy on United Church of Christ Congregations

1. At least one survey was received from 259 congregations (43.2%), including surveys from 213 pastors and 226 laypersons (representing 144 congregations). An additional 25 pastors (4.2%) stated that they could not complete the surveys, either because they did not remember participating, or, more often, that because of a pastoral or lay leadership change no one was available who was knowledgeable about the workshops. Because a significant number of items came only from the clergy survey, only the 213 congregations with clergy returns (35.5%) were retained to avoid statistical problems with large amounts of missing data. The sample thus is probably biased toward congregations in which more activity occurred, and for some variables, restriction in range may have attenuated the relationship with church growth. Where responses from both clergy and laity were available, means of clergy-lay responses were computed for all questions that appeared on both surveys to decrease the error variance for these questions.
2. The area defined as a parish varied in size from a few census tracts to a township or an entire city or country. For this area, the 1980 census population count and the 1986 estimate were

obtained from the National Planning Data Corporation, and the percentage change was calculated. Percentage, rather than numerical, change was used to correct for the effect of very different parish sizes.

3. The "new members since 1985" measure was used, rather than change in church size or attendance, for two reasons. First, membership figures are notoriously inaccurate and often inflated. In fact, one of the first efforts in a church growth program often is to "clean the rolls" of inactive members, resulting in greater apparent membership loss among participating churches than among nonparticipating churches. Second, the workshops' main goal was to bring new members into the congregations, with secondary goals of increasing attendance and spiritual growth of existing members and decreasing losses through inactivity. Because numbers of new members may fluctuate widely from year to year, a sum of three years was chosen, rather than the figure for 1987, the year of the study, even though some of the congregations had not begun the program in 1985.
4. In the analyses of churches grouped by amount of community change, the effect of community change was not removed in the partial correlation, because grouping by amount of community change had already removed much of its effect. In the analyses of churches grouped by size of church, however, the effect of church size on number of new members was removed because, empirically, even within the subgroups, it was significantly related to numbers of new members received.
5. An alternative explanation for the relationship between efforts to form and involve newcomers in groups and the number of new members could be that churches that had received many new members in 1985 and 1986 needed to form new groups by 1987. Partial correlations between group activity (collected in early 1987) and new members received in 1987 alone (collected in 1988) were similar, however, suggesting that the relationship was not all due to new members prompting new groups.
6. Because so many congregations have their facilities used by community groups, these correlations may have been attenuated by limited variance in the measure of facility use.

Chapter Eight

Is Evangelistic Activity Related to Church Growth?

1. The significance level for inclusion was .01. Principal components factor analysis was used with varimax rotation.
2. Variables were chosen that had factor loadings of $\pm .40$ or more.
3. All of the items used to create the scale were recoded so that low scores indicated high evangelistic activity and high scores indicated low evangelistic activity. Not all items contributed to the scale in an equal manner. Questions that were correlated with growth at .20 (Pearson's r) or lower were recoded into categories 2 to 4, while questions that were correlated with growth at .21 or higher were recoded into five categories (1 to 5). Yes/no questions were coded so that yes = 1 and no = 5 if the correlation was high, and yes = 2 and no = 4 if the correlation was low. After recoding, a scale score for each church was computed by adding responses to all the items. Two items, one that rated the church in evangelism, and another that dealt with programmed evangelistic campaigns were added twice.
4. The Uniform Church Letter is a yearly survey sent to all Southern Baptist Churches. Its purpose is to collect membership, participation, program, and giving data. Around 98% of SBC churches respond on the Letter.
5. The significance level for inclusion was .01.
6. In this case the dependent variable was percent membership change from 1981 to 1987, rather than the three-category growth/plateau/decline variable.
7. Stepwise multiple regression was employed.

8. A high ratio implies a strategy, encouraged by denominational agencies, to enroll as many persons in Sunday school as possible, whether they participate or not.
9. Significance was determined at the .05 level.

Chapter Nine Growth or Decline in Presbyterian Congregations

1. We had data available from 1970, 1980, 1985, and 1988, thus allowing us to experiment with analyses over various time spans. We did not use the 1970 figures due to the excessive time span, but we did experiment with 1980-85 and 1985-88. Neither produced as clear outcomes as the eight-year span we adopted. Measurement error, reporting, and chance events obscured the analyses over fewer years.
2. In Roof's (1973) dichotomy, following Merton's classification, these persons are "locals." They usually have strong ties to the local community. Past research shows that "locals" participate in their congregations more often than do "cosmopolitans." Yet Presbyterian congregations located where higher proportions of "locals" reside tend to be losing members faster.
3. The measure of change in church school size is from 1970 to 1985, thus overlapping with the membership change variable, which is 1980 to 1988, by five years. This raises the possibility of autocorrelation—that is, of incorrectly explaining one variable by another not totally independent of it. We explored using church school change from 1970 to 1980 rather than 1970 to 1985, and we found that it had similar, but weaker relation to church membership change (the beta was .20, not .38). The weaker beta may have resulted from substantive distance between the two time periods being related, not just the avoidance of any autocorrelation. We decided to use the 1970-85 change measure. The autocorrelation is not large, judging from the betas for Cluster I in the analyses of subgroups, which drop to near zero for small churches. If autocorrelation had been large, the betas would never drop this low.
4. The question of causal ordering arises here. Which causes which? In our model we are assuming that the institutional variable are causal for growth or decline. Yet good feelings about the congregation could be argued to be a *consequence* of growth. Both are probably true. The measure of good feelings stated, "There is a sense of excitement among members about our church's future." It was asked in 1985, roughly midway in the 1980-88 period of growth or decline. We believe that in reality, church growth and a sense of excitement about the future feed each other, so causation goes both ways. We are justified in using this measure of good feelings about the church's future because all research shows that good feelings have an effect on church growth. The only statistical issue is how strong the effect is. We cannot measure it. Possibly the betas in our tables overestimate the true causal power of this factor for church growth or decline.
5. See Hadden (1969:120) and Wood (1986) for treatments of the negative effects of conflict over pastoral leadership on congregations. The next question in the form following this question about conflict asked about specific areas of conflict. Twenty-seven percent of the congregations had experienced significant conflict, and the overwhelming majority of those conflicts were over pastoral leadership (over 90%).
6. Roof et al. (1979) found that the presence of children was an important indicator of membership growth in Presbyterian congregations in the 1968 to 1974 time period. However, as pointed out above, community data on each church was supplied subjectively by the pastor.
7. We thank Kirk Hadaway for sharing data from a 1989 study of Baptist congregations in metropolitan areas.
8. Annual rates of changes of residence varied little from 1968 to 1988, according to census data. See U.S. Bureau of the Census (1989).

Chapter Ten

Congregational Growth and Decline in Indiana Among Five Mainline Denominations

1. Special thanks to Hartford Seminary for support to the author during the final stages of data collection and to the Indiana University Summer Faculty Fellowship Program for partial support during the early stages of data processing necessary to create analyzable files. Thanks to the Lilly Foundation, which supported the collection of the survey data. Thanks to Jackson Carroll and John Hiller, who collected and made the questionnaire data available to me. Special thanks also to Sheryl Wiggins of Hartford Seminary for rapid and accurate data entry of the church yearbook data.
2. The membership changes presented in this paragraph are based on those churches for which membership figures were available in 1970, 1980, and 1988. This excludes those churches that closed during the 1970s or 1980s, newly formed churches, and churches that make infrequent reports of membership to their denomination.
3. Compared with other Indiana churches in these denominations, the churches that completed the questionnaire and met other selection criteria have larger average memberships in 1980 (407 versus 340 members), are in somewhat larger communities, and have somewhat better growth rates.
4. Seven churches were excluded because they had growth rates greater than 10% per year (or an 80% increase from 1980 to 1988). Some readers may be surprised at this. Wouldn't one want to study these extremely fast-growing churches to find out how they do it? In regression terminology such churches are "outliers." They have an extreme effect on regression results, just as an extremely wealthy person has a very large effect on calculations of average income. Had they been included in the analysis, the results would not be typical of the experiences of most churches.
5. For some denominations, the most recent membership figures available in early 1989 were for 1987, not 1988. To adjust for these differences among denominations, the dependent variable actually used in these regressions is the percentage change from 1980 to 1987 or 1988 (depending upon denomination) divided by the number of years covered in the measure of membership change. I did not account for "compounding" membership change in these calculations since there is no strong evidence that churches grow or decline at compounding rates.
6. Throughout this chapter, I report adjusted R^2 values rather than simple R^2 values. This is because there are few cases relative to the number of predictor variables used in the regressions. In Tables 10.1 and 10.2, the adjusted R^2 values come from regressions that often do not include all of the predictor variables for a given category. Regressions with many predictor variables and few cases tend to yield low adjusted R^2 values. Thus, I first used stepwise regression to select the best predictors of growth within a variable category (those variables with statistically significant betas at the .15 level of probability). I then used these variables in a new regression to obtain the adjusted R^2 values reported in Tables 10.1 and 10.2. Because of missing values, these new regressions are often based on different numbers of cases. Thus, the adjusted R^2 values for an entire category sometime exceed the sum of the adjusted R^2 values from the clusters.
7. This figure is different from the correlation reported in Table 10.1, since it is based on a larger number of cases. The correlations reported in this paragraph include churches that did not return questionnaires.
8. The standard deviation of population change rates decreased from 19% to 12%.
9. Sharp-eyed readers will notice that the total adjusted R^2 value for all identity variables is greater than the sum of the adjusted R^2 s for the three clusters. This discrepancy is due to the way these R^2 values were calculated (see earlier note) and the different numbers of cases used to calculate the R^2 values in different parts of Table 10.1.
10. It is possible that these findings could reflect some autocorrelation (respondents only say the church puts high emphasis on membership recruitment when a church is growing), but

the questions merely ask about the importance and emphasis put on these activities, not whether they are effective.

11. The first correlation is based on the ninety-eight churches in which respondents checked a one, two, or three on a seven-point scale indicating that the church is more oriented to serving the needs of the "world beyond [the] membership" than the needs of current members. The second correlation is based on 251 churches in which respondents checked four or five on this same scale. The third correlation is based on 106 churches in which respondents checked a six or seven indicating a focus on members' needs.

Chapter Eleven

Belief Style, Congregational Climate, and Program Quality

The authors wish to thank Eugene Roehlkepartain, Kirk Hadaway, David Roozen, and the members of the Congregational Studies Working Group for their comments on earlier drafts of this chapter, and the Lilly Foundation for their support of this research, the Working Group, and a great many important research projects in the area of North American religious life.

1. The original ECE study included the participation of congregations from the Southern Baptist Convention. Given the unique characteristics of that denomination (their scores on many measures were markedly higher than those of the five "mainline" denominations, as a group) their data were not included in this analysis.
2. This brief listing of the contents of the ECE study gives some idea of the scope of the project. For further information, see Benson and Eklin (1990).
3. Support for this augmentation of the data set was provided in part through an additional grant from the Lilly Foundation.
4. Cases deleted were those in which the "growth ratio" was either less than 0.3, or greater than 2.5.
5. For example, if a congregation's size remains unchanged for a given period of time, this is reflected in a change ratio of 1.0. If it doubles in size, this produces a change ratio of 2.0. If it then declines by half (returning to its previous size), the change ratio is 0.5. Adding 2.0 and 0.5 gives 2.5, which does not convey the lack of any net change over the period observed. Consider, however, the log transform of these measures. $\log 2 = 0.3$; $\log 1 = 0.0$; $\log 0.5 = -0.3$. To return to the "doubling and halving" example, the net change is $0.3 + (-0.3) = 0.0$.
6. The correlation between the "pastor's estimate" correlation with a particular characteristic and the "change ratio" correlation with that same characteristic is $-.07$, nonsignificant.
7. The particular regression procedure used is invariant with respect to order of entry (SAS, 1987). All other variables in the model are controlled for, and all regression weights are reported as if the particular predictor had been entered "last."

PART THREE

INDIVIDUALS AND THE CHURCH CHOICE

Chapter Twelve

From Church Tradition to Consumer Choice: The Gallup Surveys of the Unchurched American

1. Unfortunately, Roof and Hoge's analysis did not include childhood religiosity. Several recent studies have found strong, although largely indirect, effects for religious socialization on church involvement (e.g., Cornwall, 1989). Recent studies have also found stronger regional effects than those reported by Roof and Hoge (e.g., Stump, 1986).
2. The 1988 survey did include a measure of "localism," but not comparable in wording to that used in the 1978 survey. In an analysis of just the 1988 data, not reported here, we found

that the 1988 measure of localism had nearly the same positive effect on religious participation as Roof and Hoge (1980) report for the 1978 measure and data.

3. The items in our "church personalism" scale had a positive wording in the 1978 survey and a negative wording in the 1988 survey. We reversed the coding of the 1988 items to create comparability; and given the location of the items within a larger block of otherwise positively worded questions in the survey, our reversal probably overestimates the actual positive change from 1978 to 1988 in our church personalism scale. However, other "perception of the church" items that had identical wordings in both surveys changed in a positive direction, and this increases our confidence that at least some of the positive change over time in our church personalism scale was real. For present purposes, our interpretation is only dependent upon positive change, not the magnitude of change. For detailed statistical reasons, the reversal of coding in the church personalism scale, while not ideal, should not affect our later regression analysis.
4. A major consideration in a stepwise multiple regression is the order in which blocks are entered into the analysis. This order is dictated both by the researcher's interpretive purposes, and by theoretical assumptions about causal priority. Our model assumes that social background affects general value orientations; both of which affect traditional religiosity; all of which affect church consumerism; all of these four, in turn, affecting church membership; and all of these five affecting worship attendance. However, because we were primarily interested in (a) the direct effect of our blocks (as opposed to their total effect—i.e., direct and indirect), and (b) comparing the strength of the most immediate effects across denominational groups, we enter them in reverse causal order. That is, we enter what we assume to be the most immediate "causes" first, and the "causes of causes" last.
5. While membership may strike some as being autocorrelated with attendance, as will be seen, the relation of membership to attendance acts differently from year to year and across denominational categories—especially for liberal Protestants.
6. In addition to the step summaries upon which the textual graphs are based, the Appendix tables contain the controlled R and part-R for each individual variable in the model. A comparison of the uncontrolled and part-R's provides a gauge of how much of the total effect (uncontrolled R) of any given explanatory variable on either church membership or attendance is direct (part-R), and how much is indirectly mediated through associations with other explanatory variables (R minus part-R).
7. However, the latter does not mean that these individual variables have no effect on membership. Rather, as indicated in the detailed Table A12.1 (Appendix), they show modest effects consistent with the findings of past research. In the multivariate model, however, the explanatory power of the blocks themselves is muted, because their effects are mediated through the relationship of these items to current religiosity and church consumerism. Interestingly, of the variables in our value and social background blocks, religious socialization exhibits the strongest relationship to membership—controlled and uncontrolled.
8. We again caution that this does not mean that they have no effect. Rather, it means that the effect they do have is mediated through their influence on the first three blocks. Further, as was the case for church membership, religious socialization has the strongest overall effect on worship attendance (see Table A12.1 in the Appendix). Also in relationship to current discussions of the baby boom generation's return to active religious participation, it is interesting to note in Table A12.1 that family cycle had a greater influence on worship attendance in 1988 than it did in 1978.
9. This is true in regard both to its direct effect on attendance and to its mediated effect through church membership (see Table A12.1 in the Appendix).
10. This way of understanding religious individualism was presented by the authors at a conference in February, 1991. In a personal communication, Wade Clark Roof acknowledged that his discussion, "Reconsidering Religious Individualism," in *A Generation of Seekers*

(HarperCollins, 1993) draws from Marler and Roozen's insights about the positive implications of individualism for religious institutions.

11. And as Ammerman describes, fundamentalist believers perceive "profound differences" between themselves and other Christians at many levels: in life-style, worship, theology, and authority. In fact, the perception is that "liberal churches are not 'real churches'" (1987:79).

Chapter Thirteen

Religion in the Canadian 1990s: The Paradox of Poverty and Potential

1. The research upon which this chapter is based has been made possible in part through grants from the Lilly Endowment, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the University of Lethbridge.

Chapter Fourteen

Baby Boomers and the Return to the Churches

1. For purposes of this analysis, Protestants were classified as "mainline" or "conservative" using the denominational scheme of Roof and McKinney, 1987. "Liberal Protestant" and "moderate Protestant" affiliations from that work are here combined into a single category called "mainline."
2. On the basis of a content analysis of the expressed concerns of religious publications about youth dropping out of the church, decade by decade in this century, the "Youth Problem" was a recurring theme. It reached critical proportions in the twenties and early thirties, though at no point did the crisis seem to reach the magnitude of the sixties. These results are found in Jonathan A. Dorn, "Sodom and Tomorrow: Will the Younger Generation Really Be Good?" unpublished paper, 1989.

Chapter Fifteen

Churched and Unchurched Black Americans

1. We wish to thank the Roper Center for making the 1978 data set available.
2. In the 1978 data set there were only eleven black respondents residing in the suburban South and nineteen in the suburban non-South. The 1988 data set included a larger number of suburban residents. Massey and Denton (1988:592) report the "rapid suburbanization between 1950 and 1970 radically changed the spatial structure of U.S. cities, transforming them from concentrated, highly centralized agglomerations into scattered, decentralized metropolitan areas." This was chiefly due to white suburbanization—the central cities became blacker and the suburbs whiter during this period. In 1980 blacks were less suburbanized than other minorities, and even in suburbs segregation remained quite high (see also Stalura, 1986:140). As noted in *A Common Destiny*, 57% of American blacks reside in inner cities: "many are poorly educated, and low-skill and blue-collar jobs have been leaving the inner cities for the suburbs" (Jaynes and Williams, 1989:396). Higher rates of unemployment and substantial levels of persistent poverty increasingly characterized America's central cities over the 1980s.
3. A high percentage of older, urban blacks grew up in contexts favorable to religious socialization—they were likely to have attended Sunday school, for example. That they would turn to the church when older and when times are troubled is not surprising.
4. As can be seen in Table 15.2, significant interaction existed between place of residence and importance of religion in predicting rates of being churched. The thesis of this chapter was that in the three places of residence characterized by voluntary participation we would find personal religiousness (importance of religion to the individual) positively related to being churched, and that these settings would be significantly different from the other two (com-

munal) contexts. The significant interaction and the examination of the presence or absence of relationships across the five settings give support to this hypothesis. A similar pattern exists for the afterlife as a predictor, but the interaction is not significant; had we dichotomized place of residence into the communal and voluntary settings, we would have had an easier test for interaction. (The same could have been done for testing the interaction between each of the other selected predictors and place of residence, that is, communal versus voluntary context).

Chapter Sixteen

Participation and Commitment Among American Catholic Parishioners

1. Data reported in this chapter were first collected with the aid of a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Hartford Seminary, and the Institute for Scholarship in Liberal Arts, University of Notre Dame, also provided support for this research. Finally, I would like to thank Chengang Zhu for providing assistance with computer analyses.
2. Selected data from Phase I and Phase II were merged to provide measures of organizational structure that characterize individual parishes and affect the religious beliefs and actions of parishioners. Individual-level data from the surveys of parishioners and staff were also aggregated to create measures of salient social or psychological features that shape the climate of the parish. Finally, selected census data that reflect aspects of the local environment in which the parish is situated were incorporated into this multilevel data base. These data allow us to study and compare relationships between measures reflecting the levels of commitment and participation shown by parishioners and other relevant characteristics of these individuals, their specific parishes, and the surrounding local environment. This type of multilevel analysis (see Van den Eeden and Huthner for more extensive discussions of multilevel or contextual analyses) offers notable advantages for theorizing (Leege and Welch, 1985).
3. Each measure was selected because it reflected a unique and separate component of a parishioner's institutional participation or commitment to the local parish. In addition, the factor-based scales representing Basic and Traditionalistic Devotion were derived from previous research (Welch and Leege, 1989) that identified several distinct styles of worship by Catholic parishioners. These scales have since been shown to be reliable (e.g., alphas > .70) and valid measures, with notable relationships to a variety of important variables (Welch and Leege, 1991).
4. Once the dependent measures were determined, I examined intercorrelations between the other individual-level variables and these measures. All potential predictor variables that displayed statistically significant (at $p < .05$ level) and theoretically meaningful correlations were retained and grouped into several subsets.

I further examined intercorrelations among and within these subsets of predictor variables and, whenever appropriate, factor analyzed several of these subsets to reduce further the number of variables. Item analyses were also used to construct simple indices. These procedures minimized redundancy among the predictors and thus ultimately reduced statistical problems that might afflict later analyses. Data reduction procedures yielded four individual-level, factor-based scales (see Kim and Mueller), one summated index, and fifteen single-item measures representing the complete block of individual-level predictor variables. Although one or two variables from a set of dummy variables representing region did display a few weak, but statistically significant, zero-order relationships to the measures of participation and commitment, these relationships were reduced to nonsignificance in later preliminary analyses. As a result, I will not discuss these variables in the following sections.

5. The first of these measures, an index representing the primary socioeconomic composition of a parish, was itself created from measures of parish income level and the level of education characterizing a parish. This summated four-item index exhibited a high level of internal consistency ($\alpha = .71$).

A second index, representing the level of ethnic homogeneity within the parish congregation, was based on a parishioner's principal self-identification with one of twenty-four specific ethnic groups. Marginal distributions on this ethnic self-classification were obtained for each parish and an index of parish-level ethnic homogeneity was computed, using Lieberman's (1970) coefficient of similarity. Values for this index range from zero (indicating complete ethnic diversity—i.e., each respondent falls into a different ethnic category—within the parish) to 1.00 (indicating complete ethnic homogeneity—i.e., all respondents are classified in the same ethnic category).

An index reflecting the extent of religious endogamy within a parish was the final measure included in the set of local institutional variables. This ratio measure represents the percentage of parishioners within each parish who have Catholic spouses, and it is based on the aggregated responses of parish members to a marital status item. Values for this measure extend from 0% (indicating no religious endogamy with a given parish) to 100% (indicating complete religious endogamy—i.e., all respondents within a parish are married to Catholic spouses). The formula is represented below.

$$RE = \text{MPCS/TMP}$$

Where,

RE = Level of Religious Endogamy;

MPCS = Number of parishioners married to Catholic spouses;

TMP = Total number of married parishioners within parish

6. As is well known (Kerlinger, 1973:71-72; see also Roof et al., 1979: 220-21, 368), the magnitude of the coefficients representing percentage change in explained variance is contingent on the order in which blocks of variables are introduced into the multiple regression analysis. Thus, empirical results are strongly influenced by the theoretical assumptions reflected in the model. Furthermore, because of the extremely large number of variables included in the analysis, I report only change in the adjusted ("shrunken") R^2 statistic for each block. This adjusted coefficient is more difficult to interpret than a simple R^2 change statistic, but it is more appropriate and does allow for an easier comparison of results with other studies that conducted similar analyses and focused on Protestant denominations (e.g., Roof et al., 1979).