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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

The Problem

How does an individual's social status affect his mode of religious involvement?

The division of society into classes or strata arranged in a hierarchy of wealth and prestige is an almost universal feature of social structure. The implication of this differentiation in strata extends beyond that of power. Indeed the concept "social class" connotes not only the relative power or riches of a given strata, but life styles, values, and associations as well. The concern of this research is to determine the extent to which religiosity varies with social status, or more specifically, to determine if differences in social status are reflected in differences in religiosity even among members of a single denomination.

Denominationalism reflects the influence of social class.¹ Familiar labels therefore which certain theologians and the public attach to religious denominations usually connote the relative position that body occupies

¹See H. Richard Niebuhr, Social Sources of Denominationalism (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1929).
in the hierarchy of church bodies. The theological label of fundamentalism is implicitly and explicitly attached to proletariat and rural-dominated bodies.  

Yinger dichotomizes between fundamentalism and middle-class religion. Although there is some justification for this, are the religious bodies as homogeneous with respect to class as such labels make them out to be? A quick glance at Table I would indicate this is not the case. The accuracy of status labels is negated by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Composition of Religious Bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a look at the composition of any denomination listed.

2 loc. cit., p. 184.
There are many lower-class individuals within the Episcopalian church (commonly viewed as the church of the upper-class), and many middle- and upper-class individuals within the Baptist church (commonly viewed as the church of down-and-outers). ¹

As noted above, life styles, values, and associations vary between status groups. Presumably the means used for the satisfaction of religious needs also vary. Consequently if we find both high and low status parishioners within a given denomination, we would suspect that the religious needs of each would be met in different manners. A focus upon individual religiosity should bear this out. The directions that these means take is the concern of this research.

Background

One of the most familiar and enduring typologies within the sociology of religion is that of the church-sect. Max Weber introduced this dichotomy, ² but it was

---
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his student Ernst Troeltsch\(^6\) who was left to expand and define more specifically the traits of each pole. Though no religious group can meet all the criteria assigned to one pole, one group will more closely approximate the sect while another approximates the church type.\(^7\)

These extreme polar types bear the following characteristics which differ primarily along two axes:\(^8\)

1. The church favors a professional leadership, while the sect renounces professional for non-professional charismatic leadership.


\(^7\)Dichotomies are usually not without problems; the church-sect dichotomy is not unique in this sense. Troeltsch inserted in the center of the continuum what he called the Free Church, i.e., unclassifiable bodies such as Calvinistic groups which to him represented a mixture of church and sect types. Troeltsch, ibid. Recent studies have expanded the church-sect concept to include six more typologies: the cult, the sect, the institutionalized sect, the denomination, the church, and the ecclesia. See Harold Pfautz, "The Sociology of Secularization: Religious Groups," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXI (Sept. 1955), pp. 121-128; Leopold Von Wiese and Howard Becker, *Systematic Sociology* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1932), pp. 624-628.

2. The church maintains lax membership criteria embracing all who are socially compatible, while the sect maintains stringent membership criteria embracing only those who demonstrate signs of conversion and pass the test of a "novitiate" stage.

3. The church makes the religious role marginal or peripheral, while the sect makes the commitment total and the religious role is pivotal in all areas of life.

4. The church has impersonal fellowship among its members, while the sect is an exclusive and intimate community.

5. The church stresses formality and ritual, while the sect stresses personal testimony and spontaneity.

6. The church de-emphasizes traditional doctrines and accepts scientific and humanistic thinking in the interpretation of life, while the sect re-emphasizes the validity of traditional doctrine and stresses a literal Biblical interpretation of life.

Externally

7. The church exhibits tolerance towards other faiths, while the sect remains suspicious of or hostile to other faiths.
8. The church accommodates the secular order, while the sect remains aloof or antagonistic to it.

Though there is consensus that the preceding are church-sect characteristics, they are not exhaustive. One of the more obvious elements not included in the list is the social class composition of each type. The church gathers most members from the middle and upper classes, while the sect thrives upon lower class membership. Max Weber spoke of church and sect as being social class phenomena. Troeltsch wrote of the church as "using" the ruling classes to determine the social order; the sect, he wrote, was composed of elements opposed to the social order because of their low estate. Many researches of the past quarter century have attempted to support the relationship of class and church or

---

9 It should be reiterated that "church" and "sect" are ideal types and therefore not concrete reality. For this reason no religious body is expected to satisfy all the criteria of one type or the other.


12 "The sects, on the other hand, are connected with the lower classes, or at least with those elements in society which are opposed to the State and to Society; they work upwards from below, and not downwards from above." Troeltsch, op. cit., p. 331.
A goodly number of such studies were concerned with a dynamic organizational analysis in that the patterns associated with the familiar sect-to-church transition were sought. One ingredient in this transition was always corroborated: there is a general rise in the status of the organization's membership.

Goldschmidt\textsuperscript{14} and Niebuhr\textsuperscript{15} depart from a complete organizational analysis by limiting their work to the social-psychological needs of the different social classes with respect to religion. Niebuhr makes the point quite specifically:

\begin{quote}
\ldots one phase of the history of denominationalism reveals itself as the story of the religiously neglected poor, who fashion a new type of Christianity, which corresponds to their distinctive needs, who rise in the economic scale under the influence of religious discipline, and who, in the midst of the freshly acquired cultural respectability, neglect the new poor succeeding them on the lower plane.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Goldschmidt's work speaks in general of differing religious needs of social classes, but emphasizes two characteristics of the sect which appear in our list above. These are the

\textsuperscript{13}See for example the following: S. D. Clark, \textit{Church and Sect in Canada} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948); Benton Johnson, "Do Holiness Sects Socialize in the Dominant Values?" \textit{Social Forces}, XXXIX (May 1961), pp. 301-316; Thomas O'Dea, \textit{op. cit.}; and Liston Pope, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{14}W. Goldschmidt, "Class Denominationalism in Rural California Churches," \textit{American Journal of Sociology}, XLIX (November 1944), pp. 348-355.

\textsuperscript{15}Niebuhr, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{16}loc. cit., p. 28.
intimacy of the group and the antagonism toward the secular order. A more intensive study by Festinger, et. al., of the Seekers, a small group who foresaw the impending destruction of the earth, and consequently retreated from the larger society, revealed both these traits. The church on the other hand is more individualistic than intimate and accepts the secular culture seeking to operate within it.

Thus the church-sect dichotomy has traditionally been identified with a social status component, and to some extent with the differing religious needs of status groups. But what then of the high status sect member or the low status church member? Clearly he has cross-pressure operating on him for his social status is not congruent with his religious membership. And as Table I indicates, it would appear that a goodly number are so cross-pressured. The issue might be resolved by differing modes of religious involvement. This research will focus on a number of separate dimensions of religiosity to determine if they "hang together" in any consistent manner.


18 The degree of acceptance of the secular culture is the main concern of H. R. Niebuhr's Christ and Culture (New York: Harper and Row, 1951). It is evident from his work that acceptance or non-acceptance is a questionable (perhaps unjustified) dichotomy, since there are many positions between extremes taken by different religious bodies.
patterns. Certain hypotheses will be advanced to test the relationship of these patterns and social status.

Related Literature

Religion has been a prominent field of study and a proper concern for social scientists from Comte to the present day. Nisbet contends that:

No other single concept is as suggestive of the unique role held by sociology among the social sciences in the nineteenth century, or as reflective of its underlying premises about the nature of man and society, as the concept of the sacred. I use this word to refer to the totality of myth, ritual, sacrament, dogma, and the mores in human behavior. . . . the main line of sociology reveals a fascination with the analytical uses of the religio-sacred that is unmatched in any other social science.19

It is perhaps enigmatic that religion should loom large as an area for sociological inquiry. For had not the Enlightenment demonstrated the expendability of all institutionalized religion? And didn't sociology and its "Father", Auguste Comte, arrive on the scene soon after the Enlightenment? Furthermore during that nineteenth century period two of social science's great minds, namely Bentham and Marx, viewed religion of any

kind with an utter disdain. Bentham wrote that religion
is harmful "not only to the believer himself, but also
to others through him. . . . (for it creates) in the
heart of society factitious antipathies between men who
believe and men who do not believe." He thought absurd
the notion that religion can theoretically serve a need
as an analytical tool in understanding human behavior.

Neither did Marx see any necessity for religion as
a tool for understanding or as a necessity for man.
"Religion," he wrote, "is the expression of real distress
. . . It is the opium of the people." Therefore the
abolition of religion is required for real happiness; to
facilitate this the societal system which requires
illusions must be abolished.

Yet religion was not illusion in the greater part
of sociological thinking of that period. Durkheim wrote
that "there is something eternal in religion which is
destined to survive all the particular symbols in which
religious thought has successively enveloped itself." 23

20 Quoted by Elie Halevy, Growth of Philosophic
21 loc. cit., p. 294 ff.
22 Lewis Feuer, (Ed.), Marx and Engels: Basic
Writings on Politics and Philosophy (Garden City:
23 Emile Durkheim, The Elementary Forms of the
Religious Life (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.,
The nineteenth century, which was, "so far as religious writing is concerned, one of the two or three richest in the whole history of Western Europe,"24 did much to kindle a scientific interest in the role of religion in human behavior.

Emile Durkheim and Max Weber in the early part of the twentieth century were concerned with a functional analysis of religion and its role in the social system. Durkheim's methodology25 directed him to focus on "social things", and religion was for him a "social thing". All human experience he saw as being divided into two heterogeneous spheres, namely, the sacred and the profane. The profane refers to workaday experiences, the realm of adaptive behavior; the sacred is not a utilitarian sphere like the profane but the experiences of awe and reverence found predominantly in religion. The sacred is not only non-utilitarian but non-empirical and does not involve knowledge as well. The object of religion was society itself; the function therefore of religion was the preservation of society. The worship of God is therefore a worship of society, a technique whereby "the social group reaffirms itself periodically".26

24 Nisbet, op. cit., p. 227.
For Weber religion was an independent causal element influencing behavior throughout history. In his study of Protestantism and non-Christian world religions he sought to demonstrate this position. For Marx the types of religion were but reflections of types of society. The greatness of Weber lies in his reversal of Marx through demonstration that types of society may be reflections of types of religion. Religion was concerned with the problem of meaning in Weber's formulation. Religion served to answer three problem areas of the individual: the problems of contingency, powerlessness, and scarcity. The answers worked out to these become part of the culture thereby affecting the goals, the rules, and the values of the society.

Attempts at understanding the complex phenomenon of religion have resulted in the construction of numerous typologies, aside from the sacred-profane and church-sect mentioned above. Most of these typologies are


28 See Nisbet, op. cit., p. 251 ff.

29 One of the most complete reviews of religious typologies is found in Edward McKenna, "Six Dimensions of Religiosity and Reismen's Inner-Other Direction," unpublished M. A. Thesis, Western Michigan University, 1966.
descriptive traits of organizations or individuals. Unfortunately the development of satisfactory dimensions of the phenomena has been neglected. The practice of distinguishing people as being more or less religious as measured by a single indicator has been the rule and not the exception. Thus while focusing on but one aspect of religious involvement, studies have made assumptions about the whole. It is impossible to determine the degree of religiosity without also taking into account the different kinds of involvement possible.

One of the most elementary problems with using single indicators, for example, church attendance, to measure religiosity is its non-comparability. Christian denominations vary in the number of weekly church services held. To attend 100 per cent of the services within the Episcopal church requires less participation than attendance at 100 per cent of Baptist services. And who is to judge the Episcopalian or the Baptist more religious? Secondly, by determining religiosity from a single indicator, implicitly the researcher's conceptualization of religiosity is that of an unidimensional phenomenon. Recent efforts therefore have been put forth to locate the dimensions of religiosity.

Glock has suggested that religiosity is composed

\[\text{See Chapter 2 of Charles Glock and Rodney Stark, Religion and Society in Tension (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965). Chapter 2 is Glock's revision of an earlier paper he read at the American Sociological Association meetings at Chicago, September, 1959.}\]
of five separable dimensions. From his acquaintance with many religions he has identified a consensus of general areas within which one can be religious. These identifiable dimensions are:

1) Experiential - the emotional response one brings to his religion.

2) Ideological - the religious conviction and commitment to doctrine.

3) Behavioral - participation in the church as organization.

4) Intellectual - the knowledge possessed of one's faith: its past history, its current activity, and its scriptures.

5) Consequential - the influence of religion upon everyday activities.

Numerous empirical studies utilized this framework of Glock's, though few have made use of more than three of his dimensions. Since we are concerned in this research with religiosity and social status, previous studies of religiosity and status should be examined at this point.

The findings of status and religious involvement are contradictory. Some reveal a linear relationship in which involvement increases with increasing status. Others give evidence of a curvilinear relationship in
which the extreme upper and extreme lower status groups are almost totally uninvolved.

**Empirical support for high status religiosity**

Many early studies made primary use of the behavioral dimension, and many considered only one element within this dimension, namely, church membership. Cantril made use of data from a Gallup and an Office of Public Opinion Research Poll. He found that non-church members were lower in status than church members, which led him to conclude that there was a positive relation between membership and social class. Warner's study of Yankee City supported the notion that middle- and upper-status groups have higher church membership rates than the lower-status groups. And like Cantril, Warner found the upper classes to have slightly less church members among it than the middle classes, but more than the lower classes. Moberg relates that a low incidence of home ownership among Protestants is correlated with low

---


32 Linearity is evident when the middle and upper classes are combined; curvilinearity is the pattern when these two classes are separated.

church membership. Bultena, West, and Hollingshead found in their respective community studies that the high status residents evidence a higher rate of church membership than their low status counterparts.

Another element properly located within the behavioral dimension which has become the most frequently used measure of religiosity is church attendance. Already in 1899 Perry had evidence indicating workingmen do not attend church as frequently as the higher status individuals. He developed a questionnaire to be filled out by labor leaders to answer the simple question "why". In 1916 Boisen searched for changes within the church brought about by increasing formal education of its members. He found evidence indicating college-trained men attended church much more frequently than the non-college educated.

39Anton Boisen, "Factors Which Have to Do with the Decline of the Country Church," American Journal of Sociology, XXII (September 1916), pp. 177-192.
Lazerwitz's\textsuperscript{40} national survey findings show a direct relationship between frequency of church attendance and educational and occupational levels; the relationship does not hold, however, for income levels. The Lynds\textsuperscript{41} found 55 per cent of the Middletown white collar adults attending church at least three times per month, while only 25 per cent of the blue collar adults attended that frequently. Burchinal's\textsuperscript{42} aforementioned research finds a positive linear relationship between social class and attendance.

Using a dichotomous distinction between middle and working classes, Lenski's\textsuperscript{43} research in Detroit found the middle class adults were more likely to be regular church attenders than the working class adults. Zimmer and Hawley's\textsuperscript{44} study of Flint, Michigan, supports the preceding research, in that white collar workers and the more highly educated were found to attend church more often than the less educated.


\textsuperscript{41}Robert and Helen Lynd, \textit{Middletown} (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1929).

\textsuperscript{42}Burchinal, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{43}Gerhard Lenski, \textit{The Religious Factor: A Sociologist's Inquiry} (Anchor Books Edition; Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1963), pp. 115-116. Lenski reveals that the mobile males within the middle class were more likely to be regular church attenders than the non-mobile men in both the working and middle classes.

\textsuperscript{44}Basil Zimmer and Amos Hawley, "Suburbanization and Church Participation," \textit{Social Forces}, XXXVII (May 1959), p. 351.
Numerous Catholic studies have reported findings not unlike those above. Fichter\textsuperscript{45} found the better educated Catholics in his sample to be the more frequent attenders. Kelley's\textsuperscript{46} findings were almost identical to Fichter's. National poll data of 1951 released by the \textit{Catholic Digest}\textsuperscript{47} found only 62 per cent of the lower class attended church while 75 per cent of the upper class did so.

A third element of the behavioral dimension which has been associated with social status--though it doesn't occur as often in the literature as church membership or attendance--is participation in church activities. Church functions in which the member may participate are numerous indeed; some typical activities include: the finance board, building committee, deacon's board, ladies aid, Sunday School, nursery, Vacation Bible School, literary circle, the choir, denominational board, bowling team, Couples' Club, Young Adults, and many, many others. It is the rule and not the exception to have one or more activities going on each evening of the week within most


\textsuperscript{47}As cited by N. J. Demerath, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 11.
Protestant churches of some size. In a small survey among its research scientists, the DuPont Company found over 50 per cent of those sampled to be very active members of church activities. Fichter in his investigation among Catholics found that those with high educational attainment are much more likely to participate intensively and assume positions of leadership in church organizations than those with less education. Reeder investigating the religious organizations among Mormons found a positive relationship between education and participation. Kosa and Schommer, using a dichotomous working and middle class distinction among Catholic college students, showed a positive—though weak—relationship between status and participation.

In a personal communication with a minister, we were discussing the countless activities the church engages in. He bemoaned this fact from the point of separating family members too many evenings per week. But he did so in a rather unconventional manner. He said, "Mary had a little lamb; it would have been a sheep. But it joined an American church, and died from lack of sleep."


in campus religious activities. Glock and Ringer found the high status respondents in their Episcopalian sample to be the more active, though the extreme upper status groups were less involved than the middle groups. Essentially a curvilinear relation was found. Kaufman's study of a township in central New York revealed a positive linear relationship between social status and participation in church activities. The Elmtown study of Hollingshead consistently showed the lower status groups to be the least active in church affairs.

The above findings that upper status individuals are more often than lower status to be members, service attenders, and leaders in church organizations, have been criticized on two counts by Page and Lenski. Page notes that many church functions (bowling teams, literary clubs, and the like) are essentially secular in nature and therefore more appealing to middle and upper status groups. They serve as a channel for enticing new members or keeping old members. But by their nature they are unattractive to the low status individual, establishing therefore a form

Glock and Ringer, op. cit.
Hollingshead, op. cit.
of selective recruitment. A familiarity with American church activities lends plausibility to Page's position, especially when coupled with the financial costs often-time of being a participant in some of the church organizations. Lenski\(^{56}\) contends that higher church participants on the part of the middle and upper classes is but a reflection of their general tendency towards heavier involvement in voluntary organizations.\(^{57}\)

The evidence presented seems to be consistent—except for disputes concerning linearity and curvilinearity—in their findings that high status are the higher participants. However all the aforementioned measures have been of the behavioral sort. And in terms of Glock's dimensions cited above, religiosity is more than a behavioral phenomenon. The qualifications of high status religiosity become pronounced when other dimensions are investigated.

**Empirical support for low status religiosity**

Fukuyama's\(^{58}\) study of Congregationalists permitted

\(^{56}\) Lenski, op. cit., pp. 47-50.

\(^{57}\) Stark, in an attempt to refute Lenski's argument, has reshuffled Lenski's data. By controlling for organizational participation, the high status still give evidence of higher attendance than the lower status. See Rodney Stark, "Class Radicalism and Religious Involvement in Great Britain," *American Sociological Review*, XXIX (October 1964), pp. 698-706.

him to identify four dimensions of religiosity: the cultic, creedal, cognitive, and devotional. The cultic corresponds to Glock's behavioral; the creedal to the ideological; the cognitive to the intellectual; and the devotional to Glock's consequential. Fukuyama found a positive relationship between status and the cultic and cognitive dimensions, but a negative relationship for the creedal and devotional. Lenski in his Detroit study cited previously used questions about a belief in God, a life hereafter, and the like, to measure orthodoxy. Among white and Negro Protestants he found "the doctrinally orthodox were more numerous among southern-born, first- and second-generation immigrants, working-class people, and the less well educated". The same pattern was not found among Catholics however.

Dynes' dissertation on 360 Protestants in Columbus, Ohio, revealed a negative relationship between status and Christian beliefs. Demerath's survey in Winchester, Massachusetts, found social status negatively related to fundamentalism in beliefs and tolerance of relativism.

59Lenski, op. cit., p. 59.
The familiar community studies generally support the research of Dynes and Demerath though, understandably, the measures make no claim for sophistication.

Summary

The findings on social class and religiosity seem at first glance to present many inconsistencies. The majority of the researches that have depended primarily on the behavioral indices have labeled the high status individuals the more religious. The researches using ideological or consequential indices have rather consistently labeled the low status as being more religious. The discrepancies themselves suggest a pattern, however. It is not sufficient to say status groups differ in their degree of religiosity—though this apparently is demonstrable on any number of dimensions. The findings also reveal status groups differing in kind of religiosity. Using sociological jargon, we would suggest that within dimensions of religiosity we can locate quantitative as well as qualitative differences. It is the task of this research to make use of these degree and kind differences in determining the patterns of religiosity which arise.

Since church membership and participation in church functions is on the increase in America, the bemoanings of many evangelical and fundamentalist men of the cloth that America is becoming secular and departing from the faith appears to be based on non-behavioral dimensions.
between low status and high status individuals.

Glock's dimensions of religiosity permit the most complete analysis of religiosity and for that purpose will be used in this research. Some questions about these dimensions—their independence and interrelationship—will be taken up later in the paper. At this point we must attach definitions to the concepts being used in this research.

Concept Definitions

Social status

Status is one of social science's most disputed and at the same time most maligned concepts. Kahl avoids the term using "prestige" in its place. Packard has identified status for his vast readers to refer to one's standing in the community—a standing vigorously sought and laboriously maintained. Status, therefore, to use

63 A religious literacy test which could be used to tap the intellectual dimension has not been used in this research. Such a test which adequately measures all that is involved in Glock's intellectual dimension is not known to exist to the author at this date. Correspondence with Drs. Glock and Demerath turned up nothing. Because of the size of the sample and the rather lengthy interview schedule it was decided that the development of such a test for this research would not be feasible. Therefore the intellectual dimension has been excluded.

65 Packard, op. cit.
a hackneyed phrase, is many things to many people. No matter what meaning is attached, status presupposes a hierarchical ordering of groups or individuals in the society in terms of esteem. Within this hierarchy is found both ascribed and achieved status, i.e., position by virtue of birth, sex, and age, and position by virtue of achievement respectively. Social status will be used in this research to refer to the socially recognized designation of a position in social, as opposed to geographical, space to which individuals are assigned.

Religion

There are almost as many definitions of religion as there are definers. Frazer's definition is "a propitiation or conciliation of powers superior to man which are believed to direct and control the course of nature, and

66 Rousseau identified ascribed and achieved status without calling them such many years ago: "I conceive that there are two kinds of inequality among the human species; one, which I call natural or physical, because it is established by nature, and consists in a difference of age, health, bodily strength, and the qualities of the mind or of the soul; and another, which may be called moral or political inequality, because it depends on a kind of convention, and is established, or at least authorized, by the consent of men." As quoted in T. B. Bottomore, Classes in Modern Society (New York: Pantheon Books, division of Random House, Inc., 1966), p. 10.

67 The modifier "social" when attached to "status" comes the closest to Weber's use of status as opposed to class. "The genuine place of classes," he wrote, "is within the economic order, the place of status groups is within the social order ..." Essays, op. cit., p. 194.
of human life". Yinger suggests it is incumbent upon us to use a definition of religion that can include nationalism, communism, and science (as a way of life). Such a definition may be superior for certain purposes for it enables the social scientist to label almost any individual religious. The scope in this research precludes our use of such a definition; rather, we would suggest a definition which is not unlike Berger's "religious establishment", i.e., religion is a formally, securely established and in a taken-for-granted manner important institution of American society. For this study, then, religion is seen as an organized body in the Christian tradition that possesses a system of beliefs and rites.

Dimensions of religiosity

Religiosity in this research is viewed as a multi-dimensional variable. Four components or dimensions are utilized in the conceptualization of religion: behavioral, consequential, ideological, and the experiential.

69 Yinger, op. cit., p. 122.
a) The behavioral dimension has to do with specific religious behaviors such as church attendance and participation in parish activities. It is perhaps the easiest of the dimensions to locate empirically. Quantitatively people can range from almost no involvement—for example the church member who never attends—to very much involvement—the member who regularly attends church meetings and serves on many church-related committees. Qualitatively it is possible to engage only in behaviors which are recognized as being of a very formal type, or to be engaged in informal religious behaviors. Behaviors which bespeak spontaneity and intimacy would be of the informal type, while behaviors of an impersonal nature would be considered formal.

b) The consequential dimension concerns itself with one's religious spillover into his secular affairs. "Included . . . are what people . . . do and the attitudes they ought to hold as a consequence of their religion."\(^7\) Presumably the more explicit the religious imperatives, the more likely there will be consequences which follow. Quantitatively one can testify that religion pervades deep into every area of his life or pervades not at all. For some religion serves as a pivotal point for their entire actions and decisions; for others religion is a

\(^7\) Glock and Stark, op. cit., p. 21.
discrete entity which remains separate from their secular affairs. Qualitatively, one's religion can direct him to be either this-world or other-world oriented.\textsuperscript{72} To put it another way, he who uses religion to improve his lot in life and that of fellowman is giving evidence of a different kind of religious consequence than he who practices self-denial and unconcern for temporal needs of others.

c) The ideological dimension has reference to beliefs concerning tenets of one's faith. In the Christian faith these would include belief in God, the virgin birth, Christ and his miracles, for example. These are referred to as warranting and purposive beliefs. But it also includes beliefs, known as implementing beliefs, regarding the method for the church and the individual to translate the warranting and purposive into action. An example here would be opinions or beliefs concerning the role of the church in social problems or in disciplining its members. Quantitatively individuals will differ as to the number of the church's teachings they accept. But qualitatively beliefs can differ as to kind. The familiar

\textsuperscript{72}The Puritans of New England provide an example of the paradox often exhibited within this dimension. Their theology was one which required religion to pervade every decision and activity of their life (the quantitative), and yet theirs was an other-world religion (qualitative), "for we are but strangers in a foreign land".
disputes over the social gospel in the early part of this century come to mind here. It was not simply a matter of the liberals having no beliefs. Thus the qualitative distinction might be identified as acceptance of modern beliefs or of traditional beliefs.

d) The experiential dimension concerns itself with the experience of some religious emotion on the part of the individual believer. Included in this dimension are all those sensations, perceptions, and feelings experienced by the individual and defined by him as communication, however slight, with divine essence. The range of such experience is broad and its relative absence as an everyday event makes it somewhat difficult to trap empirically. Quantitatively it is possible to measure the frequency of occurrence of these experiences: one can have many, few, or none. But—and perhaps more important—there is a distinguishable qualitative difference. The conviction of sin via the Holy Spirit at a revival meeting is certainly different from the familiar awe felt before the beauties of nature. William James has labeled the former a "sick soul" and the latter a "healthy-minded" experience.

Typology of religious involvement

The dimensions just reviewed reveal different ways in which people can be religious. Within each dimension it is possible to locate individuals in a quantitative
fashion expressing either high or low religiosity. We have also indicated that there is a qualitative element within these dimensions as well. Viewing the dimensions qualitatively as a continuum it is possible to locate individuals as expressing one kind of quality or the other within a given dimension. The task of this research is to identify any patterns by which these dimensions "hang" together.

Dynes\textsuperscript{73} and Demerath\textsuperscript{74} have supplied the initial groundwork for the construction of a typology to identify different modes of religious involvement. The poles of their typology are church-like and sect-like religiosity. Dynes use of this typology went little beyond our ideological dimension. His problem was to determine if lower status individuals expressed more sectarian beliefs than higher status individuals. Demerath sought to apply the typology using the behavioral and consequential dimensions. Dynes and Demerath share a common problem with this research: to specify the variation in religiosity of low status and high status individuals. Their general hypothesis is that the low status will have a sect-like religiosity and the high status a church-like religiosity irrespective of their denominational affiliation. The major handicap

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Dynes, op. cit.}
\footnote{Demerath, op. cit.}
\end{footnotes}
in both of their researches was the limited dimensions of religiosity used.

What then is church-like and sect-like religiosity and what justifications are there for their use as a typology? We have in an earlier discussion identified the accepted characteristics comprising the church and sect. The problem now is to translate these organizational characteristics into individual terms. The church-like and sect-like distinctions become fruitful at that point since they fit each of our four dimensions in a manner that illuminates both quantitative and qualitative differences in religiosity.

Consider first an illustration. Demerath cites two hypothetical individuals who present evidence of divergent modes of involvement with religion.\(^{75}\) Both individuals are the male head of a family; both belong to the same church. But the first man is a banker, who was born into the church, attends church regularly, and is chairman of the finance committee. Questions of doctrine are neither urgent nor familiar to him. Private prayer is felt to be unnecessary. He derives utmost satisfaction from the church's reinforcement of his business ethics.

The second individual is a machinist, joined the

\(^{75}\)Demerath, op. cit., pp. 27-28. I have changed some of the demographic characteristics of each individual.
church voluntarily, attends church sporadically, and, while belonging to no church-related organizations, his close friends are members of the same church. Prayer is spontaneously resorted to with peaks and depressions in his life. He derives contentment from the church's promise of a glorious hereafter.

The unanswerable question of course is which of these is the more religious? The familiar measures of religiosity would find the banker to be the more religious. But both men evidence a difference in kind of involvement as well as a difference in degree. The first has acquainted himself with and makes use of those aspects of his church which cater to his religious needs. The second has done the same. Yet his is a more informal, more internal religion. The banker is "doing" his religion; the machinist is "feeling" and "believing" his.

In terms of our four dimensions of religiosity what would sect-like and church-like involvement be? Each can be identified quantitatively and qualitatively.

a) Behavioral - Behavior within the sect is of a spontaneous and intimate sort as opposed to the church with its rather formal and rigid behavior. Thus church-like involvement would be frequent church attendance and participation in many parish activities. But the sect-like would not be totally uninvolved; he will have a qualitatively
different type of involvement. He would, for example, be predisposed to participate in Bible study groups with other sect-like friends in the neighborhood rather than attend a formal, often cold worship service. And he would certainly refrain from boards and committees since these are task oriented and often impersonal.

b) Consequential - The consequences of religion for the sect-like individual should be more penetrating and pivotal to his everyday affairs. It would not be uncommon for him to frequently resort to prayer when faced with minor problems. And while the church-like would perhaps see a marriage counsellor for marital difficulties, the sect-like individual would seek the aid of a minister. Qualitatively church-like religiosity will assist in integrating one into the secular world, while sect-like religiosity will lead away from the secular and cause one to de-emphasize success within the secular environment. 76

c) Ideological - Sect-like religiosity would predispose one to accept a literal interpretation of the Scriptures and reject philosophic or scientific truths

76 This is the individual manifestation of an attribute Bryan Wilson found among the sect as organization: "Status must be status within the sect, and this should be the only group to which the status-conscious individual makes reference." See "An Analysis of Sect Development," American Sociological Review, XXIV (February 1959), pp. 1-15.
that contradict traditional doctrine. The church type by contrast will not accept as many traditional teachings of the church since his mind is open and aware of "truths in dispute". But it's not simply a matter of the church-like having no beliefs; his will be apportioned differently, pointing up a qualitative difference. Thus we would find the church-like--presumably possessing a social awareness and legitimizing the church's involvement in the larger society--accepting the now familiar social gospel, which the sect-like--with his preoccupation with the kingdom of God--is unable to accept.

d) Experiential - Sect-like religiosity in the literature is virtually synonymous with frequent two-way communication with divine essence. The revivals of sectarian groups are familiar to many. Biographies of Mary Baker Eddy, Joseph Smith, and Billy Sunday testify to their own frequent visitations of the Spirit and their stress upon such experiences for the layman as a sign of his salvation. But church-like religiosity does not totally exclude an experiential dimension. Such experiences however will have a qualitative difference from

---

77 Billy Sunday, the early 20th century revivalist, summed up this characteristic of sect-like religiosity in one lucid statement: "When the Word of God says one thing and scholarship says another, scholarship can go to hell!" As quoted in William McLoughlin, *Billy Sunday Was His Real Name* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1955), pp. 275-276.
those of the sect-like. The awe before nature (which James sees as the healthy-minded) experience is qualitatively distinct from a conviction of sin and warning-from-God experience (James' sick-soul). 78

The use of church-like and sect-like religiosity as typologies in this research is intended to shed light on the question of how individuals can be meaningfully distinguished in terms of their orientations to religion. The justification for a constructed type is that it can serve to expose empirical regularities. 79 Actually there is evidence to support our supposition that church-like and sect-like involvement can meaningfully distinguish parishioners. Troeltsch 80 indicated church-like and sect-like elements were identifiable within the church since the first century. And as Glock 81 indicates, the church and sect concepts have been used in the study of such diverse phenomena as religion and power, acculturation,

78 Louis Schneider and Sanford Dornbusch find support for this distinction in kind in their content analysis of devotional and inspirational literature used in America. See Popular Religion: Inspirational Books in America (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958).

79 Probably the most complete yet concise work on typologies, their construction and use, is John McKinney, Constructive Typology and Social Theory (New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1966).

80 Troeltsch, op. cit., pp. 42-43.

secularization, social movements and—as seen in the Dynes and Demerath studies previously mentioned—religious orientation.

McKinney maintains that a constructed type can be drawn from "... more general types that have already received substantial empirical verification, or it can be constructed directly from the particulars of a historical situation".\(^{82}\) Church-like and sect-like religiosity are an example of the former case. The problem faced by this research is a probe into the relationship between social status and the elements comprising this typology. The task at this point is to relate some selected generalization of social stratification and religiosity in order to specify the issue and draw hypotheses for this research.\(^{83}\)

Theoretical Framework and Development of Hypotheses

Alexis de Tocqueville and Max Weber were but two early observers who asserted that the United States was

\(^{82}\)McKinney, op. cit., p. 63.

\(^{83}\)The reader will notice that the typology of religiosity posited both a qualitative and a quantitative axis. Unhappily the limitations of this research have forced a conspicuous omission of instruments designed to differentiate respondents on the qualitative axis. The theoretical framework appears adequate for generating hypotheses regarding qualitative differences of religiosity; though implicit, these hypotheses are not formally developed and must await further research for their development and testing. Therefore, all of the hypotheses in the following section relate to the quantitative axis of the typology of religious involvement. This in no way is meant to
a country of "joiners". Though such an observation has some empirical validity in a cross-cultural perspective, the explanations given for this phenomenon appear overly simplified in the face of empirical evidence. One such explanation is that, in the transition from an agrarian to an industrial society, the primary institutions—church, neighborhood, and family—have broken down, and voluntary associations now serve as substitutes. But typically the "joiner" is the upper and middle class American; the blue-collar individual is less a joiner than his white-collar counterpart. If the breakdown of primary

83(cont.) suggest an ideological position of the researcher that the quantitative axis is the more important of the two. On the contrary, it is felt that the combination of the two would clear up some of the apparent—though perhaps not real—paradoxes in present knowledge of religious involvement. Thus, admittedly this research is insufficient for the complete construction of the church-sect typology of religiosity as differentiated on the two axes. This deficiency is not insuperable in light of the fact that the research, though not exhaustive, goes beyond the conventional use of church attendance to measure religiosity.

84 Herbert Goldhamer is representative of this position. See his "Voluntary Associations in the United States," in P. K. Hatt and A. Reiss (Eds.), Reader in Urban Sociology (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951).

institutions is the explanatory factor for "joining", one is thereby forced to assume that this "breakdown" is more intensive among the white collar than the blue collar. This researcher is not familiar with evidence to substantiate such an assumption. Furthermore, to speak of breakdowns in institutions presents two problems -- a value problem and an analytical problem. "Breakdown" conveys a value-judgment which is outside the scope of social science; to speak of "change" in structure and function of these institutions would be more appropriate. An analytical and definitional problem is also present when change is diagnosed as "breakdown". What serves as the base when making the judgment of breakdown? Breakdown compared to what prior time period? Breakdown in terms of not achieving the functional goals of the institutions? 86

In confronting this unsubstantiated assumption of breakdown as an explanation for becoming a "joiner", Knupfer 87 suggested four alternative contributing factors for the lesser organization-proneness of the blue-collar group. The factors she notes are: insufficient

86 Note that this problem is not unlike the one which must be confronted when the social scientist speaks of "social disorganization".
income, lack of time and energy, reluctance to mix with persons of higher status, and a general withdrawal from community life and interpersonal relationships with any but close friends and relatives. Whereas the institutional breakdown approach concentrated on one component of interaction, namely frequency, Knupfer has hinted at another component so important for this research: the origin or object of interaction, i.e., who interacts with whom? Hollingshead and Warner have clearly demonstrated that the origin or object of interaction is with individuals from the same or adjacent strata. They contend that this serves to maintain the boundaries of the separate strata and it also perpetuates the strata- or class-specific norms and values. In terms of our religious concern, we might expect the blue collar and white collar members of a given church to have a minimum of inter-strata interaction.

A third component of interaction, namely content, is appropriate to an understanding of the socialization process and personality formation as it relates to all four of the dimensions of religiosity. Hodges maintains that the "web of interaction is the central ingredient of

---

social stratification" since interaction is operative in creating, catering to, and sustaining different needs at different levels. The data available on differential content of interaction are limited, however. These data are difficult to acquire, for as Kahl indicates, the only fully satisfactory technique of obtaining them is participant observation. There is much inferential and intuitive evidence of the differential content of interaction from one strata to another, but the description given by two systematic studies, namely Deep South and Urban Villagers, make content of interaction an explicit concern.

Davis, Gardner, and Gardner in Deep South by observation and interviewing describe "clique life" of various strata in a selected community. With the exception of the upper class elite, formality of interaction within the cliques increased with social status. The authors conclude that the function of the interaction was to cement the individual to his class by offering solidarity with persons beyond the family that would promote well-being and belongingness. The cliques are,

---

in the authors' judgment, the locus of social norms and facilitate the sharing of beliefs. And just as importantly perhaps, the authors noted that the middle and upper strata tended to combine clique activity and business life which is a qualitative difference in the content of interaction in comparison to the working and lower strata.

Gans\textsuperscript{91} reports that his lower-class Italian-Americans restricted when possible most of their interaction to intimate peers. They were hesitant to become involved in new roles and were prone towards misanthropy. Gans reports that his urban villagers were person-oriented rather than object-oriented and preferred what Goffman has labeled the "backstage" language of behavior. Their interaction was premised on informality and revealed a "stick-togetherness" which served as a mutual insurance scheme to cushion the impact of an unfamiliar and hostile world.

The focus here is essentially what has been labeled "style of life", i. e., the visible manifestation of the subculture. The style of life and interaction patterns --the frequency, origin, and content-- are significantly different from strata to strata. In light of this we can suggest some hypotheses regarding the differential

manifestation of the components of the behavioral dimension of religiosity. The first component is church attendance which is conceived in this research as a rather formal type of behavior that in many cases requires engaging in the unfamiliar. A second component is parish participation which consists of participation in church societies and lay boards. These are generally formal, impersonal and task-oriented. A third component of behavioral religiosity is the number of close friends who are fellow church members. In this research this component is viewed as a possible substitution to parish participation which disposes of the rigidity and formality incumbent in parish participation.

Three hypotheses of the behavioral dimension will be tested in this research:

H1a -- Church attendance will be positively related to social status.

H1b -- Parish participation will be positively related to social status.

H1c -- The number of close friends in the church will be negatively related to social status.

The development of hypotheses concerning the consequential, ideological, and experiential dimensions requires the relating of some further generalizations of social stratification and some historical generalizations of religiosity. This is the task to which we turn next.
A tradition within Western thought has seen religion as a haven for the disinherited. The saliency of faith for this disinherited element in society is a reoccurring theme, and there appears to be a basic unanimity on this point as testified by church historians and social theorists. Weber, even more so than Troeltsch, made extensive use of this position. From his research on major world religions, Weber finds a fairly consistent relationship between position in society and propensity to accept different religious views and practices. This relationship is not without exceptions, however. For example the peasants will not become active propagators of a religious view except when threatened by enslavement. Excluding for the moment the peasantry, let's look at the contrasting expressions of religiosity Weber found.

Unlike Marx who saw religion as an opiate given by the bourgeoisie to the proletariat, Weber found the carriers among the lower middle strata;

From the time of its inception, ancient Christianity was characteristically a religion of artisans. Its savior was a semi-rural artisan, and his missionaries were wandering apprentices.

---


loc. cit., p. 95.
Though religion was the haven for this strata, anti-religion or areligiousness of the upper classes was not a corollary. Rather the two strata give evidence of a religiosity which differs in kind as well as degree. The usual explanation for this differentiation was based upon an assumption of differential religious needs and interaction proclivities. Weber repeatedly identified these differences; an extensive series of quotes follow which compare the differential need and manifestation of the consequential and ideological dimensions.

...it is immediately evident that a need for salvation in the widest sense of the term has as one of its foci, but not the exclusive or primary one, ...disprivileged classes. Turning to the 'sated' and privileged strata, the need for salvation is remote and alien to warriors, bureaucrats, and the plutocracy ...The lower the social class the more radical are the forms assumed by the need for a savior, once this need has emerged.94

Other things being equal, classes with high social and economic privilege will scarcely be prone to evolve the idea of salvation. Rather, they assign to religion the primary function of legitimizing their own life pattern and situation in the world. ...what the privileged classes require of religion, if anything at all, is this psychological reassurance of legitimacy.95

What they (disprivileged classes) cannot claim to be, they replace by the worth of

---

94 loc. cit., p. 95.
95 loc. cit., p. 107. Italics added.
that which they will one day become, to which they will be called in some future life here or hereafter. 96

As a rule, the class of warrior nobles, and indeed feudal powers generally, have not readily become the carriers of a rational religious ethic. The life pattern of a warrior has very little affinity with the notion of a beneficent providence, or with the systematic ethical demands of a transcendental god. Concepts like sin, salvation, and religious humility have not only seemed remote from all elite political classes, particularly the warrior nobles, but have indeed appeared reprehensible to its sense of honor. 97

... the attitudes of the commercial patriciate toward religion shows characteristic contrasts in all periods of history. The strongly mundane orientation of their life precludes their having much inclination for prophetic or ethical religion... The more privileged the position of the commercial class, the less it has evinced any inclination to develop an other-worldly religion. 98

In fairness to Weber we would be remiss by excluding yet another factor besides the social situation which he emphasized as contributing to religion. He states:

Since every need for salvation is an expression of some distress, social or economic oppression is an effective source of salvation beliefs, though by no means the exclusive source. 99

96 loc. cit., p. 106.
97 loc. cit., p. 85.
98 loc. cit., p. 91.
And again:

[... the need for salvation and ethical religion has yet another source besides the social condition of the disprivileged and the rationalism of the middle classes, which are products of their practical way of life. This additional factor is intellectualism as such, more particularly the metaphysical needs of the human mind as it is driven ... by an inner compulsion to understand the world ...]

The point of these numerous citations from Weber[101] is that it brings into focus the differential types of consequential and ideological religiosity garnered from his historical analyses. A distinctive pattern emerges of which Weber himself was so well aware. This pattern theoretically determined by differential interaction and related religious needs of the various strata leads to the research hypotheses of the consequential and ideological dimensions respectively:

[100] loc. cit., p. 117.

[101] Weber's starting point is a unique one. He begins by discussing the complex relations between social status and the propensity for alienation—the underlying accessibility to the influence of religious movements. A minimum of alienation is to be expected among the lowly peasants and groups with military functions (eg. feudal nobilities). The former is heavily infused with traditionalism and the latter with a bureaucratic ethic to maintain the establishment and "make it work". Thus his important starting point—which illuminates the numerous quotations above—was the differential propensities toward alienation reflected in the different social strata making them either more or less susceptible to the influence of religious movements. See further Parsons' Introduction to The Sociology of Religion, op. cit., pp. xix-lxvii.
H2 -- Consequential religiosity will be negatively related to social status.
H3 -- Ideological religiosity will be negatively related to social status.

Weber, and following him Troeltsch, Simmel, and Niebuhr, recognized differential needs and expressions of the experiential dimension of religiosity. Weber cast the explanation for this differential in terms of the degree to which the strata were bound by social convention. Of the lower strata he wrote:

Since these groups are not bound by the social conventions, they are capable of an original attitude toward the meaning of the cosmos; and since they are not impeded by any material considerations, they are capable of intense ethical and religious emotion.102

Simmel builds on Weber's position but adds a supplementary explanation.103 In an attempt to understand the nature of society, Simmel laid emphasis upon the concept of "relation". Society was to him manifested in dynamic relations. And religion first and foremost was a matter of relationships also--with others, with god(s), with any supernatural force. Furthermore, in forming these relationships, men tend to enter into the relationships with a supernatural

102 loc. cit., p. 126.
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and other men in terms of the kinds of relationships which have become second nature to them in their social milieu. Thus we find a toned-down religious emotionalism among high status, who, in the words of Weber, are bound by less social convention.  

The hypothesis then for experiential religiosity to be tested in this research is:

H4 -- Experiential religiosity will be negatively related to social status.

The typology of church-like and sect-like religiosity as noted earlier, embodies both quantitative and qualitative differences in religiosity. To focus on both the quantitative and qualitative is too ambitious for this research. The hypotheses have been limited therefore to testing only the quantitative differences of the four dimensions as manifested by differential social status.

The preceding relating of empirical generalizations serves to elaborate the issue within Glock's typology and reconcile the disputed empirical findings on social status and religiosity reviewed earlier by opening up meaningful relations between concepts. A concise and concluding sentence is as follows:

Simmel also used this "relationship theory" to explain the lesser participation on the part of the low status groups in the internal affairs of the church.
rationale for predicting a systematic consistency between the relation of social status to a propensity for church-like or sect-like religiosity can be taken from Niebuhr.

Niebuhr—following Weber—notes in reference to Calvinism that worldly success, as a sign of election, justified exploitation of the disinherited on the part of the Calvinist. And since non-success equals non-election, the disinherited would derive little comfort from such a religion:

Neither Lutheranism nor Calvinism had a message for them (the disinherited) and both resented, with the vehemence of those whose economic rather than religious interests are threatened, the attempt to found a religion which met the need for a Christianity of emotional fervor and for a social reconstruction. 105

Niebuhr, like Weber, stresses the propensity of the lower strata for abundant religious emotion and fervor. Given that inhibitions on emotional expression have not been set up "by a system of polite conventions," religion will—indeed must—express itself in emotional terms. 106

Niebuhr makes no mention of Weber's "propensity for

106 loc. cit., p. 30. And also: "Presbyterianism was intellectualistic, it was authoritarian, it was aristocratic; the disinherited required an emotionally experienceable and expressible faith, and one which contained some promise of social amelioration. Westminster could have no appeal for them." P. 43.
alienation" as a factor in the different strata's accommodation to religion, though the reader can recognize that he is using this same framework. He more than Weber finds the social and economic situation determining the ebb and flow of any given religious movement. His contention is that these movements spring forth as solutions to frustrations of the disinherited classes. But as the movement takes shape its raison d'être is transformed into the advancing of middle class values; leadership is snatched away from the poor by the middle and upper class elements. Niebuhr's conclusion—and it is that of a religious sociologist as well as a sociologist of religion—stands out in bold relief: The disinherited have for the most part been uninvolved in, and outside of, religious institutions.

A resultant from this handing the reins of church administration to the high status members—one which is without exception pointed out in every account of the familiar sect to church transition—is a middle class

107. Note P. L. Berger's response to the notion of Protestantism as the religion of the bourgeoisie: "If the statement applies to values rather than to membership, it gains plausibility." loc. cit., p. 88.

108. Niebuhr's conclusion is not in dispute here. The important contribution of Niebuhr for this research, like Weber, is his recognition of both qualitative and quantitative differences in high and low status religiosity.
orientation of the church as institution. Thus the church is used to support the business ethic of its leaders, and, in the words of the Lynds, going to church becomes a kind of moral life insurance policy. When proprietors and managers predominate on church boards, is it not probable that "the average church will of necessity be a strong supporter of the status quo in business life?" The individual joining such an organization is in effect giving public testimony of his adherence to such a value system. This gives some light to the non-participation of low status individuals discussed previously.

In conclusion, the focus of this research is upon the utility of the church-like and sect-like typology of religiosity. The general hypothesis is that social status is positively related to church-like religiosity and negatively related to sect-like religiosity. The typology is a nominal definition and the "test" of it is an assessment of its utility and not its truth assertion.


111 A few authors have contended that religious surrogates are today performing many functions traditionally
fulfilled by religion. Nationalism, political radicalism, and labor unionism are examples cited. These are seen as surrogates to the extent that they offer a salvation (though of a temporal nature) to the deprived. We are not attacking this proposition; on the contrary, it appears consistent with the approach used in this research. (See Rodney Stark, "Class, Radicalism, and Religious Involvement in Great Britain," op. cit.) Our hypotheses, therefore, are prefaced with the phrase "given some minimum degree of involvement." As Chapter 2 points out all subjects in the sample are official church members, thereby meeting the criteria of minimum involvement.
CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY - SAMPLING AND MEASUREMENT

The conceptual model for this research was presented in Chapter I. As a heuristic device it served to formulate and specify the research problem by defining and describing the assumptions underlying it. The second stage at which we again make use of the model is in selecting appropriate empirical methods for the research design. The concern of this chapter then is to translate the model into operational terms permitting the transition from the conceptual to the empirical plane. A discussion of the research case, sample, data collection, and the measurement of properties will be undertaken therefore at this point.

Sample and Data Collection

The research case

The selection of the research case is dictated by the level of the social system on which the research focuses. Because our typology of religious involvement is a focus upon individual religiosity, the research case for this study is the individual. Moreover, because the research does not posit an assumption of the universality
of religion and, in keeping with our definition of religion as "an organized body in the Christian tradition," the research case is the individual in a role as church member.

According to the model, then, the conceptual universe would be all church and sect members. The model alone did not dictate the actual choice of the population; pragmatic considerations also entered into the choice. The final decision to use adult, male Presbyterians from a Midwestern community was based upon the following factors:

1) Obtaining permission to use Presbyterians in the sample was easily facilitated. 2) The Presbyterian denomination in America presents a rather uniform breakdown in terms of the social status of its members—a factor necessary for testing the research hypotheses. 3) The lack of an ethnic label attached to Presbyterians removed a possible source of bias. 4) As explained below, interviewing rather than mailed questionnaires had to be

---


2 By way of contrast, the author was told by a denominational "leader" in the same Midwestern community upon requesting permission to interview his parishioners, "No, for three reasons. Social science never has and never will contribute anything to the church. Religion is a private affair and since I have been entrusted by God with the welfare of my parishioners, I cannot permit this intrusion. Furthermore, I personally could complete most of your interview schedules for any number of my parishioners since I know their practices and beliefs."

3 See Table 1, above p. 2. As will be pointed out below, this breakdown does not necessarily hold up within any given community.
used for data collection. Though it was felt that structural effects or contextual properties might be an important determinant of behavior in any given congregation, the adequate testing of this would require the sampling of a number of congregations with varied demographic characteristics as well as the sampling of individuals within them. This would necessitate a sample considerably larger than could be handled through interviewing. 5) Women were excluded because in a research where social status is the basic independent variable, it is important to place individuals accurately on a social status continuum. Perhaps for lack of indices for the non-working wife, most researches assign women to the position of the husband; it was felt that to do so in this research might permit the intrusion of enough discrepancy to obscure any possible findings.

The sample

1) Sampling frame: In determining a sampling frame the researcher attempts to match his frame in such a way that it corresponds as closely as possible to the conceptual universe. As indicated above the difficulties involved have prevented us from so doing here. The final sampling frame consisted of all adult, male members of

---

two Presbyterian churches in a Midwestern community (pop. 96,000). The larger of the two churches is the old established church (organized in 1849) located in the center of town. Few of its parishioners live in close proximity to the church since the surrounding area is, for the most part, non-residential. Its activities and organizations run the gamut from purely recreational to religious and serve the very young and old alike. The second church involved in determining the sampling frame is both smaller and newer (organized in 1958). It began as an offshoot of the downtown church and, after organization, became located in suburbia. The members are generally younger and live in closer proximity to the church than is the case in the downtown church. The suburban church has fewer activities and organizations for primarily two reasons: 1) the congregation has fewer members which limits the resources and energies available for the maintenance of many activities, and 2) the congregation appears to be more homogeneous in terms of age and interests than is the downtown church, thereby making unnecessary a wide assortment of heterogeneous programs designed for the aged and retired, etc.

The combined membership for the two churches is about 2,300 including women and children. The sampling frame, i.e., adult male members, consisted of 790 individuals, 599 from the downtown and 191 from the suburban church.
2) Sampling procedure: Initial contacts were made in late April, 1967, with the ministers of the two churches involved. A copy of the research proposal was submitted to them at that time and permission was requested to use a percentage of their members in the study. Ministerial and session (as the council or ruling board is known in the Presbyterian church) approval came after the first session meeting in early May.

Both churches maintained up-to-date membership roles which were given to the author for sampling purposes. After eliminating women, children, and non-member adult males, a total of 790 male members remained as the sampling frame. An initial pretest on 13 individuals drawn by random sampling techniques revealed that simple random sampling would result in the selection of an extremely high percentage of high status individuals and very few of low status. To prevent this the researcher resorted to a modified form of stratified sampling. From the initial 790 names, 150 were drawn using a table of random numbers. These were submitted to the respective church secretaries who were requested (either from personal knowledge of membership files) to specify the

---

5The membership directory of the downtown church lists the non-member spouse (with asterisks) of a member spouse. After crossing these asterisked males from the listing, the minister upon seeing those crossed out commented: "There go our low status individuals; often the wife is a member, the husband not."

---
occupations of these 150 individuals.

The returned lists of individuals and their occupations came to 147 rather than 150; one member was deceased, one had moved, and the whereabouts of the third was unknown to the secretaries. The remaining 147 were split into high and low status by occupation with the use of the Duncan occupational prestige listing. The range of this instrument is 0 - 100; 50 served as the cutting point. This operation turned up 44 low status and 103 high status individuals.

The author was fully cognizant of the discrepancy which can result from determining status by occupation alone, as well as error contained in church records—many of which are not up-dated. But because the research problem requires an adequate number of both high and low status individuals to sufficiently test the hypotheses, it was decided that occupation could serve as the stratifying factor since it was the only information available.

All 44 low status individuals were included in the sample. A table of random numbers was used to select 44 of the 103 individuals in the high status stratum.

The nature of some of the data to be collected precluded the possibility of using mailed questionnaires. It was discovered in the pretesting that some items—especially those making up the consequential and experiential instruments—required more explanation and probing.
than would be possible in a mailed questionnaire. Thus it was decided to use interviews.

The sampled individuals, whose addresses were obtained from the church directories, were quartered off according to the section of the city (SE, SW, NE, NW) in which they lived. On one of four successive Mondays, beginning with the second Monday in June, the individuals living within a given geographic section were notified by mail of the study and their selection as a respondent. The letter, sent over the signature of a member of the Sociology department, informed them of the nature of the research. It indicated that their respective church session had given its approval to conduct the research. The letter said further that each individual would be contacted by telephone in the near future to arrange for an appointment for the interview at his convenience. Of the eighty-eight letters sent, one was returned undelivered. Two individuals without telephones could not be located at home despite repeated visits during the late afternoon and early evening. It is assumed therefore that eighty-five individuals were notified.

The number of interviews completed was sixty-eight. This represents 80 per cent of the eighty-five individuals

---

6Those in the sample who had no phone or an unlisted number were told in a post script that the author would visit the home to arrange for an appointment.
notified. The seventeen who refused to be interviewed were compared with the respondents on occupation—the only demographic variable known. Very little homogeneity appeared, thus minimizing any systematic bias resulting from a 20 per cent self-selection factor.  

Data collection

The city, as indicated above, had been divided into geographic quarters. All the sampled individuals living within any given quarter received the introductory letter on the same day. It was hoped that by arranging appointments for all the interviews within one geographic area for the same week, travel time between interviews could be kept to a minimum.

Upon confronting the respondent (usually at his home in the early evening, though a few were interviewed

---

See Appendix I. The only noticeable (if in fact a pattern can be read into an N of 17) homogeneity of the non-respondents was age, i.e., a somewhat disproportionate number were retired. Lenski, we might add, was plagued with the same bias. See Lenski, op. cit., pp. 16-17. As an interesting aside, all but one of the low status non-respondents gave "I'm too busy" as the reason for refusal. Only one high status non-respondent gave this reason; they generally were more blunt in expressing either disinterest in the research or disinterest in religion in general. Many of the (eventual) respondents indicated that "if the church is behind this, I'm not interested". When assured that the church was involved only to the extent of granting permission to interview her members, these individuals agreed to an appointment. Even though the letter of introduction was on Sociology department letterhead, it perhaps could have been more clear on the church's role, thus minimizing this misunderstanding.
at their place of employment), the interviewer identified himself by name (and— for those who had forgotten the appointment or didn't recognize the name— stated the nature of his business). In 70 per cent of the cases the respondent and interviewer were by themselves in a room or on the patio. Prior to the actual interview, and by way of introduction, the respondent was told that the research was attempting to assess the different religious patterns that existed among the residents of the community. He was once again guaranteed anonymity of his responses. An attempt was made to circumvent any give-away question as to the hypotheses of the research, the interviewer's religious affiliation, and the like. The interviewer made it rather explicit that any and all questions would be welcomed at the completion of the interview.

The interview was of a standardized type. (The

8 The author and Mr. Donald Williams, a fellow graduate student in Sociology, did all of the interviewing. The author contacted all the respondents by telephone, and they were told at that time who would be coming to interview.

9 The ideal, of course, would have been privacy in 100 per cent of the cases. The request to be alone was not made, however. It would be an error to suggest the presence of the wife and/or child(ren) in the room had no effect upon the responses elicited. In only one incident was the presence of the wife known to irritate or put the respondent ill at ease. This was the rather humorous setting of a wife who was a devout Lutheran and a husband whom she considered to be a very liberal Presbyterian beyond hope. Hidden behind her newspaper, but intently listening to both the interviewer's questions and the husband's replies, she would blurt out with "You'll get yours!" whenever he gave— by her definition— a liberal (nay, unchristian) response.
complete schedule is reproduced in Appendix III.) All of the questions used from the schedule for this research were of the fixed-alternative or closed type. The amount of time used in completing the interview was between 30-35 minutes. 10

Measurement of Properties

Religious dimensions

1) Behavioral religiosity: In Chapter I behavioral religiosity was defined as those religious practices in which the individual church member engages. It was indicated that this dimension is the most widely used single indicator of religiosity in researches. It was stressed, however, that although it is a necessary and important aspect of one's religiosity, it is by no means the whole of it. This is undisputably supported when one reflects on the theoretically independent nature of the dimensions of religiosity.

For this research three aspects of the behavioral dimension were measured: frequency of church attendance, participation in parish activities, and number of close friends within one's church. As a measure of church attendance, each respondent was asked to report the

10 The approximate time spent with each respondent averaged out to one hour. After completion of the interview, questions were generally not slow in coming and discussion freely followed.
frequency of his attendance with the aid of a card handed him on which was printed the following:

1. Once a week or more
2. Two-three times per month
3. Once a month
4. A few times a year
5. Never

The responses to the five items were trichotomized on an intuitive basis. Those reporting items 1 or 2 were considered "regulars" or high attenders and received a score of two; those reporting item 3 were considered "irregulars" or moderate attenders and received a score of one; those reporting items 4 or 5 were considered to be "marginals" or low attenders and received a score of zero.

As a second measure of behavioral religiosity, respondents were asked about their membership and participation in parish activities. Specifically, each was asked the name and/or function of the parish organizations of which he was a member; whether he considered his participation within the organization to be "much", "some", or "very little"; and whether he was currently an officer in the organization. In devising a technique for scoring participation, an attempt was made to select sufficient criteria to permit discrimination between degrees of membership and involvement in parish activities.

---

11 This technique was used by Lenski's interviewers in his Detroit study. See Lenski, op. cit., p. 382.
"Membership" does not always necessitate or imply "active participation"; thus a subjective assessment of the amount of participation was asked of the respondents. It was also reasoned that holding office in an organization is an indicator of high participation or involvement. In scoring participation then, each membership was given a score of two; "very much" participation received a score of two, "some" participation a score of one, and "very little" a score of zero; an officer's position received a score of two. For any given activity, then, the range of scores was two through six. The scores from each activity were summed for each respondent. The summed scores were trichotomized at approximately the tails of the trimodal distribution. Scores of six or more are considered "high" participation, scores between five and two "moderate", and scores under two "low" participation.

A third measure of behavioral religiosity employed the rather new notion of the number of close friends one has from his church. The recent stress on this indicator derives from a conception of it as an alternative to more formal types of parish participation. The respondent was asked "About how many of your five closest friends are members of your church?" A response of three through five friends was given a score of two; one or two friends a score of one; and zero friends a score of zero. These cutting points were determined empirically upon examination...
of the frequency distribution of responses. The categories selected present minimum information loss for presenting the data in tabular form.

2) Consequential religiosity: In Chapter I consequential religiosity was defined as the actions people take in their secular pursuits and the attitudes they hold as a result of their religion. To adequately tap this dimension, behavioral and problem-solution measures are needed as well as attitudinal. Because such measures were not practical, the respondent was simply asked to subjectively assess the amount of help he received from his religion on eight items. The alternative responses offered him were "very much help", "some help", and "little or no help". The items were subjected to a discriminative power item analysis; all were above the .50 acceptance level. Furthermore, the responses were dichotomized and formed a Guttman scale with a coefficient of reproducibility of .924. The respondent was asked: How much help has your religion been to you in the following areas of your life:  

---

12 As one respondent put it: "You're trying to assess the degree to which my religion spills over into the other six days of the week."


14 Items 1, 3, 6, and 7 are taken from Demerath, op. cit., p. 72. The author added the remaining items since four are insufficient for scaling.
1. In meeting the right kind of people.
2. In giving peace of mind.
3. In bringing your family close together.
4. In making on-the-job decisions.
5. In giving you freedom from worry.
6. In making you aware of the needs of others in your community.
7. In helping you to understand people of different cultures and races.
8. In getting along with your neighbor.

A response of "very much help" was given a score of two; "some help" a score of one; and "little or no help" received a score of zero. The items form a seventeen point scale ranging from zero to sixteen. Scores above eleven are considered high consequential; scores of seven through eleven are moderate; and scores under seven are low. These cutting points appeared appropriate according to the frequency distribution of the scores.

3) Ideological religiosity: As used in this research ideology has reference to the beliefs one holds of his religion. In measuring this component, both warranting (or purposive) and implementing beliefs have been included. The interview schedule included twenty-five items relating to ideology. Responses were arranged along a five point Likert-type scale, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". While the interviewer read the items, the respondent recorded his response on a sheet listing the five response categories across the top and the numbers one through twenty-five along the side (see Appendix I). This technique facilitates the interviewer...
by eliminating repetition of the five possible responses to each item; it also benefits the respondent by keeping clearly before him the available responses to each item.

The initial items were analyzed by the discriminative power technique. From a universe of twenty-five items, fifteen with the largest DP value were selected as a measure of ideological religiosity. As a measure of reliability, the items were subjected to the split-half test. 15 Using the Spearman-Brown correction formula, the items attained a correlation coefficient of .941. Using dichotomous responses, the Guttman scalogram technique formed a coefficient of reproducibility value of .887. This coefficient is extremely close to the .90 arbitrary criterion set by Guttman; considering the small sample size, this coefficient suggests that these items may in fact scale.

As an assessment of validity, the items were given to four sociologists representing four different religious backgrounds. Each was asked to judge whether a positive response of "agree" or "strongly agree" identified a church-like or sect-like polarity. On each of the fifteen items there was 100 per cent agreement between the judges. In scoring the scale, for those items which stated a

---

15 Goode and Hatt, op. cit., p. 236.
sect-like belief a response of "strongly agree" was scored as one. When the item stated a church-like belief, the scoring was reversed and "strongly agree" was scored as five. The items are given below, and those representing a church-like belief are indicated by an asterisk:

1. Jesus Christ was born of a virgin.
2. After death some men will be punished eternally and others will be rewarded.
*3. Man can fully know God simply by looking at nature.
4. The Bible was written by men who were inspired by God.
*5. Basically all religions are but different paths to the same goal.
*6. The Genesis I account of creation is probably a myth.
7. Sometime after death we will see and recognize our families.
*8. There is too much emotionalism in revivals.
9. Faith in Christ is absolutely necessary for salvation.
10. Before going into the ministry one should feel called by God to do so.
*11. I think the church should be involved in public and social problems.
*12. Many traditional teachings of the church are not in tune with today's world.
13. Urban renewal and public housing are none of the church's business.
14. It is very important to convert all people to Christianity.
*15. It is necessary for the church to change some of its teachings as times change.

A total scale value was computed for each respondent with low values indicating sect-like (or high ideological) belief and high values indicating church-like (low) belief. The theoretical range of values is from fifteen through seventy-five; the actual range of scale values was between...
twenty-three and sixty-nine. These values were tri-chotomized after inspection on a frequency distribution. The cutting points selected were congruent with the near-trimodal distribution. Scale values under thirty-five were given a score of two, values between thirty-five and fifty a score of one, and values above fifty received a score of zero.

4) Experiential religiosity: The measurement of this dimension is a concern with religious emotion experienced by the individual. The handicaps of empirically determining this dimension are obvious. First of all it involves recall on the part of the respondent more so than previously cited instruments. The recall involves for many respondents going back as far as childhood. Secondly, there is less consensus as to what constitutes a religious emotion or experience than there is, for example, in labelling church attendance as religious behavior.

Well aware of these limitations, the author felt the research model dictated that some measure be used, however elemental, in tapping this dimension of religiosity. Four items were therefore constructed, each having as its referrent an experience with divinity. The items have not been subjected to the appropriate rigor of testing for reliability and scalability, and therefore no pretense is made for their sufficiency in
measuring the experiential dimension. The respondent was asked if he had ever had the following:

1. A feeling that you were somehow in the presence of God.
2. A feeling of being afraid of God.
3. A sense of being saved in Christ.
4. A sense of sharing in God's plan.

Persons who gave a positive response to three or more items received a score of two; those giving a positive response to less than three were scored zero.

As indicated in Chapter I, social status is the independent variable for this research. It was defined as the "socially recognized designation of a position..." Permit a subjective evaluation. It is the interviewer's opinion that those who gave a positive response to any given item did so not so much from recall of events many many years back, but did so because the item had reference to an experience that was both urgent and familiar to them. For this reason, the author feels the items do meaningfully distinguish between high and low experiential religiosity. This is a post hoc rationalization and not intended as a recommendation for the items' use in future researches.

A "moderate" category was not used for this reason: Items one and four yielded positive responses from 72 per cent and 66 per cent of the respondents respectively. Since both therefore were nearly assured positive responses, it is quite possible they are doctrinal placebos as discussed by Will Herberg in Protestant, Catholic, Jew, revised edition (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1960). With this consideration it was felt that only "high" and "low" could serve as appropriate unambiguous categories. It should be added that the arbitrary scores of "two" and "zero" (high and low) are only used in constructing the combined index of church-like and sect-like religiosity. In testing the hypotheses of social status and experiential, the information lost in dichotomizing is regained in that a measure-of-association statistic is employed which converts raw scores into ranks, thereby utilizing a near-maximum of information.
in social space . . . to which individuals are assigned."\(^{18}\) The measurement of one's position within the social status hierarchy has been and is an unsettled dispute in the literature of social science. The measurement of social class is rather straightforward by comparison as a function of "access to the market". But measuring prestige and life styles presents compounded difficulties. What, for example, do occupational prestige scales scale? What are those asked to rank occupations doing: are they legitimizing the system? or are they actually attributing prestige to the various occupations?

The instrument utilized in this research to determine status position is Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position.\(^{19}\) The two factors are occupation and education. The use of occupation is based upon the assumption that it is a reflection of one's skill and power in performing system-maintenance functions. The inclusion of education is based upon the assumption that it is a reflection of cultural tastes as well as knowledge.

\(^{18}\) Above, p. 25.

The scale value for each factor is determined by the following technique: Occupations have been ranked on a seven point index according to their differential prestige ratings. A rank of one is indicative of occupations to which much prestige is attached by virtue of the manipulation or control of others or the creative talent associated with it. A rank of seven is indicative of the low evaluation attached to unskilled physical labor. Education, too, is ranked on a seven point index and is premised on the assumption that individuals of similar education possess congruent values and behavior patterns. A rank of one is assigned to graduate training; seven is assigned to less than seven years of formal education.

In forming the index, the rank of each factor is weighted. The weights for each factor were determined by multiple correlation techniques. The weight for the occupational rank is seven; the weight for education is four. The possible range than for the Index of Social Position is eleven through seventy-seven. This range may be treated as a continuum or collapsed into status levels. For tabular presentation as given in Chapter III, the scores have been collapsed into simply high and low status. Index scores under forty-four form the high status category, and scores of forty-four and over the
Control variables

1) Age: Previous findings on religiosity and age indicate that after adolescence—a period of high interest and participation—a decline sets in which reaches its depression in the thirties. Though certainly not conclusive, the findings show a trend toward the revival of religious interest with advancing years. It is important then to determine the degree to which any relationship between social status and behavioral religiosity holds after controlling for age. A simple dichotomy of those over forty and those forty and under is used.

2) Participation in non-parish activities: The literature is replete with criticism of findings of high correlation between status and parish participation (including church attendance) as being spurious. The third variable is said to be the high status group's propensity for joining and participating in voluntary organizations. It is important, therefore, that a control

---

20 Hollingshead has divided the scores into five separate status levels. The levels with their scores are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Level</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>16 - 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>28 - 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>44 - 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>61 - 77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reader will note that high status as used in this research is a composite of Hollingshead's status levels I, II, and III. Low status is his IV and V.
be made for participation. The measurement of participation in each voluntary non-parish activity is identical to that used in measuring parish participation. For presentation in table form, the cumulative points for each individual were divided differently, however. Those with five or more were given a score of two; those under five received a score of zero.

Combined index of church-like and sect-like religiosity

In Chapter I church-like and sect-like were presented as ideal types or poles of a religiosity continuum. Table I presents the attributes of each type.

Table I
Scores on Dimensional Attributes of Church-like and Sect-like Religiosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Church-like</th>
<th>Sect-like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Church Attendance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Parish Participation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Friends from Church</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above, pp. 63-64.
In forming a combined index, the first step was to translate the dimensions into numerical weights. There was no method to determine whether one dimension contributes more weight than another dimension to one's mode of religious involvement. In the absence of precise measures of differential contributions, it was decided to simply assign equal weights to each dimension. For the consequential, ideological, and experiential dimensions the trichotomies described above were used. For the behavioral dimension a combined trichotomous index composed of church attendance, parish participation, and church friends was formed from the trichotomies described above. Each respondent therefore received a score of zero, one, or two on each dimension. The index represents the combination of these scores and ranges from an aggregate low of zero, indicating church-like religiosity, to an aggregate high of eight, or sect-like religiosity. For purposes of presentation in Chapter III, the scores of this aggregate index have been divided into equal thirds: scores of zero to two are considered church-like; scores of six to eight are considered sect-like; and scores of three to five are deviant cases who fit neither the church-type nor the sect-type.

22 The original trichotomous values of church attendance and parish participation—in which "high" is a church-like trait—were reversed.
CHAPTER III
ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter a leave is taken of the generalities of theory and the crudities of instrument construction to permit a focus upon the findings of the research. First, data relating to the research hypotheses given in Chapter I will be presented along with an inspection of third (control) variables when they are suspected of influencing relationships found. Then the findings of a combined index of dimensional polarities of the typology will be presented.

A Test of Hypotheses

A primary concern of this chapter is to test the hypotheses presented in Chapter I. All the hypotheses took the form of a statement of a relationship (either positive or negative) between two variables. The statistic selected for each hypothesis as a measure of the degree of association is the Spearman rank correlation coefficient ($r_s$). The choice of this statistic was based primarily upon three considerations: 1) All the data attained an ordinal level of measurement—a necessary assumption in using $r_s$. 2) Since a parametric test of
association requires an assumption of normality, this research would suggest that a non-parametric test be used. 3) The $r_s$ has a power efficiency of .91 when compared to the product-moment measure of association.¹

**Church attendance**

This was seen in Chapter I as a basic component of behavioral religiosity and behavior of a rather formal nature. Previous findings of the relationship between social status and church attendance have been inconsistent ranging from negative to positive as well as curvilinear. In this research it was hypothesized that church attendance would increase with social status, or that a positive relationship exists between social status and church attendance. Table I shows that this hypothesis is supported. The relationship appears to be quite small, for the computed $r_s$ value, with a correction for ties, is only .229.

The most noticeable pattern revealed in Table I is the rather even distribution in each category of church attendance for the low status parishioner, as opposed to heavy concentration of the high status in the extreme categories. This may give evidence that church attendance

Table I
Church Attendance by Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Church Attendance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High  % (f)</td>
<td>Moderate % (f)</td>
<td>Low % (f)</td>
<td>Total % (f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>53 (23)</td>
<td>12 (5)</td>
<td>35 (15)</td>
<td>100 (43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>36 (9)</td>
<td>36 (9)</td>
<td>28 (7)</td>
<td>100 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( r_s = .229 \) Significant beyond .05 level

for the high status parishioner is an "all or none" type of behavior.

It is clear that Table I does not support the studies which have found the low status groups the most frequent church attenders. An inspection of the frequency of church attendance upon dividing the sample into three status categories gives no evidence of support to the studies which have found church attendance to be a curvilinear function of social status.

While social status explains some between-group difference in church attendance, it was hoped that a question concerning one's motive for attending church would go further in explaining the between group difference as well as some within-group difference. Each respondent was asked, therefore, to say in a few words why he did or did not attend church. The responses are similar for both status groups. The two explanations given most frequently were those referring to personal
need and tradition or habit. Even those individuals who attended church but a few times each year made reference to tradition. Thus the open-ended question on motivation for attending church does not help to explain or go beyond the data in Table I.

**Parish participation**

This refers to one's involvement in the organizations and activities of his church. Given the wide range of functions which are found within most churches today, it is possible for a parishioner to find numerous activities in which to engage his time and effort. On the other hand, he may at his own discretion participate in few or no activities. On the basis of the theoretical framework which placed the leadership and planning for policies of the church in the hands of her high status members, it was hypothesized that there was a positive relationship between social status and parish participation. Table 2 describes the relationship that was found. It shows that the prediction was strongly supported. The strength of association is rather high with a computed $r_s$ value, with a correction for ties, of .513.

The empty cell (low status, high participation) can hardly be considered a function of the arbitrary cutting points used in trichotomizing the data. To move just one of the six low status "moderate" participants into the "high" cell would result in twenty-two participants in
Table 2
Parish Participation by Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Parish Participation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>40 (17)</td>
<td>30 (13)</td>
<td>30 (13)</td>
<td>100 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>24 (6)</td>
<td>76 (19)</td>
<td>100 (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = .513 Significant beyond .0005 level

the comparable high status cell. The interpretation, therefore, of Table 2 is rather straightforward. Not one of the low status individuals in the sample can by any acceptable reshuffling of categories be considered "high" in parish participation.

As an interesting aside, the correlation between the high status "low" participants and the high status "low" church attenders is extremely high, as is to be expected perhaps. Of the fifteen high status "low" church attenders (see Table 1), eleven are to be found among the thirteen "low" participants in Table 2. Or, reversing the above (since no causal relationship is implied), of the thirteen high status "low" participants (see Table 2), eleven are also "low" church attenders.

It could be argued--and indeed is argued--that any relationship found between social status and church attendance and/or parish participation is spurious in
that a third variable, namely participation in voluntary associations, has inflated the obtained correlation value. The reasoning behind this appears to follow these lines: The assumption is made that religious organizations are one type of voluntary association. Given the higher participation in voluntary associations on the part of high status individuals—a well-documented empirical finding—the relationship between status and church participation is said to be spurious and should disappear were one to control for participation in non-church associations. Table 3 shows such a control.

**Table 3**

Combined Index of Church Involvement (Church Attendance and Parish Participation) by Social Status, Controlled by Non-Church Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>High Non-Church Participation</th>
<th>Low Non-Church Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church Involvement</td>
<td>Church Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\tau_{xy} = .285$

$\tau_{xy.z} = .135$

Significant beyond .0005 level

(No significance tests yet exist for the partial $\tau$.)

The value of the rank correlation coefficient ($\tau$)

$\tau$ rather than $r_s$ had to be used at this point since the $r_s$ unlike $\tau$ cannot be generalized to a partial correlation coefficient.
between social status and church involvement, corrected for ties, was .285 (which is equal to a $r_s$ value of .368). The value of tau while controlling for participation in voluntary (or non-church) organizations was reduced to .135. This is a substantial reduction and must be interpreted as an indication that at least within the sample of this research, the relationship between social status and church involvement is relatively dependent upon participation in voluntary organizations.

A few observations from Table 3 are noteworthy. Of the twenty-four individuals highly involved in church affairs, twenty-one or 87.5 per cent are also highly involved in non-church affairs. In other words, those with the least available time to give are the ones who give the most time to the church. Does this suggest the "I'm too busy" response has no basis in fact?

Of the individuals who are high non-church participants, 63 per cent of the high status group are also high church involved as opposed to only 9 per cent of the low status. It would seem that status rather than non-church participation is the important predictive variable here.

---

3 The label "church involvement" rather than simply "parish participation" is used here to avoid confusion, because, as Chapter II points out, church attendance as well as parish participation have been combined in forming the index. They were combined because it was felt that both are forms of participation.
But such may not be the case. Rather, the type of non-church participation may be all important. Research indicates, for example, that the high status are more inclined towards service, professional, and civic type organizations while fraternal lodges and veteran type organizations predominate among the low status. Perhaps church organizations are more similar to the former type organizations and, therefore, more familiar and comfortable to the high rather than low status individuals.

Age is another variable which is frequently viewed as a contributor to the spuriously high correlation between social status and church involvement. The argument runs that involvement in church increases with age. More specifically, involvement decreases after the teen years, reaching its lowest ebb sometime during the thirties. Beginning around the forties involvement begins to increase, a progression marred only by incapacitation or disengagement frequently brought on in the later years. The important contributing variable, then, to the correlation between social status and church involvement would be age.

A control for age was made, therefore, and Table 4 shows the results of that control. The tau value between social status and church involvement, with a correction for ties, was .285. The control for age produced a partial tau value of .296, which simply interpreted suggests that, at least within the present sample, age is not a contributing
Table 4

Combined Index of Church Involvement
(Church Attendance and Parish Participation) by Social Status, Controlled by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Young Church Involvement</th>
<th>Old Church Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>44 (7)</td>
<td>56 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>25 (2)</td>
<td>75 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \tau_{xy} = .285 \] Significant beyond .0005 level
\[ \tau_{xy.z} = .296 \] (No significance tests yet exist for the partial tau.)

variable as argued in the above paragraph. 4

Church friends

Interaction with friends from one's own church was viewed in Chapter I as a type of informal religious behavior. This is essentially interaction within the ethclass. 5 It was hypothesised that this type of

---

4 This conclusion should not be generalized in light of the age distribution of this sample. Fifty-seven percent or thirty-nine of the individuals were between the ages of thirty and fifty. It is possible, therefore, that there are not enough individuals on the ends of the age distribution to permit one to conclude that age is never a contributor.

5 Gordon has introduced the concept of "ethclass" as the intersection between the horizontal stratification of social status and the vertical stratification of religion. Gordon suggests that "with regard to social participation in primary groups and primary relationships, people tend to confine these to their own ... ethclass". Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 52.
behavior, i.e. selecting friends from one's own church, would be more widespread among the low status than the high status. That is, it was predicted that there would be a negative relationship between status and the number of friends from church. Table 5 demonstrates that if indeed any relationship exists it is extremely low. The

Table 5
Church Friends by Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Church Friends</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18 (8)</td>
<td>42 (18)</td>
<td>40 (17)</td>
<td>100 (43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16 (4)</td>
<td>72 (18)</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
<td>100 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s = -.198$ Significant beyond .10 level

computed value of $r_s$ with a correction for ties is $-.198$. The relationship does go in the predicted direction, however. Table 5 indicates that selecting friends from church is not as viable an indicator of behavioral religiosity as conceived in the theoretical framework. Nor does it seem that the lower status use this to any large extent as a substitute for more formal religious behavior. Another explanation is that a chance factor entered at the data collection stage, for the respondent was asked "... how
many friends are from your church?" The chance factor operating is church friends chosen primarily for reasons other than their common faiths. Perhaps a more discriminating question might have asked how many close friends from church were chosen primarily because of a common faith.

**Consequential religiosity**

As used in this research this dimension refers to the amount of penetration one's religion has made into his secular life. It was hypothesized that the higher the social status the lower the consequences of one's religion. In other words, an inverse relationship is expected between status and consequential religiosity. Table 6 shows that this hypothesis is only partially supported. It appears that there is little difference between high and low status in reported consequences of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
<th>Moderate (%)</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25 (11)</td>
<td>35 (15)</td>
<td>40 (17)</td>
<td>100 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28 (7)</td>
<td>60 (15)</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
<td>100 (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s = -.198$ Significant beyond .10 level
their religion. The $r_s$ value, corrected for ties, turns out to be $-.198$, a rather weak correlation; but it suggests a relationship does exist and again it goes in the predicted direction.\(^6\)

The research instrument used to tap this dimension was subjective: each respondent was asked to estimate the impact of his religion. Some objective indicators would be preferable; these might consist of behavioral and problem-solving situations in which religion could function as an element in determining behavior. Conceivably such indicators would permit finer discriminations and be more comprehensive in terms of the conceptual definition of the consequential dimension.

This is a curious dimension, indeed, and future researchers would do well to assess the direction which the consequential takes. For example, two individuals of the same religious faith can maintain that religion is of great consequence in deciding how to cast their ballot. For the first individual the consequence may take the direction of voting for a given issue, while

\(^6\)Too often perhaps correlations are interpreted singly as the amount of variation in one variable explained by the other; or, to put it another way, correlations are judged by their utility in estimating the dependent variable from the independent, i.e. using the correlation in a prediction equation. As judged from this criteria, the correlation value of $-.198$ obtained in church friends and consequential above is poor indeed, since it can explain only 4 per cent of the variance.
the second individual in all piety is led to vote against the issue. Future research might consider if the directionality as well as the degree of the consequential varies with social status.

**Ideological religiosity**

This dimension refers to the degree the individual accepts the beliefs of his religious body. It was hypothesized, on the basis of the greater influence of secular ideology upon the high status individual; coupled with the low status need for other-world promises of joy and hope, that a negative relationship would be found between status and religious beliefs. The hypothesis is well supported by the data, as seen in Table 7. Corrected for ties, the $r_s$ value is -.576. There is considerable difference on the ideological dimension between the status groups. The finding is not surprising in any sense; in the review of the literature in Chapter I, it was pointed out that all studies have consistently found orthodoxy (i. e. high ideological religiosity) anchored in the lower status church members.

The findings presented in Table 7 are of great consequence to the church as organization. As Weber, Troeltsch,

---

7 Some of Glock's research findings indicate that this pattern has emerged in the area of civil rights measures where commitment to the same ethic of brotherly love can take either a pro or con direction in the ballot box.
Niebuhr, and others have indicated, the support for change in traditional church creeds, practices, and faith commitments resides in the high status groups who, more than the low status, are inclined to be disaffected with orthodoxy. Ninety-one per cent of the high status as opposed to only forty per cent of the low status individuals in the sample do not have a high commitment to orthodoxy. Taken as groups, certainly the high status can be looked to for support when creedal or confessional changes are initiated. The low status might be expected to oppose changes in the traditional creeds and practices of the church. Indeed, from this group stem the charter members of the sect.

**Experiential religiosity**

The concern in measuring this dimension is an assessment of the frequency of the parishioner's experiences with divinity. It was hypothesized that high status would
generally be lower in frequency of religious experiences than low status. The frequencies and percentages are shown in Table 8. Unlike the other dimensions which were

Table 8

Experiential Religiosity by Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Experiential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (%) (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>33 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>64 (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s = -0.322 \]

Significant beyond 0.005 level

trichotomized, this one is simply dichotomized into "high" and "low" religiosity. The relationship produced a \( r_s \) value, corrected for ties, of \(-0.322\). Thus the direction and strength of the association between status and the experiential is supportive of the hypothesis.

The reader should be cautioned against "reading in" too much with this correlation value, for, as discussed in Chapter II, the instrument is very unsatisfactory. The author suspects it is biased in favor of the low status group since the four items refer to experiences

---

\(^8\) See rationale for the dichotomy on p. 70, n. 17, above.
which are quite possibly interpreted as being synonymous with fundamentalism. There may be hesitancy, therefore, on the part of the high status more than the low status to report experiences of this type to an interviewer. Therefore, an open-ended question about religious experiences was included in the schedule. Each respondent was asked if there had been particular moments in his life during which he shared an experience with the Divine.

Table 9
Responses to Open-Ended Question on Religious Experience by Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Reporting One Or More Experience</th>
<th>Reporting No Experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>79 (34)</td>
<td>21 (9)</td>
<td>100 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>72 (18)</td>
<td>28 (7)</td>
<td>100 (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 presents the responses to this question. Seventy-nine per cent of the high status and seventy-two per cent of the low status mentioned at least one experience. These percentages are in seeming contradiction to the data in Table 8 which show only half as many high status as low status in the high experiential cells. This finding lends support to the suspicion that the former instrument is biased in favor of the low status group.
Those respondents reporting an experience were asked to indicate the nature and setting of it. The nature of the experiences for both the high and low status were generally awe and/or reverence. But the setting in which the experiences occurred differed between the two groups. These data are presented in Table 9a. Sixty-eight per cent

Table 9a
The Setting of the Religious Experiences (From Table 9) by Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Nature and Ritual</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>68 (23)</td>
<td>32 (11)</td>
<td>100 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>39 (7)</td>
<td>61 (11)</td>
<td>100 (18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the high status reported a setting of nature and/or ritual while only thirty-nine per cent of the low status mentioned these. Just as frequent among the low status were settings of danger and death of a loved one.

Ideal types and deviant cases

One task of this research has been type construction. The type is essentially an hypothesized compound of observable yet selected attributes of religiosity. The research
has defined these attributes and given them the character of system, i.e. they are assumed to belong together and are representative of church-like or sect-like behavior.

An inherent danger in using typologies is to treat them as "real" rather than "nominal" definitions. As nominal definitions constructed types are not truth-asserting and therefore not testable on that ground. Rather, a manifest function of all types is to identify and simplify. And therefore it is the use of the type that determines its scientific utility. Table 10 gives

Table 10
Combined Index of Ideal Type
Polarities of Dimensions by Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Religiosity Type</th>
<th>Church-like % (f)</th>
<th>Deviant Cases % (f)</th>
<th>Sect-like Total % (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High: 54 (23) 37 (16) 9 (4) 100(43)
Low: 4 (1) 40 (10) 56 (14) 100(25)

$r_s = .603$ Significant beyond .0005 level

some picture of the typology in use. It shows the frequencies broken down by social status in the church-like and sect-like categories and a half-way category of deviant cases.

Fifty-four per cent of the high status group and only four per cent of the low status are in the church-like cells. Fifty-six per cent of the low status and nine per cent of the high status are in the sect-like cells. But thirty-seven per cent and forty per cent of the high and low status groups respectively are deviant cases fitting neither pole of the typology. What about these deviant cases? Are any patterns discernible that set them off from their predicted polar types?

An inspection of the dimensional scores reveals that the deviation is not concentrated around one or two dimensions. The deviation is randomly scattered on all four dimensions and no pattern emerges.

One pattern which did show up to set off the deviant from the non-deviant cases is an urban-rural background factor. As Table 10a shows, in both status groups considerably more deviants are from urban backgrounds (the first eighteen years of life). Conjecture about the theoretical importance of this should be done cautiously since the frequencies are extremely low. Intuitively, however, it would seem that the predominance of urban backgrounds on the part of the low status deviants is easier to explain than the urban backgrounds of the high status deviants. For as Chapter I indicates, sect-like religiosity is more frequently found in rural than in urban settings. Such may predispose the urban low status...
Table 10a
Church-like, Sect-like and Deviant Cases
By Rural-Urban Background, Controlled by Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Sect-like Low Status %</th>
<th>Church-like High Status %</th>
<th>Sect-like Deviant Cases (f)</th>
<th>Church-like Deviant Cases (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>86 (12)</td>
<td>61 (14)</td>
<td>30 (3)</td>
<td>37 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>14 (2)</td>
<td>39 (9)</td>
<td>70 (7)</td>
<td>63 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (14)</td>
<td>100 (23)</td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
<td>100 (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10b
Church-like, Sect-like, and Deviant Cases by Membership in Other Denominations, Controlled by Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership In Other Denominations</th>
<th>Low Status Sect-like %</th>
<th>Church-like High Status %</th>
<th>Sect-like Deviant Cases (f)</th>
<th>Church-like Deviant Cases (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57 (8)</td>
<td>52 (12)</td>
<td>10 (1)</td>
<td>44 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43 (6)</td>
<td>48 (11)</td>
<td>90 (9)</td>
<td>56 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (14)</td>
<td>100 (23)</td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
<td>100 (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individual to a non-sect-like religiosity. Under harsher light, this reasoning may be suspect since it leaves unexplained—indeed it all but contradicts—the predominance of an urban background among high status deviants.

A second pattern found among deviants in the low status but not the high status group is the high percentage who have changed denominational affiliation. Table 10b reveals that whereas eight out of the fourteen low status non-deviants have switched denominations, only one of ten deviants reported such a change. Individuals change their denominational affiliation for many reasons, most of which can be classified as conventional or intentional reasons. The conventional includes changes made as a result of moving or joining a spouse's denomination. The intentional are changes made as a result of dislike for a church, its minister or its creeds. All those indicating a change in denominational affiliation were asked why the change was made. Obviously there are too few cases to make a judgment, but it is possible that a change in denominations and the reason for the change are cues for a refinement in the typology.

There is very little payoff that can be derived from an analysis of the deviant cases in this study. There are very little data available on the cases and there are almost too few cases to permit making judgments.
CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND SUGGESTIONS

A General Summary

In Chapter I the problem of this research was identified as an assessment of the relationship of social status and religiosity. A review of the literature suggested that findings in this area are seldom complementary and often in contradiction to each other. The researcher, by being sufficiently selective, can support a generalization of greater religiosity for the high status or greater religiosity for the low status. This contradiction is perhaps more apparent than real, and is a function of lack of agreement on the conceptual definition of religiosity and its empirical referents, as well as poor instrumentation. One weakness found in most research prior to the 1960's has been the assumption that religiosity was a unidimensional variable. Following Glock, this research assumes at least four dimensions of religiosity, and further assumes that these can operate independently of each other, so that, for example, a person may be highly involved on one dimension and considerably less so on another. It was further suggested that both quantitative and qualitative distinctions of
religiosity existed on each dimension. Thus not only, for example, does one individual have more experiences with divinity than does another individual, but it is known that for the first individual this experience is awe before the handiwork of nature, while the other individual experiences a heartfelt conviction of sin. For want of practical instruments, however, qualitative differentials in religiosity were not investigated.

A typology was constructed utilizing four dimensions in varied combination. The polar ends of the typology continuum have been labeled church-like and sect-like religiosity. Table 1 presents the types and their

Table 1

Dimensional Components of Church-like and Sect-like Religiosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Religiosity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Church Attendance</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Parish Participation</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Friends from Church</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respective dimensional combinations. With respect to these dimensions, six research hypotheses were generated from the theoretical framework. A general hypothesis of the research is that social status is positively related to church-like religiosity and negatively related to sect-like religiosity.

The six research hypotheses were tested among a sample of sixty-eight male Presbyterian church members. The data were gathered by means of interview. The hypotheses and the results of testing them are:

H1a -- Church attendance will be positively related to social status. Supported

H1b -- Parish participation will be positively related to social status. Supported

H1c -- Number of close friends from church will be negatively related to social status. Not Supported

H2 -- Consequential religiosity will be negatively related to social status. Not Supported

H3 -- Ideological religiosity will be negatively related to social status. Supported

H4 -- Experiential religiosity will be negatively related to social status. Supported

* \( \alpha = 0.05 \)

In judging the utility of the typology, it was found that fifty-four per cent of the high status and four per cent of the low status group evidenced a church-like religiosity. Fifty-six per cent of the low status and
nine per cent of the high status evidenced a sect-like religiosity. Thirty-seven per cent of the high status and forty per cent of the low status fit neither pole and are examined as deviant cases in Chapter III. Among the deviant cases no prominent regularities emerged, though it is possible that there were too few cases, insufficient data on the cases, and poor instrumentation to recognize possible regularities. In any case, it would seem that, since the justification for the existence of a typology is its utility in exposing and systematizing empirical regularities, the church-like and sect-like typology as it stands does not pass the test since only sixty-two per cent of the sample fit either pole. This is not meant to suggest that the typology be discarded. As will be recommended below, some major respecifications and articulations of the typology should be made. Furthermore, final judgment cannot be passed until the problem of inadequate measurement is overcome. It is also felt that any future research employing this typology make use of the quantitative and qualitative differentials known to exist in the dimensions of religiosity.

Some Major Limitations

The sampling frame and the sample

Riley stresses the importance of matching the sampling
frame as nearly as possible to the conceptual universe. In other words, a conceptual model and conceptual universe should be relatively free to dictate the sampling frame. Such was not the case with this research. The author and major advisor felt the nature of the instruments required interviewing rather than questionnaires. The decision to interview required the selection of a moderate sized sample. Thus while the conceptual universe consists of all members of organized denominations, the sampling frame was limited to the male members of two Presbyterian churches. The final drawn sample consisted of eighty-five of these members.

In retrospect this proved to be a very costly compromise for it places five limitations upon the research. Three stem primarily from the small sample size; two stem from choosing only Presbyterians, though related to small sample size. First of all, the size of the sample, coupled with the selection of the Presbyterian denomination, resulted in getting almost no low status individuals, i.e. those composing the lower-lower and upper-lower classes. This places severe limitations on the researcher in testing a model using social status as the sole independent variable. Furthermore, it all but rules out investigations into curvilinear relationships when they are suspected. Secondly, the small sample
virtually precludes the use of control variables since cell frequencies rapidly decline. Third, the small sample does not contribute to better instrument construction. Fourth, the sample really limited the research to the testing of only one half of the theory, i.e., the conceptual model postulates that church-like and sect-like religiosity is a function of status and will be found in either a sect or a church setting. Since all the respondents were drawn from a church setting, only this half of the theory could be tested. Fifth—related to the fourth—the selection of only two churches, coupled with an N of sixty-eight, prevents the important testing for structural effects. We know that congregations vary as to their "degree of sectness" as well as their social status makeup. The model predicted status is the important independent variable here and not the context or makeup of one's congregation. This was an assumption in the research, but it is also an empirical question and could be tested under the proper conditions, the conditions being a much larger and stratified sample drawn from many religious bodies. Figure 1 presents in combination the two minimum variables to be employed in drawing a sample designed to test the assumption of no structural effects. The cells represent combinations which might influence religiosity over and above or in-spite-of social status.
Figure 1
Combinations for Sample Selection Designed To Permit the Testing of Structural Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Religious Organization (degree of sectness)</th>
<th>Percentage of Upper Class Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (sect)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (church)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both variables are theoretically continuous rather than discrete. Therefore, the possible combinations of degree of sectness and social status are quite numerous.

Instruments

The instruments employed in this research were efforts to quantify religiosity on four dimensions. Those used for the behavioral dimension are standardized in the literature and are satisfactory to this author. The consequential instrument is insufficient in that it doesn't tap all the aspects included in the operationalizing of that dimension. The instrument was subjective and could not assess the
consequences of one's religion for attitude formation and problem-situations. The ideological instrument—like those used for the behavioral—is felt to be congruent with the operationalization of the dimension. The experiential instrument is the most unsatisfactory of all. The deficiencies are spelled out at length in Chapters II and III. The instrument is biased in favor of "fundamentalist" type experiences, wholly reliant upon recall, and is intuitively disparate from the dimension's operationalizing. The problems presented by the instruments of the respective dimensions are not insuperable. Not all of them, however, could be eliminated within the scope of this research.

The conceptual definitions of the dimensions given in Chapter I suggest both kind and degree or qualitative and quantitative distinctions. The research did not tap the qualitative. The task of determining the nuances within the qualitative component of each dimension is formidable, but the developing of instruments to do just that would be a most welcome contribution to the sociology of religion. With respect to the framework of this research, it may well be that identifying the subtleties of the qualitative components of religiosity would contribute much towards the refinement of the typology. Intuitively the qualitative differences of religiosity seem as important for theory and research as do the quantitative.
A methodological addendum

The author shares a conviction that unobtrusive measures in social science have been given far too little credence and have not been exploited to any appreciative extent. This is true in social science generally and no less true in the sociology of religion. While the use of such measures has severe limitations in the area of religiosity, they do deserve consideration.

Four unobtrusive measures are briefly considered here. Each of them could potentially contribute to our knowledge of social status and religiosity. The four measures are specified, followed by the question or questions such a technique might answer:

1) Consulting church records to determine why individuals change congregational or denominational affiliation.

Query: In terms of the demographic and background factors available from church records, what distinguishes those individuals who change for intentional reasons from those who change for conventional reasons?

2) A frequency and kind tabulation of the activities and programs offered by individual churches.

Query: Do activities offered in churches of status homogeneity differ from those offered in churches of status heterogeneity? within denominations as well as between denominations? Do the status-homogeneous churches have
activities which perform mainly sect-like or mainly church-like functions? and are both functions performed by activities in status-heterogenous churches?¹

3) The volume of smudge prints and wear on pages in church song books.

Query: Do churches in the same denomination but with different status profiles make use of different songs? If so, what songs are these, i.e. do the songs fit into different categories (devotional, emotion, penitence, thanksgiving, joy, etc.) in a taxonomy of religious songs?

4) Keeping records of overtures brought to higher religious courts; cross-tabulating these on a liberal-conservative dimension, doctrinal versus polity concerns, etc.; categorizing the initiating congregations in terms of size, SES, region of the country, and an urban-rural dimension.

Query: Are the congregations initiating the conservative and doctrinally-focused overtures different from congregations initiating other types of overtures?

Some Contributions and Implications

In a very real sense this was an exploratory research.

¹The author is familiar with a heterogeneous church which has two separate adult Sunday School classes. The one class is informally known as the class for liberals, the other for conservatives. The former is attended in the main by the younger adults and/or middle class. The latter is attended by the older and/or working class.
As such its major intent was to gain familiarity and perhaps new insights into the phenomenon of religiosity. What, if any, are the benefits of this research and does the research have broader implications for social science and organized religion?

In the first place, unlike most studies of religiosity, this research has focused on four dimensions simultaneously. For some time now theoreticians have addressed themselves to the problem of the dimensions of religiosity: how many dimensions, the nature of each dimension, and their interrelationships. And while the framework has been set forth, researchers have utilized it in piece-meal fashion. By examining the four dimensions simultaneously, this research enables one to view how the dimensions operate independently of each other.

The research suggests that a single church can accommodate parishioners whose profiles on the four dimensions are very dissimilar. The two churches from which the sample was drawn are apparently able to cope with and permit both sect-like and church-like involvement among its parishioners. The upper status in the sample, for example, were inclined towards a church-like involvement, and the lower status towards a sect-like. Thirty-eight per cent of the respondents, however, had dimensional profiles which were different from these types; yet all appear to be facilitated by the one church. From an
organizational perspective, this suggests that truly the church as institution is "fearfully and wonderfully made".

Another merit of this research—more specifically, the framework of the research—is the face validity of the four dimensions. It was the experience of the researcher that many respondents were more than passively interested upon realizing that their religiosity could be analytically separated into four aspects or dimensions. The dimensions on the face of it had validity and made explicit to them what had either been hidden or implicit.2

Such a delineation of the dimensions of religiosity has other merit as well. What, for example, is meant by irreligiosity, or, conversely, what is piety? Is the irreligious individual low on all the dimensions? and is the pious individual high on all? Heresy, as belief held contrary to that of the church, is one of the few labels which clearly has reference to only one dimension, the ideological. The dimensional referents of many other labels—pillar of the church, liberal, pious—are very unclear.

This brings up the larger issue of criteria used for admittance into denominations, as well as grounds for excommunication. Actually, these are the source of many

---

2For a few respondents the acquisition of this new knowledge resulted in soul-searching and self-vituperation. For a few others it had the reverse effect: "I look good on two parts of the research; two out of four's not bad."
revealing paradoxes in organized religion. Which dimension is used in establishing criteria for membership? or is more than one dimension used? And do these vary between denominations? And, conversely, which dimension(s) is criterion for excommunication? The author is familiar with denominations which employ primarily the ideological in admitting members: a test of doctrine must be passed. These same denominations employ primarily the behavioral and consequential in excommunicating members: a test of "life" has been failed. There are, on the other hand, denominations which make "high" on the experiential the necessary and sufficient condition for admitting, as well as remaining, a member. Still others employ all four dimensions as criteria to retaining one's membership.

What are the historical factors which account for the differential criteria between denominations? And what accounts for the disparity within denominations of tests to get in and tests to stay in? What instruments are used to determine if a given individual measures up to admittance criteria or "staying-in" criteria? Are there differential measures employed for lower status and upper status? In other words, is it easier for a rich man or a poor man to pass through the "eye" of First

---

And do the churches have as much difficulty with instrumentation as does social science?
Prescopalian? Given the criteria for admittance and remaining a member, are there deviants who have "beat the system" getting in? and deviants who "beat the system" thereby managing to stay in?

Repeatedly it has been suggested that, in terms of the ecumenical movement, mergers will occur first between denominations of similar social status composition. Is status composition possibly a spurious factor and the important factor being denominational emphasis upon common dimensions?

One further question suggests itself from the dimensions of religiosity. Students of stratification have made important advances through a focus upon status discrepancy or status inconsistency. Does a religiosity discrepancy exist? and if so, what might it look like, and what are the ramifications it might have to other substantive areas in sociology? Certain profiles on the dimensions are common, e.g. the church-like and sect-like. But other profiles seem to be uncommon and inconsistent. For example, the following profiles

---

4 The suggestion that differential criteria may still be employed is not made in jest. Historically, there have been what by today's standards are considered legitimate and illegitimate criteria for membership or exclusion from membership. Passing a doctrinal test, attending services, a felt conviction of sin: these would be included under the former; social status, skin color, nationality: these would be considered under the latter. The analogy here with the legitimate and illegitimate variables of social stratification is obvious.
intuitively suggest themselves as being discrepant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would an analysis of individuals with any of these religiosity profiles suggest relationships to other issues in social science such as psychosomatic symptoms, political behavior, authoritarianism, social participation, or social mobility?

The above are all suggested as possible questions for future research. The framework of this research and the multidimensionality which it employed have made potential contributions to resolving these larger questions. It is hoped that this framework will be fully exploited by future research.
APPENDIX I

Comparison of Respondents and Non-Respondents

Table 1
Occupational Prestige of Respondents and Non-Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Status</th>
<th>Occupational Prestige*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (f)</td>
<td>Low (f)</td>
<td>Total (f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>84 (36)**</td>
<td>76 (32)</td>
<td>80 (68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>16 (7)</td>
<td>24 (10)</td>
<td>20 (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (43)</td>
<td>100 (42)</td>
<td>100 (85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High = scores above 50 on Duncan Occupational Prestige Listing
Low = scores of 50 or below on Duncan Occupational Prestige Listing

**The frequencies in the high and low status cells do not correspond with those elsewhere in the research which were calculated on the Hollingshead Index.

Table 2
Retirement Status of Respondents and Non-Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Status</th>
<th>Retired (%)</th>
<th>Not Retired (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>50 (5)</td>
<td>84 (63)</td>
<td>80 (68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>50 (5)</td>
<td>16 (12)</td>
<td>20 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
<td>100 (75)</td>
<td>100 (85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II
Letter of Introduction

Dear

Mr. Jerry Van Spronsen, a graduate student in the Department of Sociology of Western Michigan University, is currently conducting a project under my supervision on the patterns of religious involvement among Kalamazoo citizens. Rev. McShane and the session of First Presbyterian Church have cooperated with us and have expressed their approval of the study plan.

Your name has been selected through a random sampling process conducted by Mr. Van Spronsen, and we are requesting your cooperation in a brief interview. You will be contacted by telephone within the next ten days so that we might make an appointment for an interview at your convenience. Any questions that you may have can be asked at that time. If in any case you do not wish to be involved in this survey, all you need do is indicate so at that time. You are under no obligation to work with Mr. Van Spronsen, but your cooperation will be appreciated.

We think you will find the interview an interesting experience. Needless to say, all responses will be kept strictly confidential. If you wish, you may receive a summary of the research findings later in the summer.

The cooperation of the citizens of Kalamazoo in past surveys has been most gratifying, and we earnestly hope that you will be able to cooperate with us in this study.

Sincerely yours,

Morton O. Wagenfeld, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Sociology
APPENDIX III

Interview Schedule

1. Sex ______

2. About how old are you? ______ Under 21 ______ 51 - 60
   ______ 21 - 30 ______ 61 - 70
   ______ 31 - 40 ______ Over 70
   ______ 41 - 50

3. What is your present marital status?
   __ Married ______ Widowed
   __ Divorced ______ Single
   __ Separated

4. a. (If married) Are there any children living with you? ______ Yes ______ No
   b. (If yes) How many? ________________

5. a. Are you employed now? ______ Yes ______ No ______ Retired
   b. What is/was your occupation? __________________________

6. Could you tell me about how much schooling you have had?
   ______ 8th grade or less ______ Some college
   ______ Some high school ______ Completed college
   ______ Completed high school ______ Some graduate school

7. a. Where did you live most of the time until you were 18?
   ______ In the country
   ______ In small town under 10,000
   ______ In city under 100,000
   ______ In city over 100,000
   b. How long have you lived in the Kalamazoo area? ______

As was indicated to you in the introductory remarks, this is a study of religious behavior. Therefore the remaining questions will be concerned with various aspects of your religious life.

8. Of what religious denomination are you a member?
   ________________________________

9. a. Have you ever belonged to any other denomination?
   ______ Yes ______ No
b. (If yes) What denomination was this?

__________________________________________________________

c. Why did you leave this denomination?

__________________________________________________________

10. Have you ever changed from one church to another within one denomination?  ____ Yes  ____ No
(If yes) Why did you make this change?

__________________________________________________________

11. About how often have you attended church in the past year?

SHOW CARD 1

____ Once a week or more
____ 2-3 times per month
____ Once a month
____ A few times a year
____ Never

12. a. Do you attend Sunday School?  ____ Yes  ____ No

b. (If yes) About how often?

SHOW CARD 1

____ Once a week or more
____ 2-3 times per month
____ Once a month
____ A few times a year
____ Never

c. (If children at home) Do your children attend Sunday School?  ____ Yes  ____ No

13. a. When asked why they attend church, people give us a wide variety of answers. If you had to put it in a few sentences, what would your answer be to the question: Why do you attend church?

__________________________________________________________

b. Do you feel your wife and relatives would apply pressure if you did not go to church?

____ Yes  ____ No  ____ Don't Know

c. (If yes) Much or little pressure?

W ____________________________
R ____________________________

d. If for some reason you decided to become a Roman Catholic, do you feel your wife and relatives would discourage you from doing so?

____ Yes  ____ No  ____ Don't Know
14. a. Do you take part in or belong to any activities or organizations of your church besides Sunday School and church services? ___ Yes ___ No

b. (If yes) What sort of activities are these, i.e., what is the name and/or purpose?

c. Would you say you participate much, some, or very little in _____________ (cite each activity)?

d. Are you an officer in any of these?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>much</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. a. Do you take part in or belong to any non-church organizations such as the lodge, labor union, country club, professional organizations and the like? ___ Yes ___ No

b. (If yes) What organizations are these, i.e., what is the name and/or purpose?

c. Would you say you participate much, some, or very little in _____________ (cite each organization)?

d. Are you an officer in any of these organizations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>much</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How many of your five closest friends are members of your church?

__0 __1 __2 __3 __4 __5
17. a. And now some questions about prayer:

Would you say you pray almost never, occasionally, or very often?

___ Never
___ Occasionally
___ Often

b. How often do you say grace before meals, almost never, occasionally, almost always?

___ Never
___ Occasionally
___ Always

d. What is your personal preference: to pray at set times, to pray when the need arises, or both?

___ Set times
___ Need
___ Both

18. All told, what percentage of your family income was given for religious causes last year?

___ 0
___ 0 - 3%
___ 4 - 6%
___ 7 - 9%
___ 10% and over

19. There is agreement among religions that consequences follow from belief. At this point we would like to ask some questions about the consequences of your religion. How much help is your religion to you in the following areas of your life? Please respond with much, some, or very little as I read each item.

1. In meeting the right kind of people. ____________ Much ____________ Some ____________ V. Little
2. In giving peace of mind. ____________
3. In bringing your family closer together. ____________
4. In making on-the-job decisions. ____________
5. In giving you freedom from worry. ____________
6. In making you aware of the needs of others in your community. ____________
7. In helping you to understand people of different cultures and races. ____________
8. In getting along with your neighbor. ____________
20. As you know there is disagreement within Christianity over many things. We would like to have your opinion on a series of statements. Will you please check the response on this sheet which represents your opinion to each statement I read?

1. Jesus Christ was born of a virgin.
2. After death some men will be punished eternally and others will be rewarded.
3. Christ came to the earth only to set an example for our lives.
4. Sometime after death we will see and recognize our families.
5. A child is born into the world already guilty of sin.
6. Christ did not really arise from the dead.
7. The Bible was written by men who were inspired by God.
8. The Genesis 1 account of creation is probably a myth.
9. Man can fully know God simply by looking at nature.
10. Christ is the divine Son of God.
11. Some ministers claim the Bible contains some myths; they are probably correct.
12. Faith in Christ is absolutely necessary for salvation.
13. Basically all religions are but different paths to the same goal.

21.

1. A person who is not willing to follow all the rules of the church should not belong.
2. People should stand up and testify to their faith before joining a church.
3. There is practically no difference between what the different Protestant churches confess.
4. There is too much emotionalism in revivals.
5. Before going into the ministry one should feel "called" by God to do so.
6. I think the church should be involved in public and social problems.
7. Many traditional teachings of the church are not in tune with today's world.
8. Urban renewal and public housing are none of the church's business.
9. A bartender can be a good Christian.
10. It is very important to convert all people to Christianity.
11. Church members who do not tithe should be disciplined.
12. It is necessary for the church to change some of its teachings as times change.
Place a check (✓) on the appropriate line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>UNSURE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place a check (✓) on the appropriate line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>UNSURE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Some people at one time or another go through a religious experience, and some do not. The religious experience can range from a sudden conversion at a revival meeting or a promise to serve God after a close brush with death, all the way to a simple awareness of God's presence while walking through the outdoors. We would like to ask you some questions about such an experience or experiences you may have had.

a. Have you ever sensed the following experiences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A feeling that you were somehow in the presence of God.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A feeling of being afraid of God.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of being saved in Christ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of sharing in God's plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Are there particular moments when you feel close to the Divine? __ Yes __ No

c. (If yes) Could you speak about these experiences for a little while giving me a description of them (it), where they took place, the nature of the experience(s), etc.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

Thank you . . . etc. . . .

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX IV

Relationships Between the Dimensions

Intercorrelation\textsuperscript{a} Matrix of Four Dimensions of Religiosity and Combined Index of Religiosity \textsuperscript{b}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beh.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conseq. Rel.</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideo. Rel.</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper. Rel.</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Index</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}The assumption of interval data required for product moment correlation is not met; the data attained only an ordinal level of measurement.

\textsuperscript{b}The combined index included the score of the separate dimensions; therefore, the coefficients between the combined index and the dimensions are inflated.

With the caution that any interpretations made of this matrix must be tentative, it would appear that two things are suggested by the intercorrelations. In the first place, it is quite possible that were a factor analysis to be undertaken, the dimensions could be
reduced to two conceptual variables or factors. One
would be related to the behavioral dimension and a
second to the three dimensions of consequential,
ideological and experiential.

A second interpretation suggested by the table
relates to the extremely high correlation coefficient
between the combined index and consequential (0.822) and
the low coefficient between the combined index and
behavioral (0.461). Does this suggest the consequential
is the best predictive dimension and, conversely, the
behavioral the poorest? Is this statistical support for
the admonition of traditional Christianity, namely,
"by their fruits shall ye know them"? Certainly an item
analysis must be employed before these and similar ques-
tions could be answered. But were such an analysis to
reveal the extreme pervasiveness of the consequential
and the relative unimportance of the behavioral, it
would cast suspicion upon very many of the generaliza-
tions in the literature where religiosity has been
implicitly conceptualized similar to its conceptualiza-
tion in this research, but explicitly operationalized
as church attendance alone.
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