
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2009

The Effects Of Religious Affiliation And Participation On Racial Discrimination

Jason LeVine
University of Central Florida



Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

LeVine, Jason, "The Effects Of Religious Affiliation And Participation On Racial Discrimination" (2009).
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019. 4135.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/4135>



University of
Central
Florida

STARS
Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

THE EFFECTS OF RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION AND PARTICIPATION
ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

by

JASON R. LEVINE
B.A. University of South Florida 1997

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Sociology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term 2009

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between religious affiliation and racially discriminatory attitudes. Several investigations have been conducted on the topic, yet they did not choose national representative samples. My research examines four decades of NORC General Social Surveys to analyze how religious affiliation and attendance affect the outcome of a survey question which tests the level of discriminatory attitudes among respondents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	3
Authoritarianism.....	4
Religious Orientation.....	4
Evangelicals – Fundamentalism in the United States.....	8
Integration – combining Authoritarianism, Orientation, and Fundamentalism.....	11
CHAPTER THREE: DATA AND METHODS.....	18
Dependent Variable.....	18
Independent Variables.....	19
Religious Affiliation.....	19
Religious Participation.....	23
Demographic Variables.....	24
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYTICAL STRATEGY.....	26
CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.....	27
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS.....	32
APPENDIX: TABLES.....	37
REFERENCES.....	44

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Cross tabulation Snapshot over four decades.	38
Table 2: Cross Tabulation [GSS Year and Favor law against racial intermarriage].....	38
Table 3: 1970s Logistic Regression Results: Effects of Religious Affiliation and Participation on Racial Discrimination.....	40
Table 4: 1980s Logistic Regression Results: Effects of Religious Affiliation and Participation on Racial Discrimination.....	41
Table 5: 1990s Logistic Regression Results: Effects of Religious Affiliation and Participation on Racial Discrimination.....	42
Table 6: 2000s Logistic Regression Results: Effects of Religious Affiliation and Participation on Racial Discrimination.....	43

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Discrimination and prejudice have long affected many subgroups of Americans since the colonization of North America. The history of the United States is a narrative of independence and freedom: independence from tyranny and freedom to practice religion in peace without persecution. The United States, a country of varied religious denominations that sought to create their cities on a hill to emulate the teachings of Christianity, is also the same country that actively participated in the deplorable institution of slavery. It is this country, founded by these freedom-seeking denominations with an ethos of rugged individualism and a pioneering spirit that not only competed against each other for dominance of this new land of riches but also subjugated and massacred their current residents and imported more than four hundred and fifty thousand Africans through the institution of slavery. This study seeks to further uncover a relationship between religiosity and racial discrimination in a country where remnants of this type of subjugation and domination of the racial and religious “other” have not entirely been removed from the collective consciousness of the social fabric.

Social scientists have been studying the role of religion on prejudice since Stouffer’s seminal work in 1955 and a recurring theme emerges. There is a correlation between the levels and types of religiosity and the consensus that discrimination and prejudice are either justified, acceptable, or non-existent (Emerson and Smith 2000). This study occurs in the light of President Obama’s executive order to open faith-based support to non religious individuals. This was done to avoid any discrimination on the part of religious organizations. This policy change was a compromise to appease religious conservatives by maintaining the faith-based office and

alleviating concerns of liberals that the federal government sanctioned the discrimination by recipients of faith-based grants (Chicagotribune.com, 2009).

Religion is the single most visible display of membership into voluntary organizations in the United States. The bowling league and fraternal organization have lost their positions as the leading voluntary organizations (Roof 2003). Religious affiliation in the United States has increased its potency over the last four decades with the Evangelical brand of Protestantism leading the pack (Lyndsay 2006). The strength of the Evangelical movement has waxed and waned in the United States since the country's founding from the Great Awakening and the Red River Crusade to the Scopes Monkey Trial when the movement was forced into hiding after a shameful display of closed-minded zealotry. The mentality of the Evangelical movement found comfort in resisting social interaction with non-believers (Chang 2003) and went underground to build its strength. Then Ronald Reagan took up their cause, and they recognized their call to arms; the Religious Right was born. Their purpose was to take up ideological arms in the growing culture war (Hunter 1991). Research has shown that white Evangelicals are not always the most open minded of devotees when it comes to racial issues (Emerson and Smith 2000) and issues of tolerance (Stouffer 1955, Gay and Ellison 1993).

The purpose of this study is to augment the existing literature regarding the relationship of the affiliative and behavioral dimensions of religiosity on attitudes towards discrimination in the following ways: 1) by examining the role of affiliation and participation on attitudes toward interracial marriage laws, 2) by studying the attitude toward interracial marriage laws as an indicator of a larger attitude of prejudice towards other races over time.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The social scientific research into the role of religion as a predictor of discrimination is widely published (Allport and Ross 1967, Altemeyer and Hunsberger 1992, Hunsberger 2005, Laythe et al 2002). Racial and religious intolerance are not the only attitudes that are shaped by religiosity. Religious affiliation plays a role in attitudes toward homosexuality (Altemeyer and Hunsberger 1992, Fulton et al. 1999), gender roles (Peek et al. 1991) and political tolerance (Gay and Ellison 1993).

Samuel Stouffer's (1955) book studied the variables relating to political intolerance. Stouffer's work is considered a landmark by a number of articles studying political tolerance (Murphy and Walter 1987, Wilcox and Jelen 1990). Stouffer (1955) found that Jews were the most tolerant religious denomination when it came to tolerance of opposing political beliefs, followed by Catholics and Protestants with increased rates of church attendance correlating to a decrease with political tolerance (Murphy and Walter 1984). Political intolerance was frequently related to low income and rural living (Wilcox and Jelen 1990) which is the membership pool for the Evangelical congregations (Wald 1987). Studies into political tolerance found that conservative Protestants are less tolerant (Wilcox and Jelen 1990, Gay and Ellison 1993). The role of religion into aspects of tolerance and discrimination are well documented. We have seen how religion has affected attitudes toward differing races and ethnicities, sexual orientations, and political beliefs. What are the theoretical explanations behind religiosity and discrimination?

Authoritarianism

The concept that an absolute power, truth, and authority exists and that the follower accepts only the prescribed offerings of this authority breeds organizations that are solely bent on protecting their belief structure from intrusion from outsiders (Adorno 1950, Unger 2002). Covert ideologies of right-wing authoritarianism (Laythe et al. 2002, Hunsberger and Jackson 2005) and social dominance (Pratto et al. 1994) exploit the perceived threat posed by out-groups. The out-groups compete over material and economic resources. They compete for control over spiritual and popular culture. Out-groups can also compete for political and social power. This leads authoritarian groups and their members to lash out with an arsenal provided in their reactionary tool-kit (Blumer 1958).

Throughout the research, evangelicals score higher on social dominance and right-wing authoritarian scales (Kirkpatrick 1993, Laythe et al. 2001, Unger 2002) leading scholars to suggest that there is a component inherent to fundamentalist affiliation that leads to higher levels of discrimination as a result (Laythe et al. 2002). Evangelicals are the fastest growing group of fundamentalists in the United States (Solomon 1996). They are also more likely to reflect authoritarian traits and therefore more likely to display discriminatory attitudes.

Religious Orientation

At this point, I focus attention on the work of Allport and Ross (1967) as they examined the role of religious orientation on prejudice. Much of Allport and Ross' (1967) findings regarding the role of religion and prejudice are along the same lines as Herbert Blumer's (1958) essay on prejudice and group position (Bobo 1999). This landmark work created the scales of

measurement used to understand the difference between Extrinsic (E) and Intrinsic (I) orientations toward religion and their effect on prejudice. Allport and Ross (1967) started by looking at what is known as the extrinsic orientation. Extrinsic orientation can be defined as a state in which religion serves a purpose other than to center a person's spirituality and is more concerned with the external factors of religious affiliation. Individuals that are extrinsically oriented toward religion often affiliate with a religious group for its social implications. The extrinsic orientation effect on attitudes is a reflection of the group's concerns. These individuals join religious organizations for the social status that may come from volunteer membership in this group. The social capital gained from the ability to network within this group is the real benefit to those of this orientation. Respondents who lean toward an extrinsic orientation toward religion are more likely to display attitudes of discrimination.

Intrinsic orientation is quite the opposite. Intrinsic orientation relates to the internalized purpose of membership in a religious group. Individuals with high intrinsic orientation are concerned with personal salvation and regard religion as the foundation for their guiding moral principles (Allport and Ross 1967). Intrinsic orientation motivates individuals to internalize the morals and creeds of the religion, and in the form of Christianity, takes the forms of "humility, compassion, and love thy neighbor" sentiments (Allport and Ross 1967:441). Extrinsic orientation has been more highly correlated to levels of intolerance and prejudice than intrinsic orientation. This occurs because extrinsic orientation leads to individuals who are more likely to support group solidarity since belonging is not a matter of a spiritual choice but of a social choice to belong to an in-group.

This is where the association with Blumer can be made (Bobo 1999). Blumer (1958) criticized the dominant belief of his day that racism was strictly the result of the authoritarian

personality described by Adorno. Blumer stated that this approach missed the importance of collective interaction. It is the collective act of identifying the dominant in-group and then identifying one's own group position in respect to the in-group (Blumer 1958). The role of prejudice is played out as the individual assigns those that s/he is prejudiced against to the other group or out-group. The individual then experiences a feeling of superiority and entitlement to the resources warranted to the in-group and simultaneously feels a sense of threat from the alien members of the out-group. The lowest status positions of the dominant in-group exert their perceived sense of elevated group position over the highest educated and paid members of the out-group, even if the status and accomplishments of the latter are greater than that of the former. This sense of group position is a learned response and is collective in nature (Blumer 1958).

The work on religious orientation and prejudice by Allport and Ross (1967) and its particular importance in measuring extrinsic orientation, which is like Blumer's (1958) prejudice as a sense of group position, has led to further and enhanced analysis of the role of religion and prejudice. However, not all studies into religious orientation lead to the same conclusion.

Existing literature points to a conflict in the Allport and Ross (1967) assumptions that orientation alone dictates levels of prejudice. Strickland and Weddell (1972) tested the religious orientation model on two select demographic groups, Southern Baptists and Southern Unitarians. The study chose to test a southern fundamentalist group against a non-traditional group and determine where the orientation factor came into play.

Theoretically, the extrinsic respondents should have tested higher on the discriminatory attitude test and the intrinsic orientation respondents would have tested lower on these types of attitudes. However the results were mixed because of the traditional vs. non-traditional test groups. The traditional group, comprised of the Southern Baptists had more members

responding that they had an intrinsic orientation (internalized religious morals and themes) and higher attendance rates while scoring higher on the prejudice scales while the non-traditional Unitarians appeared to be more extrinsic in orientation (uses religion as a self-serving tool) with lower attendance rates and lower prejudice indicators. What was the explanation for the contradictions seen in their study? The authors point to another attitude indicator that they also tested during this study that they use to explain their results. Strickland and Eddell call this attitude indicator the dogmatic indicator (Strickland and Eddell 1972). Dogmatism is “(a) a relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, (b) organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which, in turn, (c) provides a framework for patterns of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward others” (Rokeach 1954:195). It is high levels of dogmatism within intrinsically-oriented individuals that offsets the effects that internalized religious values brings as predicted by Allport and Ross (1967). The authors conclude that the use of the intrinsic/extrinsic orientation test will not always work on all religious groups to determine levels of prejudice. Strickland and Eddell (1972) conclude that the orientation test should be used as a test on mainline and traditional religious groups and the inclusion of non-traditional religious groups in tests of this nature should be avoided.

Griffin, Gorsuch and Davis (1987) investigated the role of religious orientation on religious prejudice. Their study focused on the island of St. Croix to test how religious orientation affects prejudice toward other religious groups. Specifically, the test looked at the prejudicial attitudes toward Rastafarians by Seven Day Adventists. The study concluded that there is no single relationship between religious orientation and prejudice but reported that intolerance is related to culturally accepted attitudes, and devoutly religious members of society report a stronger leaning toward the overall cultural directive (Griffin, Gorsuch and Davis 1987).

This again shows a significant relationship toward Blumer's sense of group position. The collective attitudes of the group were dominant in determining whether prejudice was to occur. I speculate that Evangelicals should demonstrate discriminatory behavior regardless of an intrinsic orientation toward religion, which is contrary to Allport and Ross but in line with Strickland and Eddell. This study should enhance their findings by focusing on traditional religious groups.

Evangelicals – Fundamentalism in the United States

Historically, research into the differentiation between Mainline and Evangelical groups indicates a definitive separation in the core of the groups beliefs. On the one hand, Mainline Protestants for example are more prone to accept the concept of modernity and embrace the social gospel of reform through faithful commitment to the "other." On the other hand there is also the phenomenon of the Evangelicals in which adherents embrace a return to the old ways of religion in which the doctrines are taken at face value with strict adherence to tradition. The Evangelical groups also share a belief that salvation can only be attained within one's own group (Chang 2003). The concept of salvatory propinquity harkens the concept from symbolic interactionism of "group position." The in-group of membership so isolates itself that membership is the end all. Belonging is the goal and the group mantra is hailed as sacred. Die hard commitment to the core beliefs is held so tight that no fresh, new, or alternate viewpoints are accepted.

Emerson and Hartman (2006) reviewed the literature and put forth a concise sociological understanding of the rise of fundamentalism in the modern period. Much of the fundamentalism literature in sociology is rooted in the writings of Weber. Weber first identified that the rationalization of the world through the advent of scientific practices proved to demystify the

world. Modernity was rooted in rationalization and emerged from the scientific principles that allowed humans to master the earth. The industrial revolution and global domination by multinational corporations were intertwined with the concept of modernity. And, it is these aspects of modernity that cause the rise of fundamentalism (Emerson and Hartman 2006). Fundamentalists are the people, groups, and organizations that resist the demystifying effect of modernity (Emerson and Hartman 2006). Fundamentalism can be framed within the context of modernity. It is the policies and procedures of bureaucracies, rooted in rational scientific principles of modernity that regulate our lives, that the religious fundamentalists began revolting against (Emerson and Hartman 2006).

Religious communities became split between those that support modernity and those that resist the demystifying of the world. This is important when discussing U.S. religious denominations because one tenet used to differentiate mainline Protestants from (CP) Conservative Protestants (see Woodberry and Smith 1998 for their discussion of the use of CP instead of Evangelical or Fundamentalist) is whether the group shows support for modernity. Mainline and liberal Protestants have been identified for their support for the principles of modernity. The clash between modernity and traditionalism came to a head during the early part of the 20th Century when a series of pamphlets known as “The Fundamentals” (1910 – 1915) were published (Emerson and Hartman 2006). The pamphlets were a reaction to progressive Protestants’ desire to modernize the religion (Woodberry and Smith 1998). In 1925, the battle was made public during the Scopes Monkey Trial. Conservatives were dealt a heavy blow on the public stage that forced them into the underground until they reemerged in the 1970’s as a political force (Wilcox 1986).

The literature reviewed by Emerson and Hartman (2006) echo the work of political scientist Benjamin Barber in *Jihad vs. McWorld* (1996). Barber identified the global struggle between the forces of Globalization and Traditionalism. The traditional camps fought to reinstitute traditional forms of government and local rule based on varying forms of nationalism and religious fundamentalism (Barber 1996). Their battle is with the forces of globalization that are forcing an interdependent world of artificial cooperation onto groups that would prefer to be left out of the processes of modernity (Barber 1996).

The term McWorld refers to a world of neighborhoods in which each neighborhood resembles each other neighborhood with copious amounts of chain-stores and outlets. The idea is that in the age of modernity the modern citizen creates neighborhoods that resemble the neighborhood they come from. On a micro-scale, the McWorld can be viewed from the perspective of a US highway traveler. A driver along I-95 can pull off the highway in Jacksonville, FL and experience the same sights as when the driver pulls off the highway in Philadelphia, PA. The force of corporations is so strong that their influence emerges across state lines. The fundamentalists see this as a threat to their way of life; a life based on tradition and regional difference. Modernity, with its rationalization, global corporate influence, and liberal non-religious beliefs are a direct threat to the fundamentalist way of life. The threat is so imminent that the only justifiable reaction with any promise of success is a war. The fundamentalist holy war against demystification and non-belief has also been referred to as a “culture war” (Hunter 1991).

Integration – combining Authoritarianism, Orientation, and Fundamentalism

Research has expanded beyond a strict focus on religious orientation and incorporated other aspects of religiosity and their role on discrimination and prejudice. Altemeyer and Hunsberger (1992) bring to light factors of religion that affect prejudice in the form of psychometric measures of prejudice. They created scales testing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, and quest.

The study starts by defining right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) as the relationship between authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism. Individuals who score high in RWA are individuals most likely to bring the religion of their childhood into their adult life. They are also the individuals most likely to read scripture, pray, and go to church most often. Right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) can be defined as a “covariation of authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism” (Altemeyer and Hunsberger 1992:114). RWA has been associated with support for conservative politics, double standards in thinking, highly punitive attitudes, and hostility toward ethnic out-groups (Altemeyer and Hunsberger 1992).

Religious fundamentalism (RF) is a concept in which individuals accept that there is one set of religious beliefs that contain the “fundamental, basic, essential, inerrant truth about humanity and deity” (Altemeyer and Hunsberger 1992:118). Religious evangelicals scored higher than other denominations on the RWA scale and also score the highest on the RF scale. However, the authors note that over-generalizing the results should be avoided because there were individuals in the study that reported high on RF and were less bigoted than individuals who scored low on RF and RWA (Altemeyer and Hunsberger 1992).

Rowatt and Franklin (2004) agree that it is important not to over-generalize regarding the degree to which RF is an indicator for prejudice. Religious fundamentalism did not significantly impact the results as much as RWA, which was shown to be correlated to racial prejudice (Rowatt and Franklin 2004). The conclusions by Rowatt and Franklin help focus attention at RWA rather than at RF specifically. The more internalized the core beliefs of Christianity are, the more likely that racial prejudice should be squelched as long as RWA tendencies can be discouraged (Rowatt and Franklin 2004). These studies bring into play both aspects of the prejudice model discussed by Blumer in 1958; authoritarianism based on Adorno's scale and the sense of group position exhibited in hostility toward out-groups (Blumer 1958).

Studies report that RF and RWA have been correlated with tendencies toward discrimination based on race, religion, sexual orientation, or politics (Wilcox and Jelen 1987, Gay and Ellison 1993, Kirkpatrick 1993, Laythe et al. 2001, Fulton et al. 1999) as long as Christian Orthodoxy (CO) is controlled (Laythe et al. 2002). This is important because it is this variable, Christian Orthodoxy (CO), that is comparable to the intrinsic orientation of Allport and Ross (1967) that equates internalized religious doctrine with enhanced levels of humility and compassion. The most recent literature focusing on religion and prejudice from the psychological camp used localized survey data focusing on college student respondents (Kirkpatrick 1993, Jackson and Hunsberger 1999, Laythe et al 2001). The issue with college student samples is that the demographic characteristics are not varied enough to make generalizations to the larger population. College-aged students, especially when sampled at specific geographic locations, such as a small university in Ontario, Canada represent a fixed pool of like-minded, like-educated, and like-classed population. The sample is very

homogeneous to an extent that the students are very bright young adults raised in middle-class households.

Studies show that individuals with high levels of right-wing authoritarianism have a higher likelihood of displaying intolerant or discriminatory behavior. Individuals that internalize the beliefs of their religion and exude higher levels of Christian Orthodoxy have less of a chance of exhibiting intolerant behavior. So how do social scientists know how to look for and categorize those individuals with tendencies toward religious fundamentalism and Christian orthodoxy? A breadth of sociological studies have focused attention on understanding how to categorize religious denominations in order to isolate denominations and religious families who should have a tendency toward the fundamentalist traits (Roof and McKinney 1987, Gay and Ellison 1993, Steensland et al. 2000). The data and methods chapter of this paper further explains the literature regarding denominational categorization.

I have examined the emergence of fundamentalism as a reaction to modernity. The fundamentalist branches are reacting to the rationalization of a world that is no longer full of mystery because the science of modernity has sought to answer everything with numeric precision. The reaction to modernity has emerged as a tightening down of belief with a firm hand of resolve that holds to the traditional forms of understanding and guidance.

Fundamentalists find comfort in the familiar, with the local; the local neighborhood, church, and people. Reactions become strong when the traditionalist is faced with striking change and the change conflicts with time honored belief structures. The way things used to be is challenged as new faces and ideas appear in the neighborhood. Suspicion over the perceived threat of loss, whether of position or property, seems imminent to those who cling the tightest to the old ways.

Their reactions are gauged and studied. This is where we are in the sociological journey into the understanding of the role of religion into attitudes.

Social scientists have studied the effect that extreme religious indoctrination has on open-mindedness and argued over the theoretical basis for religious extremism. The denominations have themselves begun to examine their own prejudicial history and called for an open quest for racial reconciliation. Reverend Billy Graham identified racism as the foremost problem facing the world today. Quoted from *Christianity Today*, Graham stated “This hostility threatens the very foundation of modern society” (Graham 1993:27). This was one of the most prominent calls for racial reconciliation within the evangelical church. Republican candidate for President and Former Governor of Arkansas Mike Huckabee also reverberated the same concept during his campaign in 2007 that racial reconciliation has to be the foremost topic within the Evangelical church.

Ellen Rosenberg (1993) examined racial issues among evangelicals in her analysis of the Southern Baptists in the modern South. The Southern Baptists, due to group threat, reacted to their loss of cultural control due to Federal involvement in social issues by fleeing the Democratic Party and reemerging as Republicans of the New Right (Rosenberg 1993). The traditional way of life for the white southerner was threatened by the social policies that desegregated schools and prohibited bible readings and prayer in school. The outcry was to reassemble as a new organization that was founded on articles of faith. Shrouded in pessimistic, reactionary motives and filled with symbolic racism (Henry and Sears 2002, Sears and Henry 2003), this organization set out with Ronald Reagan at the helm to reclaim the perceived power and status that was lost when civil rights were granted to all creeds and colors.

The platform of the Reagan campaign was built on undercutting the policies that provided legal social equality (affirmative action and school busing) in an otherwise racialized (Emerson and Smith 2000) society. The issues of school prayer, anti-abortion, affirmative action, and school busing were geared toward the white reactionaries that arrived in the Republican camp in droves during the late 1970s. To cite a quote directly from Rosenberg's essay, "Ronald Reagan's dirty little secret is that he has found a way to make racism palatable and politically potent again" (Roger Wilkins, Institute of Policy studies, Cited from Rosenberg 1993). This symbolic racism has also been referred to as "budgetary racism" by Joseph Bensman and Arthur J. Vidich (cited from Rosenberg 1993). This tactic was part of Reagan's New Federalism. It was used by the Executive Branch to curtail any policy that was enacted as law but was not in line with the Reagan Agenda. It was very similar to the tactic used in the environmental protection realm. The tactic revolved around funding.

The legislative branch writes the law and the executive branch enforces the law. The loop hole is that the executive branch has to manage the year-to-year federal budget for all internal departments and municipal funding. The Reagan Administration was able to decide where the money should be spent and where it should not. Funds that used to be available to cities directly were now handed out to state governments to manage. Demographically, cities have higher concentrations of African-Americans. These cities now had to fight the state government for meager handouts, yet at the same time, affluent white only cities thrived (Rosenberg 1993). Interestingly, the team captains of the Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1981 (OBRA), the spearhead law that put Reagan Federalism into action were Strom Thurmond, Bennet Johnston, and Jesse Helms, all Southern Baptists (Rosenberg 1993).

Some Southern Baptists still believe in the inferiority of African-Americans, while others fear the mixing of races to the point that they build inner sanctums to isolate their genes from the rest of humanity. The rise of Christian schools and full service churches provides the exclusiveness needed to protect from miscegenation and promote proper endogamy (Rosenberg 1993). The Southern Baptist Church was a semi-integrated organization prior to emancipation with African-Americans relegated to second-class status in the balcony seats. Emancipation threatened the status quo and led to the racial hostility that still plagues American society in general. However, in 1961, following the 1954 school desegregation ruling, fifty-three ministers, of which thirteen were Southern Baptists, wrote a statement published in the Baton Rouge newspaper, the *Morning Advocate*, pronouncing racial reconciliation in the name of Christian theology. Many of the clergy were punished by their flock via threats and exiting congregants.

During the 1960's, Southern Baptists that preached universal brotherhood were met with disdain but pushed forward a strong multi-ethnic evangelism that was expensive and successful in increasing the numbers of attendees from different ethnic backgrounds. This ended in 1979 when the Fundamentalists began to take over the SBC; any success toward racial reconciliation was halted (Knight 1993). The movement toward stricter fundamentalism went hand in hand with a movement toward conservatism and in the South this meant a segregationist stance against civil rights liberalism (Knight 1993).

Emerson and Smith (2000) sum up the evangelical ethos that perpetuates what they call a "racialized" society. A racialized society is one in which the old racism of Jim Crow is replaced with a society in which the racism becomes invisible, symbolic, covert, and embedded in every institution (Emerson and Smith 2000). The irony occurs when the evangelicals surveyed in their

study claim to have no awareness of or refuse to accept the existence of structural racism because of their core belief in rugged individualism. Emerson and Smith (2000) found that the ethos of rugged individualism places all responsibility for any inequality in society squarely on the shoulders of the less equal. Survey data and ethnographies point to attitudes that demonstrate that it is the lack of hard work and motivation on the part of the less equal that lead to any lack of resources or efficacy. It is precisely this occurrence that warrants further investigation into the realm of religiosity and prejudice so that we may fully understand the connection between the level and type of religious involvement and discrimination. The purpose of the following scientific analysis is to test the relationship between religious affiliation and participation on attitudes to racial discrimination. I anticipate that respondents from evangelical denominations should be the most likely respondents to express discriminatory attitudes.

CHAPTER THREE: DATA AND METHODS

The NORC General Social Survey (GSS) 1972-2006 will be used as the dataset for this study. The General Social Survey collects data on demographic characteristics and certain attitudes of residents of the United States. The survey is conducted face-to-face with an in-person interview by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, and was conducted every year from 1972 to 1994 (except in 1979, 1981, and 1992). Since 1994, it has been conducted every other year. The GSS holds data on social variables that will be used in this study.

Dependent Variable

The GSS asks a specific question regarding racial intermarriage. The question has been asked semi-consistently since 1972. This question will be used as a proxy in this study to measure attitudes regarding racial discrimination. Previous research into the role of religious participation and attendance and racial attitudes used survey data from specific samples that were not representative of the larger population. GSS data are needed to understand how religious denominational affiliation affects the attitudes regarding racial prejudice in a representative sample.

The dependent variable is the attitude toward racial intermarriage as expressed in the respondent's answer to the question, "Would you favor a law against racial intermarriage?" The variable is dichotomous since the answers available from the respondents who answered were "yes" or "no." In this study, a "yes" response is coded as a one (1) and a no is coded as a zero (0).

Independent Variables

Religious Affiliation

Religious affiliation is an important factor in this study. The hypothesis is that Evangelical affiliation leads to a higher likelihood for support of a ban on racial intermarriage. The assumption is that support for a ban on interracial marriage equates to a general sense of racial prejudice. In order to achieve a consistent measurement of religious categories, I turned to the *Social Forces* article by Steensland et al. entitled “The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art” (2000). The article provides the sociological reasoning for its reclassification of denominational affiliation using GSS data. The authors expand on previous landmark studies by Glock and Stark (1965), Roof and McKinney (1987) and T.W. Smith (1990) to ground their reclassification strategy in prominent research and provides a new recoding syntax (Steensland 2000). This study uses the Steensland et al. religious classification to measure affiliation.

The recoding of denominations resulted in the following recoded denominations: Evangelical Protestants, Jewish Respondents, No Preference respondents, African American Respondents, Other Respondents, and Catholics.

To further elaborate on the importance of the recoding strategy I direct attention to the breadth of literature related to the sociological approach to recoding denominations. Many of the studies into the focus on the role of religion and discrimination appear to struggle with the issues with the coding for religious denomination. Throughout the literature focusing on the effects of religiosity on attitudes, the question of identifying religious affiliation poses a large enough of a problem that it is the first and foremost issue brought to light during previous research. The use of blanket denominational affiliation can hamper accurate analysis. Murphy and Walter (1984)

list the examples of grouping Baptists together as one group when in fact the Southern Baptists are far more conservative than American Baptists or grouping all Lutherans together when the Missouri Synod is more conservative than the American Lutherans.

There is a recognized Evangelical-Mainline split that must be recognized when studying religious groups, especially when some studies show that mainline Protestants appear more liberal than Catholics in many studies (Stouffer 1955, Murphy and Walter 1984). Wilcox and Jelen (1990) used second source data to test the effect of religious affiliation on political tolerance. Recoding of data was required to split the liberal and conservative Protestants into appropriate camps. Wilcox and Jelen ask an important question in their discussion that further emphasizes an understanding of the religious families. They ask how much of the intolerance that was recorded was due to fundamentalists embedded within the Evangelical group. This solidifies this researcher agenda to understand where the role of pure fundamentalism enters into the realm of discrimination. Wilcox (1986) concluded that self-identified Fundamentalists within the moral majority are more intolerant than their self-identified Evangelical brethren. Wilcox and Jelen (1990) conclude that it may be the Pentecostals and Fundamentalists that are skewing the data and that the Evangelicals may not be as intolerant as they appear when grouped with the more conservative fundamentalists. They cite Guth and Green (1987) as a possible source for the method to operationalize Pentecostals, fundamentalists, and other Protestants.

Gay and Ellison (1993) understood the issues confronted by Wilcox and Jelen (1990) regarding the use of denominational affiliation. Gay and Ellison (1993) effectively break out the Southern Baptists from the other strains of Baptist affiliation and rely on Roof and McKinney's (1987) recommendation to break Black Protestants out from other denominations to paint a clearer picture. Gay and Ellison's conclusion calls for analysis distinguishing fundamentalists,

evangelicals, and Pentecostals to clear up how these groups perpetuate political intolerance (Gay and Ellison 1993).

This leads us to what has become known as the state of the art coding schema for measuring American religious affiliation. The Steensland et al. (2000) article published in *Social Forces* solidifies the work of Wald (1987) and Roof and McKinney (1987) by first stating that there are two distinct wings of American Protestantism; 1) Mainline Protestantism and 2) Evangelical Protestantism. The mainline Protestants a) accept modernity b) are proactive in social/economic justice causes c) and accept pluralism. The Evangelical Protestants a) wish to separate from the broader culture [as they did after The Scopes Monkey Trial (Woodberry and Smith 1998)], b) focus on missionary activity and individual conversion, and c) follow a strict adherence to particular religious doctrine.

The power behind Steensland et al. is that it improved upon previous coding strategies employed when examining GSS data. They found through careful understanding of religious trends in the US that non-denominational Protestants resemble Evangelicals and should be placed in a recoded group for evangelicals. In fact both non-denominational and non-denominational respondents who report going to church about once a month are grouped with Evangelicals. This is a big step because it increases the number of evangelicals. Their recoding into a new coding schema known as RELTRAD (listed in article appendix) is a better test than the FUND schema created by Tom W. Smith (1990) at the National Opinion Research Center (Dougherty et al. 2007). The RELTRAD schema takes into account religious tradition, uses improved demographic coefficients and better distinguishes between groups (Steensland et al. 2000, Dougherty et al. 2007). Like Roof and McKinney (1987), Wald (1987) and Gay and Ellison (1993), this study clearly supports a difference between Black and White Protestants and

moves forward with the recoding schema in this fashion. Steensland et al. states that the Black Protestants place an importance on freedom and a quest for justice that is not likened to any specific denomination (Steensland et al. 2000). Black Protestants share an understanding of material and psychological deprivation and political marginality that would only be comparable to Catholic immigrants and not mainstream or Evangelical Protestants (Steensland et al. 2000). Black Protestants also differ from White Evangelicals in that they are economic liberals at the same time that they are social conservatives (Steensland et al. 2000). Black Protestants may share a gospel but not necessarily side with their Evangelical counterparts when it comes to issues of political tolerance and racism.

Steensland et al. (2000) remains the state of the art for measuring American religion in lieu of detailed congregational information (Dougherty et al. 2007). Dougherty et al. (2007) take Steensland et al. (2000) a step further when the data are available. The first point these authors make is that denominations do not draw the clear lines they once did. This case was made by Murphy and Walter (1984) when they stated that Baptists as a group must be split between Southern Baptists and American Baptists and was echoed by others who have argued against denominational misclassification (Roof and McKinney 1987, Gay and Ellison 1993, Sherkat 1999, Steensland et al. 2000).

Dougherty et al. (2007) make a point to state that if the researcher has the ability go beyond self identification within the study then do so and here is why. They used what was gained from Steensland et al. (2000) but were able to get more detail than Steensland et al. did with GSS data. Dougherty et al. used the Baylor Religion Survey conducted in 2005. This mail survey contained questions regarding the religious family, denomination, two self-described identities, the name of church, and the physical location of church. This allowed researchers to

examine the name and location of the churches listed to locate the religious nones, or no/non denominations into a religious tradition. The authors claim to have exceeded the results of any study before them that attempts to place the no/non denominations into proper categories.

In the end, the sociologists trained in understanding the role of religious indoctrination are well versed in the decades of denominational study and are better equipped to make strategic changes to research programs that should extract more vivid data related to how affiliation dictates personal doctrine. The more exactly the respondents are placed, the more accurate the generalizations become when it is time to make statements regarding religious fundamentalism.

Religious Participation

Religious participation will be gauged in this study by attendance at religious services. Previous research indicates that higher levels of attendance are an indication of both a higher commitment to religious teachings and also a higher commitment to being a member of the group. The focus of this study is the relationship between the amount of time involved with voluntary association with religion and levels of prejudice indicated by the dependent variable. The GSS asks the question, "How often do you attend religious services?" Responses will be coded, Never (0), less than once a year (1), about once or twice a year (2), several times a year (3), about once a year (4), 2-3 times a month (5), nearly every week (6), every week (7), several times a week (8), no answer and don't know (9).

Demographic Variables

Demographic factors are used as control variables. The purpose is to include variables that have been identified in the literature as factors affecting racial tolerance. The measurement of each variable is listed below.

Age is measured in actual years. Years of education serve as a proxy for educational attainment. Gender is represented by a dummy variable where females are coded (1) and males are coded (0).

Marital status is measured by creating a dummy variable where married and widowed are combined and coded (1) with divorced, separated, and never married combined to form the reference category (0).

Race is measured by creating a dummy variable based on the reported race of the respondent. The GSS records the following races: White (01), Black (02), and Other (03). The dummy variable of African-American is created by recoding to (2=1, and 1=0).

Region of residency is measured by creating a dummy variable for Southern residence. The GSS captures the region of the interview in the following ways: New England (01), Mid Atlantic (02), East North Central (03), West North Central (04), South Atlantic (05), East South Central (06), West South Central (07), Mountain (08), and Pacific (09). South Atlantic (05), East South Central (06), and West South Central (07) will be used to create the dummy variable labeled southern residence.

The size of a respondent's community is measured by creating a dummy variable for urban residence by using the SRC belt code of the respondent. The GSS captures the size of the

community that the respondent dwells in the following ways: 12 Largest Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas or SMSA (01), SMSA 13-100 (02), 12 largest suburbs (03), Suburbs 13-100 (03), Other Urban (05), and Other Rural (06). The dummy variable labeled urban will be created by recoding (1=6, 2=5, 3=4, 4=3, 5=2, and 6=1).

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYTICAL STRATEGY

Logistic regression analysis is used to examine the relationship between religious affiliation and participation on attitudes toward racial intermarriage. Before the logistic regression analysis is run, this researcher first ran cross tabulations by GSS Year and the question regarding a ban on racial intermarriage with the purpose of showing the percentage of respondents that responded in favor of a ban. This was important to determine if the question itself reveals important information within the sample population. After running the cross tabulation, logistic regressions were run. The data used for the logistic regression was recoded in order to divide the GSS dataset, 1972 – 2006, into four subsets by decade {1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s}.

Division of the dataset into four subsets was done in order to create a historical snapshot over time. Logistic regressions were then run on the four decade subsets using a three model analysis. Each of the three models was run on the four decades. The first model of the logistic regression factored religious denomination into the response to the GSS question on a racial intermarriage ban. The second model added religious attendance. And finally, the third model included the demographic covariates of age, education, female, married, African-American, southern residence and urban residence.

CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Table 1 (see Appendix: Tables for all data read-outs) exhibits a snapshot of the cross tabulation between GSS year and the independent variable over the four decades analyzed. This is employed as a tool to spot an overall trend over time. An obvious trend was noticed. The percentage of respondents that support a ban on interracial marriage does decline over time. In 1972, 38% of the respondents would support a legal ban on interracial marriage. The percentages are lower in the 1980's, 1990's and 2000's, with 25% in 1982, 16.6% in 1993 and 9.5% in 2002. Detailed yearly results of the cross tabulation is exhibited in Table 2. The purpose of the cross tabulation was to determine if there is a social fact to analyze. This researcher states that a report of 38% of the representative sample that would support a legal ban on racial intermarriage is a social fact that requires examination. The GSS question used as the dependent variable was first asked in 1972. This is five years after the Supreme Court ruling that a State law banning interracial marriage was unconstitutional and violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Kalmijn 1993). It was almost a decade after the signing of the Civil Rights Act and close to a century and a half after the abolition of slavery. This 38% also rises out of a nationally representative sample that is amalgam of differing sexes, creeds and colors and begs an answer to who holds these attitudes.

The positive side of the cross tabulation is that the percentages do go down over time which leads to a conclusion that US society as whole is becoming more open-minded. By 2002, less than 10% of the respondents indicated support for a legal ban on interracial marriage. However, there is still a sub-group that does indicate a strong opinion on the matter and the purpose of this research is to find an answer to who comprises this block of supporters for a ban

on racial intermarriage and how does the religious affiliation and participation of the respondents affect the outcome of this question.

Table 3 contains the results of logistic regressions for the 1970s. This regression analysis was conducted using three models. Model 1 focuses on religious affiliation by denomination. Model 2 adds the religious participation component of attendance. And Model 3 adds the demographic control variables to test the strength of the affiliation and participation components. The logistic regression models are testing the likelihood for supporting a ban on interracial marriage using Mainline Protestants as the constant. In Model 1, as was predicted by the hypothesis, Evangelical Protestants are 2.15 times more likely to support a ban on interracial marriage than Mainline Protestants. The same model also shows that Catholics, Jewish and No Preference respondents are more likely to answer NO to the question regarding support for a ban on interracial marriage than Mainline Protestants.

In Model 2, attendance at church services was added to the model to account for a respondent's commitment to a religious group. In this model, the significant predictors for support of a ban on interracial marriage were Evangelical Protestant affiliation and church attendance. Evangelicals are 2.12 times more likely to support a ban. Model 3 expands the analysis to include the independent demographic variables. When the demographic variables are controlled, the likelihood for Evangelical support of a ban drops to 1.618 but remains a statistically significant predictor. Attendance at religious services loses statistical significance in the third model, but certain demographic variables appear to have a positive predictive influence on support for an interracial marriage ban. Southerners are 2 times more likely to support a ban. Married respondents are 1.33 times more likely to support a ban and older respondents are 1 times more likely to support on a ban with all three being statistically

significant readings. The significant predictors for support of interracial marriage come from Catholic, Jewish, No Preference and Other Protestant religious groups along with respondents with higher levels of education and urban residents.

It is important to note that the GSS did not begin recording specific denominations until 1984. From 1972 through 1983, the GSS only captured the larger denominations; Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Catholic, Jewish, Non-denominational and other. It was in 1984 that the GSS began to capture the full spectrum of denominational data. It was also in the 1980's that the GSS began to capture African-American ancestry data. Because of these issues, the model for the 1970's does not offer the same clarity we should see in the following logistic regressions.

The 1980's model in Table 4 is different than the 1970's of Table 3 because of the GSS changes just mentioned. The data from the 1980s should account for more specific denominational identifications which help place more respondents in the Evangelical Protestant group that were before unrecorded or identified incorrectly and account for African-Americans Protestants as a group in the Black Protestant Denominations and as an independent demographic variable. Table 4 outlines the logistic regression analysis for the 1980s. In model 1, Evangelical Protestants are 2.13 times more likely to support an interracial marriage ban. Black Protestants join Catholics, Jewish respondents, other Protestants and No Preference respondents showing the most openness to interracial marriage. In Model 2, the Evangelicals still show significant likelihood for supporting the ban along with the respondents with higher levels of church attendance. In this model, Evangelicals are 2 times more likely than the reference group to support the ban and high attenders are 1.03 times more likely to support a ban. Model 3 exposes the demographics as in the previous regression done on 1970's data. In the

model the African-American Ancestry variable is statistically significant as an indicator for support of interracial marriage and the Black Protestant denominational variable loses significance. However, the Evangelical Protestant group still shows statistically significant positive support for a ban on interracial marriage with a 1.46 times likelihood for support on a ban. Church attendance once again loses significance when the control variables are added. Catholic, Jewish, No preference and other Protestant respondents remain open minded toward the issue of interracial marriage.

The 1990's regressions in Table 5 capture a glimpse into the next decade in time. Model 1 reiterates support for the hypothesis that religious fundamentalism predicts racial discrimination. Evangelical Protestants stand out as the only denomination more likely to support a ban than the reference group. Evangelical protestants were 2 times more likely of displaying intolerant attitudes. Model 2 adds attendance at religious services into the analysis. This model reports that Evangelical Protestants still display statistically significant odds of 1.974 of supporting a ban and also shows that higher levels of attendance at religious services results in statistically positive correlation to a support for a ban on interracial marriage with high attenders being 1.03 times more likely to support the interracial marriage ban. Model 3 reaffirms the Evangelical Protestant stand on the question of interracial marriage with a statistically significant result that Evangelicals are 1.67 times more likely to hold intolerant attitudes. However, it is important to note that the statistical significance regarding the openness to racial intermarriage by Catholics, Jewish respondents, Black Protestants and No Preference respondents as seen in the 1970s and 1980's has disappeared in this regression analysis as soon as the control variables are introduced. Also, religious participation gauged by the Attendance variable loses its statistical significance when the demographics are controlled.

The final regression analysis displayed in Table 6 was conducted on 2000 and 2002 data only due to the years that the question is asked. Model 1 has only two statistically significant coefficients. Black Protestants show openness to interracial marriage while Evangelical Protestants show that they are 2.47 times more likely to stand against interracial marriage. The statistical significance seen with Catholics, Jewish, No Preference and Other Protestant respondents is nonexistent in this model. Model 2 adds the religious participation component but its affect is not significant in this model. The model reaffirms the Evangelical stance against interracial marriage but the significance seen in previous decades for Catholics, Jewish and other Protestants is not evident. Evangelicals remain firm in opposition to interracial marriage. They are 2.5 times more likely to express this opposition. Black Protestants and No Preference Protestants are significant predictors of openness to interracial marriage in this model. Model 3 shows the consistent positive correlation between Evangelical Protestants and support for a ban along with older respondents and Southern residents. Black Protestants remain open to interracial marriage. Attendance in model 3 remains an insignificant predictor of intolerance. Surprisingly, the Catholic and Jewish respondents were not significant in any of the three models for the 2000s.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of religious affiliation and participation on racial discrimination. Research suggests that individuals who belong to more fundamentalist Protestant denominations are more intolerant than their Mainline counterparts as well as Catholic and Jewish individuals. In this study, this would suggest that Evangelical Protestants would show greater odds for supporting a ban on interracial marriage. This analysis does confirm the study's hypothesis. Evangelical Protestants show greater odds for supporting a ban on interracial marriage. The major finding in fact is that in all four decades analyzed, the Evangelical Protestants displayed a strong tendency to support a ban on interracial marriage with all findings being statistically significant.

This is important in light of the fact that racial reconciliation continues to be a major talking point among the elite leaders of Evangelical denominations. Historically, during missions into the colonial South, Northern Evangelicals openly condemned slavery (Woodberry and Smith 1998). During the Antebellum period, Northern Evangelicals played significant roles in the abolitionist movement. However, once evangelicalism gained a foothold in the South, abolitionist sentiments were replaced with Jim Crow laws (Woodberry and Smith 1998).

The hypocrisy lies in the fact that one of the major tenets of evangelicalism is a belief in the literal interpretation of the bible. So where is the universal compassion of Jesus Christ in the modern Evangelical movement? Where has the message of "love thy neighbor" gone (Matt. 22:39)? This is what Reverend Billy Graham discusses in a 1993 article in *Christianity Today*. Modern Christianity still contains the evils of racism and it goes against scripture (1993 Graham). Graham and other prominent leaders state that is the responsibility of the followers of

Christ to face the moral and spiritual issue of racism. So is the message from the leaders on the national stage filtering down to the local congregants?

This study also focuses on a religious participation component labeled attendance. The purpose is to determine if respondents with higher levels of attendance at religious service would display intolerant attitudes. Over the four decades studied the results regarding religious participation and discrimination were mixed. In the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990's attendance at religious service was an indicator of a higher likelihood for support of a ban on racial intermarriage. The results related to attendance were only statistically significant in Model 2 of the regressions for the 1970's, 1980s, and 1990s where the demographic variables were not controlled. Once the demographic control variables were added in Model 3 of each of the decades (1970's, 1980's, and 1990's) the results surrounding religious participation lost significance. An explanation for the loss of significance regarding religious participation could be the surrounding demographic variable of southern residence. The heavy concentration of Evangelicals who are also Southern is now controlled for in the final models that the apparent importance of church attendance as a predictor for support for a ban on racial intermarriage is negated.

This study used demographic control variables to ensure that the results regarding the Evangelical Protestants were authentic in light of the surrounding social facts. After controlling for social facts that have demonstrated a propensity for intolerant behavior such as Southern residence and older age and accounting for the contrary tolerant behavior demonstrated by urban residents and higher educated respondents, the Evangelical Protestants exhibited intolerant tendencies in all four decades. Regardless of the level of attendance, Evangelical respondents were consistently more likely to demonstrate intolerant attitudes. Studies show that Evangelicals

are high attenders at religious services, yet religious attendance has no bearing on the likelihood of supporting a ban on racial intermarriage. This means that whether or not an Evangelical actively participates in religious activities has no bearing on the likelihood for intolerant attitudes. Evangelicals are more conservative and discriminate by race regardless of their rate of attendance. This is also a major finding as it relates to the racial reconciliation platform of the Evangelical elite. The message from the top is not disseminating to the local congregations. In spite of the aims of the evangelical elite, attendance at an Evangelical service is not increasing the likelihood of hearing the message of racial reconciliation. It has no bearing what so ever on the outcome. Evangelical attenders and non-attenders echo the same racially discriminatory attitudes. This indicates that the national platform of racial reconciliation is missing the mark. On the surface, the presentation of the issue and its solution on the national stage appears to be genuine, but deep in the trenches of real life the movement toward racial reconciliation is a slow one. The percentage of respondents who showed support of an interracial marriage ban has consistently declined since the inclusion of the interracial marriage question in 1972. However, affiliation with an Evangelical denomination increased over time the odds of supporting the interracial ban.

The analysis on GSS data brought to light pertinent results relating to religious affiliation and participation on discriminatory attitudes. The models for all four decades show a clear correlation between Evangelical Protestant affiliation and support for an interracial marriage ban. This is being interpreted as a clear indication of racially discriminatory bias. The strength of the statistical results on Evangelicals stand up for themselves even after introducing the demographic variables such as age and southern residence that themselves help to predict prejudicial attitudes. The data from the 2000's needs further review and a more complete data set to include all years

in which the question on interracial marriage was asked. This lack of a complete decade's worth of data prevents this researcher from being able to speculate on the sudden change regarding the Catholic and Jewish respondents during the 2000s block.

Future research agendas should further expand on this analysis. The current models should be expanded upon. The denominational variables should be supplemented by categories for African-American Evangelicals so that this researcher can test for an Evangelical/Fundamentalist bias among African-Americans to determine if the research question still remains one regarding religiosity or one of race relations. Ideational components should also be added to the analysis in order to further expand on the participation component. This study used attendance at religious service as an indicator of commitment towards religion. This is a variable that only captures the external actions of respondents. I suggest pulling from Allport and Ross's (1967) intrinsic/extrinsic orientation schema to test for internalized actions regarding religion. The ideational variable should be pulled from the GSS and regard questions relating to prayer, meditation, and thoughts surrounding God. The goal should be to separate the extrinsic orientated respondents from the intrinsic oriented respondents. When the extrinsic oriented are separated from the intrinsic oriented I should be able to see if Allport and Ross's (1967) schema holds true against the GSS data.

Social Scientific research into the role of religious affiliation and participation as a predictor of discrimination is widely published (Allport and Ross 1967, Altmeyer 1967, Gay and Ellison 1993). The General Social Survey has successfully captured over four decades of social scientific data on attitudinal responses. The question regarding a ban on interracial marriage was used in this study as a proxy for racial discrimination to determine if religious affiliation plays a role in discriminatory attitudes.

The hypothesis set forth at the beginning of the research was that Evangelical Protestants would show a higher tendency toward discriminatory attitudes. The results of this study confirm the hypothesis. The research results shed light on question of religious affiliation and discrimination and confirm previous research into this area. This study and its use of GSS data helped expand the research to a nationwide platform over time. In conclusion, this study advanced a framework of study into the role of religious affiliation and prejudice within society at large and opens the arena for further inquiry.

APPENDIX: TABLES

Table 1: Cross tabulation Snapshot over four decades.

Year	Favor Law (%)	N =
1972	38	1352
1982	25	1855
1993	16.6	1072
2002	9.5	923

Table 2: Cross Tabulation [GSS Year and Favor law against racial intermarriage]

Year	Favor Law: % YES	Favor Law: % NO	Favor Law: % DK	N =
1972	38	58.8	3.2	1352
1973	37.3	61.2	1.5	1309
1974	33.8	64	2.2	1309
1975	37.8	60	2.2	1321
1976	31.8	65.8	2.4	1363
1977	27.8	70.6	1.6	1348
1980	29.1	68.2	2.7	1466
1982	25	72.2	2.9	1855
1984	24.4	73	2.6	1420
1985	25.4	72.1	2.5	1524
1987	20.4	76.6	3	1814
1988	21.9	75.2	3	1814
1989	20.8	76.6	2.6	1031
1990	18.7	78.5	2.8	916
1991	17	79.7	3.2	986
1993	16.6	80.1	3.3	1072

Table 2: Cross Tabulation [GSS Year and Favor law against racial intermarriage]

Year	Favor Law: % YES	Favor Law: % NO	Favor Law: % DK	N =
1994	13.5	84.5	2.3	1992
1996	10.9	87	2.1	1922
1998	10.9	86.5	2.7	1744
2000	9.9	87.4	2.7	1744
2002	9.5	89.7	.8	923

Table 3: 1970s Logistic Regression Results: Effects of Religious Affiliation and Participation on Racial Discrimination

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Catholic Respondents	- .513 / .598** (.064)	- .531 / .588** (.065)	- .431 / .650** (.075)
Jewish Respondents	-1.219 / .295** (.196)	-1.193 / .303** (.196)	- .838 / .432** (.219)
No Preference Respondents	-1.069 / .343** (.124)	-1.010 / .364** (.128)	- .543 / .581** (.145)
Evangelical Respondents	.766 / 2.151** (.063)	.754 / 2.125** (.064)	.481 / 1.1618** (.075)
Other Protestants	- .418 / .658** (.188)	- .432 / .649* (.188)	- .194 / .823 (.208)
Attendance		.019 / 1.020* (.010)	.007 / 1.007 (.012)
Age			.030 / 1.030** (.002)
Education			- .223 / .800** (.011)
Female			.061 / 1.063 (.057)
Married			.291 / 1.337** (.080)
Southern Residence			.711 / 2.036** (.064)
Urban			- .111 / .895** (.019)
Constant	- .541	- .616	.472
N	7304	7304	7304
Chi-square	530.260**	533.923**	1967.981**
Cox & Snell R2	.070	.070	.236
<p>Note: Cell entries are given as logistic regression coefficients/odds ratio with standard error given in parentheses. *p < .05 **p < .01</p>			

Table 4: 1980s Logistic Regression Results: Effects of Religious Affiliation and Participation on Racial Discrimination

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Catholic Respondents	-.406 / .666** (.082)	-.432 / .649** (.083)	-.300 / .741** (.096)
Jewish Respondents	-1.819 / .162** (.393)	-1.779 / .169** (.394)	-1.378 / .252** (.410)
No Preference Respondents	-1.148 / .317** (.155)	-1.034 / .35** (.159)	-.499 / .607** (.177)
Black Protestants	-1.475 / .317** (.137)	-1.506 / .222** (.137)	-.251 / .778 (.295)
Evangelical Respondents	.757 / 2.133** (.075)	.734 / 2.084** (.076)	.379 / 1.461** (.089)
Other Protestants	-.888 / .412** (.207)	-.938 / 1.039** (.028)	-.538 / .584* (.228)
Attendance		.038 / 1.039** (.012)	.015 / 1.015 (.014)
Age			.033 / 1/033** (.002)
Education			-.198 / .821** (.013)
Female			.063 / 1.065 (.069)
Married			.009 / 1.009 (.081)
African American			-2.160 / .155** (.267)
Southern Residence			.910 / 2.483** (.073)
Urban			-.152 / .859* (0.24)
Constant	-.971	-.616	-.077
N	6566	6566	6566
Chi-square	587.534**	597.9377**	1803.589**
Cox & Snell R2	.086	.087	.240
Note: Cell entries are given as logistic regression coefficients/odds ratio with standard error given in parentheses. *p < .05 **p < .01			

Table 5: 1990s Logistic Regression Results: Effects of Religious Affiliation and Participation on Racial Discrimination

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Catholic Respondents	-.337 / .714** (.119)	-.351 / .704** (.119)	-.076 / .927 (.133)
Jewish Respondents	-1.593 / .203** (.515)	-1.564 / .209** (.515)	-.989 / .372 (.533)
No Preference Respondents	-.761 / .467** (.169)	-.675 / .509** (.175)	-.186 / .830 (.190)
Black Protestants	-1.266 / .282** (.283)	-1.295 / .274** (.238)	-.398 / .672 (.427)
Evangelical Respondents	.700 / 2.015** (.102)	.680 / 1.974** (.076)	.517 / 1.677** (.115)
Other Protestants	-1.165 / .312** (.396)	-1.214 / .297** (.397)	-1.013 / .363* (.228)
Attendance		.030 / 1.031** (.016)	.019 / 1.019 (.017)
Age			.032 / 1.032** (.003)
Education			-.224 / .800** (.016)
Female			.089 / 1.093 (.089)
Married			.062 / 1.064 (.101)
African American			-1.300 / .273* (.267)
Southern Residence			.697 / 2.009** (.091)
Urban			-.149 / .862** (0.24)
Constant	-1.816	-1.930	-.653
N	5606	5606	5606
Chi-square	245.153**	248.891**	913.887**
Cox & Snell R2	.043	.043	.150
Note: Cell entries are given as logistic regression coefficients/odds ratio with standard error given in parentheses. *p < .05 **p < .01			

Table 6: 2000s Logistic Regression Results: Effects of Religious Affiliation and Participation on Racial Discrimination

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Catholic Respondents	-.255 / .775 (.224)	-.258 / .773 (.224)	.032 / 1.032 (.244)
Jewish Respondents	-.394 / .674 (.542)	-.448 / .638 (.544)	.416 / 1.517 (.586)
No Preference Respondents	-.437 / .646 (.268)	-.546 / .579* (.175)	-.015 / .985 (.190)
Black Protestants	-1.228 / .293** (.444)	-1.201 / .301** (.238)	-1.301 / .272* (.427)
Evangelical Respondents	.905 / 2.472** (.195)	.920 / 2.509** (.195)	.702 / 2.017** (.215)
Other Protestants	-.624 / .536 (.615)	-.580 / .560 (.397)	-.285 / .752 (.645)
Attendance		-.037 / .964 (.028)	-.011 / .989 (.031)
Age			.033 / 1.034** (.005)
Education			-.202 / .817** (.016)
Female			-.384 / .681 (.157)
Married			-.165 / .848 (.715)
African American			-.263 / .769 (.450)
Southern Residence			.753 / 2.124** (.162)
Urban			-.157 / .855** (.060)
Constant	-2.190	-1.930	-1.035
N	2094	2094	2094
Chi-square	75.607**	77.260**	265.005**
Cox & Snell R2	.035	.036	.119
<p>Note: Cell entries are given as logistic regression coefficients/odds ratio with standard error given in parentheses. *p < .05 **p < .01</p>			

REFERENCES

- Adorno, Theodor W., Else Frenkel-Brunswick, Daniel J. Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper.
- Allport, Gordon.W. and J.Michael Ross. 1967. "Personal religious orientation and prejudice." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 5:432-443.
- Altmeyer, Bob and Bruce Hunsberger. 1992. Authoritarianism, Religious Fundamentalism, Quest, and Prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 2: 113-133.
- Altmeyer, Bob and Bruce Hunsberger. 2004. A Revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale: The Short and Sweet of It. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 14: 47-54.
- Ammerman, Nancy. 1987. *Bible Believers: Fundamentalists in the Modern World*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Brainbridge, William.S. and Rodney Stark. 1997. "Sectarian Tension" Pp. 86-103 in *Religion: North American Style*, edited by Thomas E. Dowdy and Patrick H. McNamara. New Brunswick. Rutgers University Press.
- Barber, Bruce. 1996. *Jihad v. McWorld: How Globalism and Tribalism are Reshaping the World*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Blumer, Herbert. 1958. Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position. *The Pacific Sociological Review* 1:3-7.
- Bobo, Laurence. 1999. Prejudice as Group Position: Micro-foundations of a sociological approach to racism and race relations. *Journal of Social Issues* 55: 445-472.
- Chang, Patricia M.Y. 2003. "Escaping the Procrustean Bed: A Critical Analysis of the Study of Religious Organizations, 1930-2001, 1930-2001" Pp. 123-136 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, edited by Michelle Dillon. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Dougherty, Kevin D., Byron R. Johnson, and Edward C. Polson. 2007. Recovering the Lost: Remeasuring U.S. Religious Affiliation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 46:483-499.
- Edgell, Penny. and Eric Tranby. 2007. Religious influences on understandings of racial inequality in the United States. *Social Problems*. 54: 263-288

- Emerson, Michael O. and David Hartman. 2006. The Rise of Religious Fundamentalism. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 32:127–44.
- Emerson, Michael O. and Christian Smith. 2000. *Divided by Faith: Evangelical Religion and the Problem of Race in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Feagin, Joe R. 1964. Prejudice and religious types: A focused study of southern fundamentalists. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 4: 3-13.
- Finke, Roger and Rodney Stark. 1997. "The Churching of America" Pp. 43-49 in *Religion: North American Style*, edited by Thomas E. Dowdy and Patrick H. McNamara. New Brunswick. Rutgers University Press.
- Fulton, Aubyn.S., Richard L. Gorsuch, and Elizabeth A. Maynard. 1999. Religious orientation, antihomosexual sentiment, and fundamentalism among Christians. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 38: 14-22
- Gay, David A., Christopher G. Ellison, and Daniel A. Powers. 1996. .In Search of Denominational Subcultures: Religious Affiliation and .Pro-Family. Issues Revisited.. *Review of Religious Research* 38: 3-17.
- Gay, David.A. and Christopher G. Ellison. 1993. *Religious Subcultures and Political Tolerance: Do Denominations Still Matter?* *Review of Religious Research*. 34(4): 151-171.
- Gay, David & Lynxwiler, John 1999. *The Impact of Religiosity on Race Variations in Abortion Attitudes*. *Sociological Spectrum*, 19(3), 359-377.
- Glaser, James.M. 1994. Back to the Black Belt: Racial Environment and White Racial Attitudes in the South. *Journal of Politics* 56:21-41.
- Graham. Billy. 1993. "Racism and the Evangelical Church." *Christianity Today*. October 4, 1993, 27.
- Griffin, G.A, R. Gorsuch, and A-L Davis. 1987. A cross-cultural investigation of religious orientation, social norms, and prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 26: 358-365.
- Guth, James L., and John C. Green. 1987. The GOP and the Christian right: The case of Pat Robertson's campaign contributors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.
- Hinojosa, V. and J. Park 2004. Religion and the paradox of racial inequality attitudes. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 43: 229-238.
- Hunsberger, B. and L.M. Jackson. 2005. Religion, meaning and prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 61: 807-826.

- Hunter, J.D. 1992. *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Iannaccone, L. 1997. "Why Strict Churches are Strong" Pp. 50-65 in *Religion: North American Style*, edited by Thomas E. Dowdy and Patrick H. McNamara. New Brunswick. Rutgers University Press.
- Jackson, L.M. and B. Hunsberger. 1999. An Intergroup Perspective on Religion and Prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 38: 509-523.
- Kalmijn, M. 1993. Trends in Black/White Intermarriage. *Social Forces*. 72: 119-146.
- Kelley, D. 1972. *Why Conservative Churches are Growing*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kirkpatrick, L. 1993. Fundamentalism, Christian orthodoxy, and intrinsic religious orientation as predictors of discriminatory attitudes. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 32: 256-268.
- Knight, W.L. 1993. "Race Relations: Changing Patterns and Practices." Pp. 144-164 in *Southern Baptists Observed*, edited by Nancy Tatom Ammerman. Knoxville. The University of Tennessee Press.
- Laythe, B., D. Finkel, and L. Kirkpatrick. 2001. Predicting prejudice from religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism: A multiple-regression approach. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40: 1-10.
- Laythe, B., D. Finkel, R. Bringle, and L. Kirkpatrick. 2002. Religious fundamentalism as a predictor of prejudice: a two-component model. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41: 623-635.
- Lyndsay, D.M. 2007. *Faith in the Halls of Power: How Evangelicals Joined the American Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Murphy, K. and O. Walter. 1984. Religious Preference and Practice: Reevaluating Their impact on Political Tolerance. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 48: 318-329.
- Peek, C.W., G.D. Lowe, and L.S. Williams. 1991. Gender and God's Word: Another Look at Religious Fundamentalism and Sexism. *Social Forces* 69: 1205-1221.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. 1994. Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 6: 741-763.
- Roof, W.C. 1978. *Community and Commitment: Religious Plausibility in a Liberal Protestant Church*. New York: Elsevier.

- Roof, W.C. 2003. "Religion and Spirituality: Toward an Integrated and Analysis" Pp. 137-148 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, edited by Michelle Dillon. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Roof, W. C. and W. McKinney. 1987. *American mainline religion: Its changing shape and future*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rosenberg, E.M. 1993. "The Southern Baptist Response to the Newest South." Pp. 144-164 in *Southern Baptists Observed*, edited by Nancy Tatom Ammerman. Knoxville. The University of Tennessee Press.
- Rowatt, W.C. and L.M. Franklin. 2004. Christian Orthodoxy, Religious Fundamentalism, and Right-Wing Authoritarianism as Predictors of Implicit Racial Prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 14: 125-138.
- Solomon, Burt. 1996. "Christian Soldiers." *National Journal*, February 24, 410-415.
- Steensland, B., J. Z. Park, M. D. Regnerus, L. D. Robinson, W. B. Wilcox, and R. D. Woodberry. 2000. The measure of American religion: Toward improving the state of the art. *Social Forces* 79:291–318.
- Strickland, B. and S.C. Weddell. 1972. Religious Orientation, Racial Prejudice, and Dogmatism: A Study of Baptists and Unitarians. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 11: 395-399.
- Stouffer, S. 1955. *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties*. New York: Doubleday.
- Unger, R.K. 2002. Them and us: hidden ideologies-differences in degree or kind? *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*: 263-288.
- Wald. K.D. 1987. *Religion and Politics in the United States*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Wallensten, P. and D. Helfand. "President Barack Obama reverses course on faith-based office". www.chicagotribune.com. February 6, 2009.
- Wilcox. C. 1986. Evangelicals and Fundamentalists in the new Christian Right: Religious differences in the Ohio Moral Majority. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 25: 355-363.
- Wilcox. C. and T. Jelen. 1990. Evangelicals and Political Tolerance. *American Politics Quarterly* 18: 25-46.
- Woodberry, R.D and C.S. Smith. 1998. Fundamentalism Et Al: Conservative Protestants in America. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 25-56.

Yancey, George. 2007. "Experiencing Racism: Differences in the Experiences of Whites Married to Blacks and Non-Black Racial Minorities." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 38: 197-213.