After The Resurrection:

The Field of the Sociology of Religion in the United States

Darren E. Sherkat and Derek Lehman

Southern Illinois University

Abstract

The sociology of religion has long been relegated to the margins of the field of sociology. Using field theory we discuss this history and provide some explanation for why actors in the strategic action field of the subfield of the sociology of religion steer it toward the margins of the broader discipline. We also present the ascendance of the field in the late 20th century and detail some current dynamics within the field. Finally, we provide an alternative measure of religious identifications in hopes of steering the field away from the sharp rocks at the margin of the sociology.

In his 1986 Presidential address to the Southern Sociological Society, Jeffery Hadden (1987) criticized the field of the sociology of religion, arguing that it had run adrift of the broader field of sociology. Using field theory derived from Bourdieu (1993) and Fligstein and McAdam (2012), we examine the development of the sociology of religion as a separate strategic action field, connected to and subsumed under the wider strategic action field of American sociology. Our focus is geographically constrained because of the peculiar circumstances of American sociology of religion—circumstances strongly influenced by incumbents and contenders with peculiar stocks of religious cultural capital motivating actions in the field and its relationship to the broader field of sociology. We borrow from earlier works by Hadden (1987), Stark (1971, 1974), and Reed (1974, 1975, 1981, 1982) documenting the development of the field over the course of the 20th century, and we provide insights into what has taken place since.

We explore four key factors that led to the resurrection of the sociology of religion in terms of its status within the broader field of sociology; (1) the growth of survey research which enabled the demographic study of religion; (2) sociological attention to the connection between religion and stratification; (3) increasing interest in social movements and political sociology, including new religious movements; and, (4) the development of more general concepts and theories applied to religious phenomena. We also discuss how incumbents and contenders in the sociology of religion and in the general field interacted and contested developments, and how incumbents dealt with challengers---particularly focusing on mechanisms of governance within the field, and the amplification of alternative sets of social skills. We further examine how external movements like the Civil Rights movement and the mobilization of the Christian Right influenced the strategies and composition of incumbents and challengers, and the relationship between the sociology of religion and the broader discipline. Finally, we seek to alter the field by

identifying key concepts and mechanisms of operationalization that could help sustain the resurrection of the sociology of religion and diminish the influence of incumbents who seek both their own domination of the field and its marginalization in the broader discipline.

The Growth, Marginalization, and Rise of the Sociology of Religion

The strategic action field of the sociology of religion was heavily influenced by the characteristics and motivations of incumbents and contenders in both sociology and the sociology of religion (Fligstein and McAdam 2012). The sociology of religion grew with the rest of the discipline in the early 20th century, but became more marginalized as sociology became more institutionalized and scientific (Reed 1975, 1981). As Hadden (1987) and Reed (1974, 1975, 1981, 1982) made clear, part of the reason for this marginalization was the rise and influence of religious sociologists as incumbents in the sociology of religion. These religious incumbents constructed and controlled governance systems to the advantage of particular types of religious believers.

As the discipline of sociology became more institutionalized and scientific, values-driven research and commentary were pushed out of the disciplinary journals, forcing religious sociologists to create their own venues. This resonates with Fligstein and McAdam’s (2012) contention that institutionalization is a contested process. Most sociologists of religion were generally encamped with “"Do-gooders," "ex-preachers," and "pre-scientific researchers" (who) were associated with one another and to be one of these three was to be suspected of being the other two as well” (Reed 1982:191). The sociology of religion became a separate strategic action field, with its own journals, associations, and understandings and valuations of the strictly scientific and social capital of this field of science (Bourdieu 1991). While this shift created a disjuncture between the sociology of religion and the general discipline, it also enabled relative

stability, enhanced by a social skill set that included the embrace of religious cultural capital emanating from liberal Protestantism, social justice Catholicism, and reformed Judaism. While secular sociologists sometimes made incursions into the field, incumbents were able to discourage non-believers and even engaged in coercion to force the unfaithful from the field (Reed 1975; Stark 1974).

As the sociology of religion began to grow in the 1960s, instability in the field led to considerable tension as contenders vied with incumbents. As Stark (1974:168) put it: "…a major barrier to our field …is the domination of the field not merely by religionists but religionists with a ghetto mentality." Stark (1974:168) went on to note that religious sociologists routinely dismissed, discouraged, and discriminated against secular research that did not fit their preferred visions: "… to be classified as a friendly secularist usually depends on what one chooses to study (or not study) and how lucky (?) one is about the signs of the correlations one turns up. I… have had to report correlations that were taken by religionists as "bad news." For this I have taken considerably more criticism and plain abuse than I ever encounter when I write on other subjects." Stark's experiences nearly fifty years ago are consistent with our own, and the future of the sociology of religion will be influenced by the composition and character of incumbents and challengers in the field—with unsuccessful contenders likely coerced to leave.

The Resurrection of the Sociology of Religion

In the mid-1950s the sociology of religion began to emerge from its relative obscurity, and general sociologists once again began to make contributions to the field, though many of the scholars who made important contributions to the sociology of religion did not classify themselves as sociologists of religion. While most of the incumbent actors in the field remained people who Reed (1975) would classify as "religionists" the composition of this group changed

in the late 20th century through a demographic boost from contending conservative Protestants, Mormons, and conservative Catholics. The growing influence of this new set of contenders is important for understanding the dynamics of the field after the resurrection.

The development of modern scientific survey research was crucial for spurring the resurrection of the sociology of religion. The United States has never collected individual-level census data on religion, and the data gap was partly filled by scientific surveys. Yet, religious diversity in the United States makes operationalization of religious factors difficult. For most of the history of scientific public opinion research, few questions were asked about religion; typically frequency of religious participation and identification with very broad groupings—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or none. In the United States, Protestant diversity makes this a useless indicator for examining religious influences on most issues. The introduction of high-quality survey research spurred the careers of many influential sociologists of religion, and it sparked interest among several general sociologists to investigate religion. Survey research enabled the development of religious demography, tracking distributions of religious groups, and examining the influence of religious factors on marriage, fertility, and other aspects of family life. Still, incumbents in the field never fully embraced scientific survey research (Stark 1971, 1974; Reed 1975), and qualitative and interpretive approaches dominated the field's key journals. The field was further influenced by religiously-hued funding agencies which poured millions of dollars into low quality studies attempting to define the character of American religion (Wuthnow 2015).

Another key to the resurrection of the sociology of religion was a groundswell of research on Weber's ([1904-05] 2008) *Protestant Ethic* thesis. Glenn and Hyland (1967:73) deemed the relationship between religious orientations and life chances "…the most viable topic of debate in

the sociology of religion in the United States.” Attention to religion and stratification waned after the early 1970s, largely because Catholic-Protestant differences were minimal. In the mid-1990s, the focus of scholarship turned to the importance of exclusivist sects, and the literature on religion and stratification began to flourish (cf. Glass and Jacobs 2005; Keister 2011; Keister and Sherkat 2014; Lehrer 2009). Still, many religious incumbent sociologists openly called for an end to studying the material fortunes of faith groups (cf. Greeley 1964; Smith 2000). Religious incumbents’ aversion to the study of the impact of religion on stratification hampered connections between the sociology of religion and the general field of sociology, and their control over governance mechanism through journals and associations discouraged potential contenders.

Increased interest in social movements and political sociology also helped spur the sociology of religion. In the 1950s, two political movements, the Civil Rights Movement and right-wing Christian anti-communist and anti-Civil Rights Movements, led to growing interest in the political importance of religion. These movements also sparked recruitment into the sociology of religion by liberal Protestants and social justice Catholics. As Reed (1975) points out, many liberal Protestants gravitated to sociology because of their interest in civil rights and opposition to the Vietnam War. However, religious incumbents were far less interested in, if not hostile to, the study of right-wing Christian movements like the KKK, the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, or Concerned Women for America. Liberal religious sociologists resented presenting Christianity as politically and theologically conservative (Wuthnow and Evans 2002), while conservative religious sociologists argued that sectarians were politically persecuted by inquiries into their politicized faith (Smith 2000).

Secular sociologists saw all manner of opportunity in studying religious movements, politicized or not. The resource mobilization paradigm was forged in Zald's (1982) examinations of the YMCA, and further honed in classic studies of the Civil Rights Movement and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (Morris 1986; McAdam 1999; McCarthy and Zald 1977). Studies of social movements used groups like the Unification Church (Stark and Bainbridge 1985), Hare Krishna, and Nichiren Shoshu Buddhists (Snow et al. 1986) to examine the importance of social networks for recruitment and conversion. Sociologists pondered the importance of solidary and material selective incentives for motivating collective action and breaking the free rider problem (Zald 1982; Sherkat 2005). The frame alignment perspective in social movement theory was formulated based work on new religious movements (Snow et al. 1986). Despite the centrality of religion in the development of social movement theory, few of the contributors identify as sociologists of religion. There was considerable tension between religious sociologists and sociologists who studied new religious movements. Indeed, many Christian religious sociologists sided with the "anti-cult" movements that developed in the 1970s, while secular sociologists who studied new religious movements pointed to the stark similarities between the practices of new religious movements and established religious groups (Bromley and Schupe 1979).

The work of Stark and Bainbridge (1985; 1987) ushered in a new era of research and theorizing in the sociology of religion, and also helped reconnect it to the broader field. Concepts were refined and a more formal approach to theorizing and operationalizing religion was employed. Their theorizing also connected with the developing influence of rational actor models in social movements, political sociology, and economic sociology. Stark and Bainbridge (1985) produced a rigorous theory of the sect-church-sect cycle, and followed up with

comparative historical evidence in American religious history (Finke and Stark 1992). Stark and Bainbridge's (1985) theory depended on the concepts of sect and church, derived from Weber and refined by Troelsch, Niebuhr, and Johnson. Sectarian movements believe that their supernatural explanations are exclusively true, while churchly movements embrace more universalistic conceptions of the sacred. Supply side theorists argued that sectarian groups are at tension with broader society (Stark and Bainbridge 1985; Iannaccone 1998); however, exclusivism need not generate tension if a sect holds a relative monopoly or controls the means of coercion—something supply-siders contend cannot happen (Iannaccone 1998; Finke and Stark 1992). Yet, Southern Baptists are not at tension with society in the South, nor are the Wahhabi in Saudi Arabia (Sherkat 2014). Supply-side partisans ignored the dynamics of religious cognitive frameworks and the importance of social networks and selective incentives, instead assuming that religious desires and beliefs are stable and that religious choices are made voluntarily in a "free" market (Sherkat 1997; Sherkat and Wilson 1995). Incumbents in the field almost uniformly rejected rational actor models. Religious incumbents resented the reduction of religion to an egoistic choice of individuals. They were especially dubious of claims that religious diversity is good for religion, and religious liberals disliked the contention that sectarian religious groups were better able to produce religious value (Iannaccone 1998; Finke and Stark 1992). Religious incumbents have long been skeptical of theorizing about religious processes, and many embraced conceptual nuance in a way that was more obfuscating than illuminating (Healy 2015; Reed 1975).

The resurrection of the sociology of religion is well documented, and in the late 20th century it appeared as if it had returned to the core of sociological theory and research (Warner 1993; Sherkat and Ellison 1999). The ASA section on the Sociology of Religion was founded in

1994, in large part to try to reduce the influence of religious incumbents in the field, and membership grew quickly particularly among young sociologists who wanted a career integrated in the discipline rather than segmented by religion. Yet, the ascendance of the field had not purged it of the sources of marginalization.

Fields of Contention After the Resurrection

The entry of religious conservatives into the field destabilized the sociology of religion. Demographically, conservative Protestants, conservative Catholics, and Mormons have come to dominate the junior ranks of the field, and access to mentoring workshops and recruitment programs from conservative foundations have helped grow their numbers and influence. As contenders in the field, young conservative Christian scholars were enabled by the resurgent interest in the sociology of religion, and many completed PhD's at top-tier programs and earned tenure-tracked jobs at major research universities. These young scholars came to redefine the focus of the field, concentrating on the positive influence of religion on a variety of outcomes—a goal shared by their liberal Protestant and Catholic elders. To accomplish this, it was necessary to make a concerted effort to jettison or redefine concepts that presented religion in an unwholesome light, or which were linked to negative outcomes. Religious sociologists employed two strategies to this end: (1) a de-emphasis on the importance of religious beliefs—focusing instead on religious participation or private devotion; and (2) a reconceptualization of categories of religious organizations and identifications. Both strategies served to limit the varied sources of religious influences on social life (Wilde and Glassman 2016). For many of the newly emboldened conservative incumbents, strategic action in the sociological field has come in tandem with conservative political activism militating in support of the patriarchal family, and in opposition to women's rights, birth control, and LGBT rights.

Recent assessments of the state of the field in the sociology of religion in the United States have focused on the parochial nature of most research and theorizing (Poulsen and Campbell 2010). Critiques of the field have tended to emphasize the narrow focus on religion in the United States, and that the vast majority of research examines Christian movements. This is certainly true, but we contend that the geographic and global substantive limitations of extant research in the sociology of religion are not the primary source of our parochialism. Rather, strategic action in the field of the sociology of religion has pushed most research into peculiar applied paths in the service of Christian religion, while pushing away inquiry into topics deemed unseemly by those who possess the social capital skill sets valued in religious circles. Similar impediments to scholarship are found in comparative religious studies for scholars researching Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, and other traditions (cf. Doniger and Nussbaum 2015), and it is notable that a large global religion initiative is sponsored by the Templeton Foundation and directed by a prominent religious conservative (http://grri.nd.edu/).

Contesting the Measure of American Religion

The new generation of incumbents in the field prefer their individual and collective identity as "evangelical"—an identity which is not wedded to identification with specific organized religious denominations or families of denominations. However, the adoption of evangelical as an identification is problematic because evangelical is also a sociological concept signifying groups with proselytizing behaviors and soteriological theologies (Weber [1922] 1993; Sherkat 2014). Notably, the identity of "evangelical" will likely also be jettisoned by partisans as it becomes spoiled (as happened with "fundamentalist" and "born again"). Religious sociological opposition to the concept of sect resulted in a muddled classification system.

Operationalizing religious diversity was a key to the resurrection of the sociology of religion, yet the system now favored by religious incumbents instead collapsed the middle—placing moderate Protestant denominations in both the "evangelical" and "mainline" religious categories. This scheme also ignored the distinctiveness of ethnic and quasi-ethnic denominations, and lumped all African American Protestants together. Worse still, it linked religious participation to "evangelical" identifications among respondents who do not claim a specific Christian identification (Steensland et al. 2000). Using this scheme, in General Social Survey samples collected since 2000 25.3% of the "evangelicals" were misclassified liberal Protestants ("other Presbyterians" .9%), Lutherans (Missouri or Wisconsin Synod, 6.2%), or respondents with no denominational identification but higher than average religious participation (18.2%). This served to increase the size of the "evangelical" group, while also making them more educated, higher income, and less extreme in political and religious orientations.

Table 1 about here

We advocate a more sociological operationalization of religious identification for use with contemporary data. In our on-line appendix, we provide the full coding scheme for this operationalization applied to GSS data. Religious identifications should be as specific as analytically possible. Christian denominations in America are marked by a history of unions and schisms which sometimes complicates boundary drawing and often tests the capacity of respondents to accurately place their identifications. Added to that are differences in ethnic history and also of liturgical and ritual practice. Table 1 presents our classification of identification groups, breaks down a few of the groups by even more specific classifications, and compares them on select religious, status, and social orientations. Our coding scheme avoids conflation with politicized religious identities and facilitates analyses of change over time.

Table 1 shows that Protestant denominations are clearly arrayed in terms of exclusivism, indicated by subscription to biblical inerrancy, and these identifications are salient for structuring political and social values and social status. Liberal universalistic groups and Episcopalians are substantially less prone to believe in biblical inerrancy, participate less frequently in religious services, and have substantially higher levels of educational and income attainment compared to other Protestants---including the moderate Protestants and Lutherans with whom they are often lumped. Table 1 also shows that Liberals and Episcopalians are significantly more supportive of abortion rights, less patriarchal, and less likely to condemn homosexuality. Sectarian Protestants and Baptists are significantly more likely to subscribe to inerrant beliefs about the Bible when compared to all other groups—and notably the Moderate Protestants and Lutherans. Indeed, while the dominant measure of religious identification places Wisconsin and Missouri Synod Lutherans in the "evangelical" camp, their beliefs about the Bible are much more similar to other Moderate Protestants than to sectarians or Baptists. Notably, people who embrace Christianity but do not specify a denomination fit more with the Moderate Protestants and Lutherans in their religious beliefs and participation, as well as their educational attainment, income, and social values. Baptists and other Sectarians have the lowest incomes and levels of education compared to all other religious classifications. Ethnicity intersects with religion to structure values and social status (particularly among Catholics), however the sect/exclusivist-church/universalist distinction remains for African Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans (Sherkat 2014). Obviously, the grouping of denominations will be determined in large part by the sociological question and the size of the sample available---however distinguishing sectarian Protestants clearly is a key for virtually all sociological examinations involving religion.

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. “The peculiar history of scientific reason.” *Sociological Forum*.6:3-26.

______.1993. *The Field of Cultural Production.* New York. Columbia University Press.

Bromley, David G., and Anson D. Shupe. 1979. “The Tnevnoc Cult.” *Sociology of Religion* 40: 361-366.

Doniger, Nancy and Martha C. Nussbaum. 2015. Pluralism and Democracy in India: Debating the Hindu Right. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. 1992. *The Churching of America : Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Fligstein, Neil, and Doug McAdam. 2013. *A Theory of Fields.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Glass, Jennifer, and Jerry Jacobs. 2005. “Childhood Religious Conservatism and Adult Attainment among Black and White Women.” *Social Forces* 83:555-579.

Glenn, Norval D. and Ruth Hyland. 1967. “Religious Preference and Worldly Success: Some Evidence from National Surveys.” *American Sociological Review* 32(1):73-85.

Greeley, Andrew. “The Protestant Ethic: Time for a Moratorium.” *Sociology of Religion* 25.1 (1964): 20-33.

Hadden, Jeffrey K.1987. “Toward Desacralizing Secularization Theory.” *Social Forces* 65(3):587-611.

Healy, Kieran. 2015. “Fuck nuance.” Paper presented at the *meetings of the American Sociological Association*.

Iannaccone, Laurence R. 1998. “Introduction to the Economics of Religion.” *Journal of Economic Literature* 36.1465-1495.

Keister, Lisa A. 2011. *Faith and Money: How Religion Contributes to Wealth and Poverty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keister, Lisa A. and Darren E. Sherkat 2014. *Religion and Inequality in America: Research and Theory on Religion’s Role in Stratification.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lehrer, Evelyn. 2009. *Religion, Economics and Demography: The Effects of Religion on Education, Work, and the Family*. New York: Routledge.

McAdam, Doug. 1999. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency.* 2nd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McCarthy, John, and Mayer Zald. 1977. “Resource Mobilization and Social Movements.” *American Journal of Sociology* 82:1212-1241.

Morris, Aldon D. 1986. *Origins of the Civil Rights Movement*. Detroit: Free Press.

Neibuhr, H. Reinhold. 1929. *The Social Sources of Denominationalism.* New York: Holt.

Poulson, Stephen C., and Colin Campbell. 2010. "Isomorphism, Institutional Parochialism, and the Sociology of Religion." *The American Sociologist* 41: 31-47.

Reed Jr., Myer S.1974. "The Sociology of the Sociology of Religion: A Report on Research in Progress." *Review of Religious Research* 15(3):157-167.

______. 1975. "Differentiation and development in a scientific specialty: the sociology of religion in the United States from 1895 to 1970. PhD Dissertation." Tulane University.

______. 1981 "An Alliance for Progress: The Early Years of the Sociology of Religion in the United States." *Sociological Analysis* 42(1):27-46.

______. 1982 "After the Alliance: The Sociology of Religion in the United States from 1925 to 1949." *Sociological Analysis* 43(3):189-204.

Sherkat, Darren E. 1997. "Embedding Religious Choices: Integrating Preferences and Social Constraints into Rational Choice Theories of Religious Behavior." In Lawrence Young (ed.) *Rational Choice Theory and Religion: Summary and Assessment*. Routledge Press. Pp. 66-86.

Sherkat, Darren E. 2014. *Changing Faith: The Dynamics and Consequences of Americans' Shifting Religious Identities.* New York: New York University Press.

Sherkat, Darren E. and Christopher G. Ellison. 1999. "Recent Developments and Current Controversies in the Sociology of Religion." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:363-394.

Sherkat, Darren E., and John Wilson. 1995. "Preferences, Constraints, and Choices in Religious Markets: An Examination of Religious Switching and Apostasy." *Social Forces* 73:993-1026.

Smith, Christian. 2000. *Christian America? What Evangelicals Really Want*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51(4): 464–481.

Stark, Rodney. 1974. "Reactions to Reed." *Review of Religious Research*. 15(3):168-169.

______.1971. "After the Resurrection: Some Apprehensions about Contemporary Social Science Studies of Religion." Unpublished paper. University of California, Berkeley.

Stark, Rodney, and William Sims Bainbridge. 1985. *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival, and Cult Formation.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. .

______. 1987. *A Theory of Religion*. Toronto: Lang.

Steensland, Brian, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces* 79(1): 291-318.

Warner, R. Stephen. 1993. "Work in Progress Toward a New Paradigm for the Sociological Study of Religion in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(5):1044-1093

Weber, Max. [1904-05] 2008. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. BN Publishing.

______. [1922] 1993. *The Sociology of Religion*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Wilde, Melissa, and Lindsay Glassman. 2016. "How Complex Religion Can Improve Our Understanding of American Politics." *Annual Review of Sociology* 42:407-425.

Wuthnow, Robert. 2015. *Inventing American Religion: Polls, Surveys, and the Tenuous Question for a Nation's Faith.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wuthnow, Robert, and John Hyde Evans. 2002. *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-based Activism and the Public Role of Mainline Protestantism*. Berkeley, CA:University of California Press.

Zald, Mayer N. 1982. "Theological Crucibles: Social Movements in and of Religion." *Review of Religious Research*. 4:317-336.

Our approach for classifying religious groups builds on longstanding classification standards (eg. Roof and McKinney 1987; Kluegel 1980; Johnson 1980). We include the exact GSS punch code for each group relevant to current religious identification (RELIG, DENOM, OTHER), and note that these codes are also applicable for the respective variables tapping religious identification at 16, or spouses' identification, and parents' identification. Appendix 1 places each group into their appropriate identification category. Appendix 2 provides SPSS syntax for clustering GSS religious traditions and denominations into identification categories.

Grouping Protestant Denominations

Religious groups should be divided as distinctly as the data allow (Sherkat 2014), and in the cumulative GSS a sizeable number of respondents can be found even for relatively small denominations. We group Christian religious identifications on a continuum ranging from churches with universalistic orientations, to sects holding exclusivist orientations. This matches the longstanding literature on the sect-church-sect cycle, as well as the historical development of American religious groups (Finke and Stark 1992; Stark and Bainbridge 1985).

Liberal Protestants are primarily constituted by Presbyterians and members of the United Church of Christ (historically known as Congregationalists). These denominations hold inclusive theological orientations, interpret scripture contextually, and have common Calvinist roots (Sherkat 2014). Added two these are smaller universalistic Christian groups like the Quakers and Friends churches, Christadelphians, Unity, and the United Church of Canada. Episcopalians are similar to liberal Protestants in many regards, but they also have a history tied more closely to Catholicism in terms of theology, hierarchical polity, and ritual. Episcopalians are also segmented in terms of ethnicity and origin in the British Empire, while other liberal Protestant groups emerged from Continental Europe or Scotland. Of course, for many if not most sociological questions, Episcopalians are rightly collapsed with other Liberal Protestants

Moderate Protestants constitute a mid-point in the church-sect spectrum and include Methodists, Reformed denominations, and Northern and American

Baptists. Lutherans also fall in this middle section but are distinctive from other moderate Protestants in that Lutheran identification is usually coupled with Northern European ancestry, and a distinctive liturgy and polity (Finke and Stark 1995; Sherkat 2014).

We separate Baptists from other sectarian Protestants because of their distinctive heritage and persistence as a denominational identity similar to Catholic identity in scope and salience. Most of the Baptists identify as Southern Baptists, though substantial numbers identify with Free Will Baptists, or a litany of independent, fundamentalist groups. We also include "other Baptists" (denom=15) and "Baptist, don't know which" (denom=18).

A diverse set of sectarian denominations populate our sectarian Protestant category. Close to half of these identify with a Pentecostal denomination (Assembly of God, Nazarene, Church of God in Christ, Apostolic, and other Pentecostals) with the rest affiliating with groups in the Anabaptist tradition (Amish, Mennonites, and Brethren), Jehovah's Witnesses, and other fundamentalist denominations (such as the Churches of Christ). While Pentecostals and other sectarians share exclusivist theological outlooks, they differ considerably in regards to styles of worship, organizational structure, and evangelism (Sherkat 2014).

Historically black Protestant churches range across the church-sect spectrum, and the effect of race should not be conflated with the effect of religious identification (Sherkat 2001). Thus, while black Protestant churches certainly share the context of racial oppression, it is not appropriate to classify these groups together when measuring the effect of religious identification—particularly when some survey respondents are assumed to attend historically black Protestant churches simply because they are both Protestant and black.

Beyond these Protestant groups are Mormons, Catholics (who we lump together with the much smaller Orthodox Christians), Jews, a catch-all category for other religious traditions, and people who reject religious identification (religious 'nones'). National survey data rarely allow for analysis of the smallest religious traditions in the United States (e.g., Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, etc.) and even Mormons and Jews must sometimes be collapsed with these traditions---though Mormons may fit more with sectarian Protestants for studies of some social values and behaviors. Large and growing proportions of Americans reject religious identification, and they are distinctive on many sociological issues.

Classification differences from Steensland et al.:

First, Steensland et al. (2000) assert that people who do not claim a specific religious identification yet report being Protestant or Christian should be coded as "evangelicals" if they attend religious services once a month or more. In their update of the dominant scheme Woodberry et al. (2012:68-69) suggest that these respondents may be divided based on belief in god or life after death, or frequency of prayer or religious service attendance. Additionally, they now call for these respondents who do not make the cut as evangelicals to be placed in a "nominal religion category" (Woodberry et al. 2012:69). Considering that from 2000 to 2014 over ten percent of GSS respondents (2239 total) were Protestants without specific denominations or claimed "interdenominational" as their religion, this is no small issue. Conflating dimensions of religious identification with religious participation or belief is obfuscating and inappropriate. This strategy artificially increases the religiosity of the evangelical group by adding respondents to the group on the basis of their behaviors and beliefs. Instead, we place these respondents in a catch-all "other Protestant" category (relig=11, 13; denom=70, 98, 99; other=998, 999).

A second point of departure is the treatment of respondents who can identify their general denomination (e.g., Lutheran, Presbyterian, Methodist, etc.), but not the specific organization. We find it problematic that "other" Presbyterians (denom=42) are included with evangelicals by Steensland et al. (2000). Similarly, "other" Methodists (denom=23) are included with evangelicals, as are "other" Lutherans (denom=34). Here, we should note a point of confusion between the original article (Steensland et al. 2000) and the same authors' update a decade later (Woodberry et al. 2012). In the update, Woodberry et al. (2012:68) state that "…"other" or "just a" Methodist, Lutheran, or Presbyterian responses were coded "mainline,"" but the original article shows these "others" listed with evangelicals and the "don't knows" listed with mainliners (Steensland et al. 2000:314-316). A recently created public repository of the Reltrad coding scheme documented on the website of the Southern Baptist Convention's LifeWay Research, places these "others" with evangelicals and "don't knows" with mainline Protestants (Stetzer and Burge 2015), as shown in the original article (Steensland et al. 2000).

In their update, Woodberry et al. (2012:68) advocate the use of religious practices or beliefs as qualifications for inclusion in the evangelical or mainline category and placing these "other" and "don't know which" Presbyterians, Methodists, and Lutherans in a "nominal religious" category if they do not participate frequently. As is the case with "other Protestants," using religious practices or beliefs to qualify inclusion for religious identification categories serves

to artificially limit variation within the category and conflate identification with participation and belief.

Finally, we address the placement of a few smaller groups by Steensland et al. (2000). Specifically, they do not include Jehovah's Witnesses (other=58) or Unity (Church) (other=82, 92) members with Protestants, instead placing them in the "other religion" group. Each of these denominations are clearly Protestant. Jehovah's Witnesses are a classic sect, holding exclusivist orientations towards theological interpretations. Conversely, Unity teaches universalistic orientations towards theological understanding and contextual interpretations of scripture and should therefore be included with liberal Protestants.

Additional References not included in main paper

Johnson, Robert Alan. 1980. *Religious Assortative Marriage in the United States*. New York. Academic Press.

Kluegel, James R. 1980. "Denominational Mobility: Current Patterns and Recent Trends." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*,19: 26-39.

Sherkat, Darren E. 1999. "Tracking the "Other": Dynamics and Composition of "Other" Religions in the General Social Survey, 1973-1996." *Journal for the Social Scientific Study of Religion* 38(4):551-560.

______. 2001. "Investigating the Sect-Church-Sect Cycle: Cohort Specific Attendance Differences across African American Denominations." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40:221-233.

Stetzer, Ed, and Ryan P. Burge. 2015. "Reltrad Coding Problems and a New Repository." *Politics and Religion* 9(1):187-190.

Woodberry, Robert D., Jerry Z. Park, Lyman A. Kellstedt, Mark D. Regnerus, and Brian Steensland. 2012. "The Measure of American Religious Traditions: Theoretical and Measurement Considerations." *Social Forces* 91(1):65-73.

Appendix 1. GSS Religious Identification

Code	RELIG	DENOM	OTHER	Identification code
Liberal Protestant				**1**
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A	1	40		1
United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A	1	41		1
Other Presbyterian Churches	1	42		1
Presbyterian, merged	1	43		1
Presbyterian, don't know which	1	48		1
Christ Church Unity	1	60	29	1
Christadelphians	1	60	30	1
Congregationalist, 1st Congreg	1	60	40	1
Friends	1	60	54	1
Quaker	1	60	70	1
Reformed United Church of Christ	1	60	72	1
United Church of Christ	1	60	81	1
United Church, Unity Church	1	60	82	1
Unity	1	60	95	1
Federated Church	1	60	98	1
United Church of Canada	1	60	119	1
Unity School of Christianity	1	60	142	1

Friends in Christ	1	60	160	1
Metropolitan Community	1	60	188	1
Episcopal Church	1	50		**2**
Moderate Protestants				**3**
American Baptist Assoc.	1	10		3
American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A	1	11		3
National Baptist Convention of America	1	12		3
National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc	1	13		3
African Methodist Episcopal Church	1	20		3
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church	1	21		3
United Methodist Church	1	22		3
Other Methodist Churches	1	23		3
Methodist, Don't know which	1	28		3
Hungarian Reformed	1	60	1	3
Moravian	1	60	8	3
African Methodist	1	60	15	3
Baptist (Northern)	1	60	19	3
Christian Disciples	1	60	25	3
Christian Reform	1	60	32	3

Covenant	1	60	42	3
Dutch Reform	1	60	43	3
Disciples of Christ	1	60	44	3
Evangelical Reformed	1	60	46	3
First Christian Disciples of Christ	1	60	49	3
First Reformed	1	60	50	3
First Christian	1	60	51	3
Reformed	1	60	71	3
Reformed Church of Christ	1	60	73	3
Swedish Mission	1	60	94	3
American Reform	1	60	99	3
Laotian Christian	1	60	146	3
Schwenkfelder	1	60	148	3
Zwinglian	1	60	150	3
National Progressive Baptist	1	60	186	3
Lutherans				**4**
American Lutheran Church	1	30		4
Lutheran Church in America	1	31		4
Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod	1	32		4
Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod	1	33		4
Other Lutheran Churches	1	34		4

Evangelical Lutheran	1	35		4
Lutheran Don't know which	1	38		4
Latvian Lutheran	1	60	105	4
Baptist				**5**
Southern Baptist Convention	1	14		5
Other Baptist Churches	1	15		5
Baptist, Don't know which	1	18		5
Missionary Baptist	1	60	93	5
Primitive Baptist	1	60	133	5
Grace Independent Baptist Church	1	60	197	5
Sectarian Protestant				**6**
Evangelical Congregational	1	60	2	6
Ind Bible, Bible, Bible Fellowship	1	60	3	6
Church of Prophecy	1	60	5	6
New Testament Christian	1	60	6	6
Church of God, Saint & Christ	1	60	7	6
Christian & Missionary Alliance	1	60	9	6
Advent Christian	1	60	10	6
Assembly of God	1	60	12	6
Free Methodist	1	60	13	6

Apostolic Faith	1	60	14	6
Free Will Baptist	1	60	16	6
Eden Evangelist	1	60	17	6
Holiness (Nazarene)	1	60	18	6
Brethren Church, Brethren	1	60	20	6
Witness Holiness	1	60	21	6
Brethren, Plymouth	1	60	22	6
United Brethren, United Brethren in Christ	1	60	23	6
Independent	1	60	24	6
Christ in Christian Union	1	60	26	6
Open Bible	1	60	27	6
Christian; Central Christian	1 and 5	60	31	6
Christian Scientist	1	60	33	6
Church of Christ, Evangelical	1	60	34	6
Church of Christ	1	60	35	6
Churches of God (Except with Christ and Holiness)	1	60	36	6
Church of God in Christ	1	60	37	6
Church of God in Christ Holiness	1	60	38	6
Church of the Living God	1	60	39	6
Community Church	1	60	41	6
Evangelical, Evangelist	1	60	45	6
Evangelist Free Church	1	60	47	6

First Church	1	60	48	6
Full Gospel	1	60	52	6
Four Square Gospel	1 and 5	60	53	6
Holy Roller	1	60	55	6
Holiness; Church of Holiness	1	60	56	6
Pilgrim Holiness	1	60	57	6
Jehovah's Witnesses	1 and 5	60	58	6
Mennonite	1	60	63	6
Nazarene	1	60	65	6
Pentecostal Assembly of God	1	60	66	6
Pentecostal Church of God	1	60	67	6
Pentecostal	1 and 11	60	68	6
Pentecostal Holiness, Holiness Pentecostal	1	60	69	6
Salvation Army	1	60	76	6
7th Day Adventist	1 and 5	60	77	6
Sanctified, Sanctification	1	60	78	6
United Holiness	1	60	79	6
Wesleyan	1	60	83	6
Wesleyan Methodist--Pilgrim	1	60	84	6
Zion Union	1	60	85	6
Zion Union Apostolic	1	60	86	6
Zion Union Apostolic--Reformed	1	60	87	6
Disciples of God	1	60	88	6

Grace Reformed	1	60	89	6
Holiness Church of God	1	60	90	6
Evangelical Covenant	1	60	91	6
Mission Covenant	1	60	92	6
United Church of Christianity	1	60	96	6
Other Fundamentalist	1 and 5	60	97	6
Grace Brethren	1	60	100	6
Christ in God	1	60	101	6
Charismatic	1	60	102	6
Pentecostal Apostolic	1	60	103	6
House of Prayer	1	60	104	6
Triumph Church of God	1	60	106	6
Apostolic Christian	1	60	107	6
Christ Cathedral of Truth	1	60	108	6
Bible Missionary	1	60	109	6
Calvary Bible	1	60	110	6
Amish	1	60	111	6
Evangelical Methodist	1	60	112	6
Worldwide Church of God	1	60	113	6
Mennonite Brethren	1	60	115	6
Church of the First Born	1	60	116	6
Missionary Church	1	60	117	6
The Way Ministry	1	60	118	6
Evangelical United Brethren	1	60	120	6

The Church of God of Prophecy	1	60	121	6
Chapel of Faith	1	60	122	6
Faith Gospel Tabernacle	1	60	124	6
Christian Calvary Chapel	1	60	125	6
Church of Daniel's Band	1	60	127	6
Christian Tabernacle	1	60	128	6
Living Word	1	60	129	6
True Light Church of Christ	1	60	130	6
Macedonia	1	60	131	6
Brother of Christ	1	60	132	6
Independent Fundamental Church of America	1	60	134	6
Chinese Gospel Church	1	60	135	6
New Song	1	60	137	6
Apostolic Church	1	60	138	6
Faith Christian	1	60	139	6
People's Church	1	60	140	6
New Birth Christian	1	60	141	6
Spirit of Christ	1	60	144	6
Church of Jesus Christ of the Restoration	1	60	145	6
World Overcomer Outreach Ministry	1	60	151	6
Course in Miracles	1	60	152	6
Unity of the Brethren	1	60	153	6

Spirit Filled	1	60	154	6
Christian Union	1	60	155	6
Church of Living Christ	1	60	156	6
New Hope Christian Fellowship	1	60	158	6
Community Christian Fellowship	1	60	159	6
United Christian	1	60	166	6
Sanctuary	1	60	167	6
Rain on Us Deliverance Ministries	1	60	168	6
The Word Church	1	60	169	6
Cornerstone Church	1	60	170	6
Life Sanctuary	1	60	171	6
Word of Faith Church	1	60	172	6
Harvest Church	1	60	173	6
Shephard's Chapel	1	60	174	6
Greater New Testament Church	1	60	175	6
Vineyard Church	1	60	176	6
Real Life Ministries	1	60	177	6
Cathedral of Joy	1	60	178	6
Great Faith Ministries	1	60	179	6
Shield of Faith Ministries	1	60	180	6
Born Again	1	60	181	6
Alliance	1	60	182	6

Church of God of Israel	1	60	184	6
Journeys	1	60	185	6
New Apostolic	1	60	187	6
Family Life Church	1	60	189	6
Faith Fellowship	1	60	190	6
Faith Covenant	1	60	191	6
Free Spirit Ministry	1	60	193	6
The Ark Church	1	60	195	6
Empowerment Temple	1	60	196	6
*New Life	1	60	198	6
Pathways Christian Church	1	60	201	6
Universal Church of the Kingdom of God	1	60	204	6
Christian, no group identified				**7**
Christian (since 1998)	11			7
Inter-Nondenominational (since 1998)	13			7
No denomination given or non-denominational church	1 and 11	70		7
Don't know	1 and 11	98		7
No Answer	1 and 11	99		7
Don't know	1	60	998	7
No Answer	1 and 11	60	999	7

Mormons				**8**
LDS	1	60	59	8
LDS--Mormon	1	60	60	8
LDS--Reorganized	1	60	61	8
LDS--Jesus Christ; Church of Jesus LDS	1	60	62	8
Mormon	1	60	64	8
Community of Christ	1	60	157	8
Reformed Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints	1	60	162	8
Catholic and Orthodox Christian				**9**
Catholic	2			9
Orthodox Christian	10			9
Christian Catholic	1	60	28	9
Polish National Church	1	60	123	9
Carmelite	1	60	126	9
Assyrian Evangelist Church	1	60	143	9
Polish Catholic	1	60	149	9
Jacobite Apostolic	1	60	183	9
Jacobite Syrian Christian Church	1	60	194	9
Jews	3			**10**

Other Religions				**11**
Other	5			11
Buddhism (since 1998)	6			11
Hinduism (since 1998)	7			11
Other Eastern (since 1998)	8			11
Muslim/Islam (since 1998)	9			11
Native American (since 1998)	12			11
Spiritualist	1	60	11	11
Religious Science	1	60	74	11
Mind Science	1	60	75	11
Unitarian, Universalist	1	60	80	11
Church Universal and Triumphant	1	60	114	11
New Age Spirituality	1	60	136	11
Hawaiian Ohana	1	60	161	11
Swedenborgian/Churches of the New Jerusalem	1	60	163	11
Divine Science	1	60	164	11
New Thought	1	60	192	11
No Religious Identification				**12**
None	4			12
Missing Identifications	98 and 99			

*New Life is listed as other=200 in the 2015 GSS codebook (see Appendix K in codebook) but is actually coded as other=198.

Appendix 2: Religious Identification Syntax for SPSS

***Restore all missing values for relig, denom, and other.

compute rv=0.

execute.

***liberal Protestants.**

IF (DENOM GE 40 AND DENOM LE 49 OR OTHER EQ 29 OR OTHER EQ 30 OR OTHER EQ 40 OR OTHER EQ 54 OR OTHER EQ 70 OR OTHER EQ 72

OR OTHER EQ 81 OR OTHER EQ 82 OR OTHER EQ 82 OR OTHER EQ 95 OR OTHER EQ 98 OR OTHER EQ 119 OR OTHER EQ 142 OR OTHER EQ 160 OR OTHER EQ 188)

RV=1.

***Episcopalians.**

IF (DENOM=50)

RV=2.

***moderate Protestants.**

IF DENOM=10 OR DENOM=11 OR DENOM=12 OR DENOM=13 OR DENOM=20 OR DENOM=21 OR DENOM=22 OR DENOM=23 OR DENOM=28

OR OTHER=1 OR OTHER=8 OR OTHER=15 OR OTHER=19 OR OTHER=25 OR OTHER=32 OR OTHER=42 OR OTHER=43 OR OTHER=44 OR OTHER EQ 46 OR OTHER=49

OR OTHER=50 OR OTHER=51 OR OTHER=71 OR OTHER=73 OR OTHER=94 OR OTHER=99 OR OTHER=146 OR OTHER EQ 148 OR OTHER EQ 150 OR OTHER EQ 186

RV=3.

***Lutherans.**

IF (DENOM GE 30 AND DENOM LE 38 OR OTHER EQ 105)

RV=4.

***Baptists.**

IF (DENOM GE 14 AND DENOM LE 18) OR OTHER EQ 93 OR OTHER EQ 133 OR OTHER EQ 197

RV=5.

***sectarian Protestants.**

*these initial variables pull out sectarians codes relig=11 (christian) or relig=5 (other), but also have valid denom codes.

compute xpent=0.

execute.

if relig=11 and other=68 xpent=1.

execute.

compute xcentchrist=0.

execute.

if relig=5 and other=31 xcentchrist=1.

execute.

compute xfsg=0.

execute.

if relig=5 and other=53 xfsg=1.

execute.

```
compute xjw=0.

execute.

if relig=5 and other=58 xjw=1.

execute.


compute xsda=0.

execute.

if relig=5 and other=77 xsda=1.

execute.


compute xofund=0.

execute.

if relig=5 and other=97 xofund=1.

execute.


IF (OTHER EQ 2 OR OTHER EQ 3 OR OTHER EQ 5 OR OTHER EQ 6 OR OTHER EQ 7 OR OTHER EQ 9

  OR OTHER EQ 10 OR OTHER EQ 12 OR OTHER EQ 13 OR OTHER EQ 14 OR OTHER EQ 16 OR OTHER EQ 17 OR OTHER EQ 18

  OR OTHER EQ 20 OR OTHER EQ 21 OR OTHER EQ 22 OR OTHER EQ 23 OR OTHER EQ 24 OR OTHER EQ 26 OR OTHER EQ 27

  OR OTHER EQ 31 OR OTHER EQ 33 OR OTHER EQ 34 OR OTHER EQ 35 OR OTHER EQ 36 OR OTHER EQ 37 OR OTHER EQ 38 OR OTHER EQ 39

  OR OTHER EQ 41 OR OTHER EQ 45 OR OTHER EQ 47 OR OTHER EQ 48

  OR OTHER EQ 52 OR OTHER EQ 53 OR OTHER EQ 55 OR OTHER EQ 56 OR OTHER EQ 57 OR OTHER EQ 58

  OR OTHER EQ 63 OR OTHER EQ 65 OR OTHER EQ 66 OR OTHER EQ 67 OR OTHER EQ 68 OR OTHER EQ 69

  OR OTHER EQ 76 OR OTHER EQ 77 OR OTHER EQ 78 OR OTHER EQ 79
```

OR OTHER EQ 83 OR OTHER EQ 84 OR OTHER EQ 85 OR OTHER EQ 86 OR OTHER EQ 87 OR OTHER EQ 88 OR OTHER EQ 89

OR OTHER EQ 90 OR OTHER EQ 91 OR OTHER EQ 92 OR OTHER EQ 96 OR OTHER EQ 97

OR OTHER EQ 100 OR OTHER EQ 101 OR OTHER EQ 102 OR OTHER EQ 103 OR OTHER EQ 104 OR OTHER EQ 106 OR OTHER EQ 107 OR OTHER EQ 108 OR OTHER EQ 109

OR OTHER EQ 110 OR OTHER EQ 111 OR OTHER EQ 112 OR OTHER EQ 113 OR OTHER EQ 115 OR OTHER EQ 116 OR OTHER EQ 117 OR OTHER EQ 118

OR OTHER EQ 120 OR OTHER EQ 121 OR OTHER EQ 122 OR OTHER EQ 124 OR OTHER EQ 125 OR OTHER EQ 127 OR OTHER EQ 128 OR OTHER EQ 129

OR OTHER EQ 130 OR OTHER EQ 131 OR OTHER EQ 132 OR OTHER EQ 134 OR OTHER EQ 135 OR OTHER EQ 137 OR OTHER EQ 138 OR OTHER EQ 139

OR OTHER EQ 140 OR OTHER EQ 141 OR OTHER EQ 144 OR OTHER EQ 145

OR OTHER EQ 151 OR OTHER EQ 152 OR OTHER EQ 153 OR OTHER EQ 154 OR OTHER EQ 155 OR OTHER EQ 156 OR OTHER EQ 158 OR OTHER EQ 159

OR OTHER EQ 166 OR OTHER EQ 167 OR OTHER EQ 168 OR OTHER EQ 169

OR OTHER EQ 170 OR OTHER EQ 171 OR OTHER EQ 172 OR OTHER EQ 173 OR OTHER EQ 174 OR OTHER EQ 175 OR OTHER EQ 176 OR OTHER EQ 177 OR OTHER EQ 178 OR OTHER EQ 179

OR OTHER EQ 180 OR OTHER EQ 181 OR OTHER EQ 182 OR OTHER EQ 184 OR OTHER EQ 185 OR OTHER EQ 187 OR OTHER EQ 189

OR OTHER EQ 190 OR OTHER EQ 191 OR OTHER EQ 193 OR OTHER EQ 195 OR OTHER EQ 196 OR OTHER EQ 198 OR OTHER EQ 201 OR OTHER EQ 204

OR XPENT=1 OR xcentchrist=1 OR xfsg=1 OR xjw=1 OR xsda=1 OR xofund=1)

RV=6.

***Christian, no group identified.**

compute zchrist=0.

if relig=11 and xpent ne 1 zchrist=1.

IF (RELIG EQ 13 OR DENOM EQ 70 OR DENOM EQ 98 OR DENOM EQ 99 OR OTHER EQ 998 OR OTHER EQ 999

or zchrist=1)

RV=7.

***Mormons.**

IF (OTHER GE 59 AND OTHER LE 62) OR OTHER EQ 64 OR OTHER EQ 157 OR OTHER EQ 162

RV=8.

***Catholics and Orthodox Protestants.**

IF (RELIG EQ 2 OR RELIG=10 OR OTHER EQ 28 OR OTHER=123 OR OTHER=126 OR OTHER EQ 143 OR OTHER EQ 149 OR OTHER EQ 183 OR OTHER EQ 194)

RV=9.

***Jews.**

IF (RELIG EQ 3)

RV=10.

***other religions.**

compute zother=0.

if (relig=5 and XPENT ne 1 and xcentchrist ne 1 and xfsg ne 1 and xjw ne 1 and xsda ne 1 and xofund ne 1) zother=1.

IF (RELIG=6 OR RELIG EQ 7 OR RELIG EQ 8 OR RELIG EQ 9 OR RELIG EQ 12 OR OTHER EQ 11 OR OTHER EQ 74 OR OTHER EQ 75

OR OTHER EQ 80 OR OTHER EQ 114 OR OTHER EQ 136 OR OTHER EQ 161 OR OTHER=163 OR OTHER EQ 164 OR OTHER EQ 192

OR ZOTHER=1)

RV=11.

***No religious identification.**

IF RELIG EQ 4 RV=12.

EXECUTE.

if denom=99 and relig=99 rv=99.

execute.

if relig=98 rv=98.

missing values rv (0, 98, 99).

execute.

value lables RV 1 'liberal Protestants' 2 'Episcopalians' 3 'moderate Protestants' 4 'Lutherans' 5 'Baptists' 6 'sectarian Protestants' 7 'Christian, no group identified' 8 'Mormons'

9 'Catholics and Orthodox Protestants' 10 'Jews' 11 'other religion' 12 'no identifica

Table 1. Religious Identifications in the General Social Survey: 2000-2014

	% Biblical Literalist[a]	% Weekly Attendance[b]	% Homosexuality Always Wrong[c]	% Abortion for any Reason[d]	% Distinct Gender Roles[e]	% College Degree[f]	Mean Income[g]	Percent of all Respondents
<u>Protestant Identifications</u>								
Sectarian Protestant	**62.2**	**52.4**	**79.4**	***22.3***	**51.5**	***4.3***	$38,529.63	8.3
Pentecostals[h]	**69.4**	**55.5**	**82.1**	***18.2***	**53.2**	***3.3***	$36,508.16	3.3
Other Sects	**57.8**	**50.3**	**77.6**	***25.1***	**50.4**	***5.0***	$39,916.28	5.0
Baptist	**58.8**	**30.6**	**73.9**	***29.5***	**43.5**	***3.6***	$39,806.89	15.2
Christian, no group given	**42.1**	**31.9**	**60.7**	39.8	**39.1**	8.6	$48,016.47	10.4
Moderate Protestant	**38.4**	**27.6**	**60.8**	41.2	36.6	9.5	$49,273.63	9.5
Lutheran	31.3	***21.6***	49.9	**48.3**	***28.6***	8.4	$55,639.36	4.3
MO and WI Synods	**42.7**	**32.6**	58.0	38.9	35.9	8.5	$55,934.35	1.3
All Other Lutherans	***26.3***	***16.7***	46.0	**52.8**	***25.6***	8.3	$55,503.98	3.0
Liberal Protestant	***22.7***	**29.8**	***44.9***	44.4	***30.3***	**19.7**	$64,869.65	3.5
Episcopalian	***15.0***	23.5	***34.6***	**55.7**	***25.5***	**20.7**	$71,513.23	1.8
<u>Other Religious Traditions and Christian Identifications</u>								
Catholic and Orthodox	***24.3***	**26.8**	***44.8***	***36.8***	36.6	***8.5***	$52,893.32	24.3
Catholic	***24.2***	**26.9**	***44.8***	***36.4***	36.7	***8.3***	$52,796.12	23.9
Orthodox	30.5	19.1	46.5	**59.6**	33.3	**20.0**	$58,010.01	0.4
Mormon	38.5	**56.2**	**76.0**	***15.0***	**62.5**	8.8	$52,885.35	1.2
Jewish	***10.8***	***8.8***	***16.1***	**75.1**	30.1	**31.4**	$80,478.86	1.8

Table 1 continued.

Other Religion (Total)	***12.3***	***16.0***	***28.6***	**63.7**	***30.1***	**19.8**	$54,624.57	3.2
Muslim	23.4	**37.6**	**76.9**	32.7	**63.5**	**16.3**	$42,082.45	0.5
Buddhist	***2.6***	***8.9***	***17.1***	**71.4**	***21.5***	**19.0**	$61,520.84	0.7
Hindu	***8.2***	***13.0***	35.3	**64.7**	**55.3**	**42.3**	$70,677.94	0.3
Unitarian	***6.4***	16.7	***6.7***	**67.7**	***6.7***	**36.7**	$71,081.02	0.3
All Others[i]	***16.3***	***12.6***	***22.6***	**68.3**	***19.6***	**12.9**	$47,633.35	1.3
None	***10.4***	***2.1***	***23.4***	**64.4**	***22.5***	**11.9**	$50,353.98	16.5
Total	33.1	25.5	51.0	42.3	35.9	9.5	$49,787.58	100

Notes: Bold indicates more than expected under independence. Bold-italics indicates fewer than expected under independence.
a= Respondents indicating that the Bible is the actual word of god and is to be taken liberally, word for word (bible).
b= Respondents attending religious services every week or more than once a week (attend).
c= Respondents indicating that sexual relations between two adults of the same sex is always wrong (homosex).
d= Respondents supporting abortions if the woman wants it for any reason (abany).
e= Respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that it is much better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family (fefam).
f= Respondents with a bachelor's or graduate degree (degree).
g= (coninc)
h= Includes Assembly of God, Nazarene, Church of God in Christ, Apostolic, and Pentecostal (see Table 2).
i= All others includes Other (relig=5), Other Eastern (relig=8), and Native American (relig=12) religions, along with other smaller groups (see Table 2 in online supplement).

Table 1 continued.

Other Religion (Total)	***12.3***	***16.0***	***28.6***	**63.7**	***31.7***	**19.8**	$54,624.57	3.2
Muslim	23.4	**37.6**	**76.9**	32.7	**63.5**	**16.3**	42,082.45	0.5
Buddhist	***2.6***	***8.9***	***17.1***	**71.4**	***21.5***	**19.0**	61,520.84	0.7
Hindu	***8.2***	***13.0***	35.3	**64.7**	**55.3**	**42.3**	70,677.94	0.3
Unitarian	***6.4***	16.7	***6.7***	**67.7**	***6.7***	**36.7**	71,081.02	0.3
All Others[i]	***16.3***	***12.6***	***22.6***	**68.3**	***19.6***	**12.9**	47,633.35	1.3
None	***10.4***	***2.1***	***23.4***	**64.4**	***22.5***	**11.9**	$50,353.98	16.5
Total	33.1	25.5	51.0	42.3	35.9	9.5	$49,787.58	100

Notes: Bold indicates more than expected under independence. Bold-italics indicates fewer than expected under independence.
a= Respondents indicating that the Bible is the actual word of god and is to be taken liberally, word for word (bible).
b= Respondents attending religious services every week or more than once a week (attend).
c= Respondents indicating that sexual relations between two adults of the same sex is always wrong (homosex).
d= Respondents supporting abortions if the woman wants it for any reason (abany).
e= Respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that it is much better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family (fefam).
f= Respondents with a bachelor's or graduate degree (degree).
g= (coninc)
h= Includes Assembly of God, Nazarene, Church of God in Christ, Apostolic, and Pentecostal (see Table 2).
i= All others includes Other (relig=5), Other Eastern (relig=8), and Native American (relig=12) religions, along with other smaller groups (see Table 2 in online supplement).