

pressures placed on individuals by church congregations. It is essential to take into account the ecological context of churches in considering their member's participation. Urban churches and suburban churches will be affected by various issues, so while their members' participation may increase or decrease depending on church attendance, it will not have the same effect on a change in participating in politics (Martinson and Wilkening, 1987).

Churches are an essential part of organizing a constituency. Churches are civic associations in which citizens' values are mobilized and seen in the public sphere. Church membership increases voting, participation in political campaigns, such as demonstrations, boycotts and lobbies, and support for legislation. Religion impacts local government because these are the individuals who are more likely to participate in government at all levels.

Churches may be hurt by considerable government growth because of the restrictions on the separation of church and state (Wuthnow and Nass 1988). Religious structures act as a point of access in the American political system. Religious organizations such as churches act as training grounds for teaching basic democratic skills. Local issues are seen as more critical to church attenders when compared to national issues, due to the connection and sense of duty the organization teaches.

In examining religious traditions and church attendance, there is a difference in political party support and other demographics. Many aspects of their lives shape an individual's political ideology: family, socioeconomic status, and education, to name a few. Demographics such as race and income correlate with political support, so it is essential to include these demographics to see whether religious factors are still significant influences when these other issues are present.

Using data from the 2014 Pew Research Religious Landscape Survey, a multinomial regression was undertaken, using SPSS, to examine these other demographic influences on political party support. Details of the survey can be found in Appendix A. The prominent religious traditions included are Catholicism, Mainline Protestantism, Evangelical Protestantism, and Historical Black churches. The results set down in Table 1 show Evangelical Protestants are more inclined to support the Republican Party even when accounting for other demographics.

On the other hand, Historical Black Churches lean toward the Democrat Party even with the other demographics. High levels of church attendance correlate with identification with the Republican Party. Individuals who affiliate themselves with the Democrat Party or as Independent have low levels of attendance. These results support what is shown in the Pew Research chart (Figure 1) but give us more detail into who is supporting these parties and contradicts researchers who suggest that religion is insignificant once other demographics are taken into account, such as Jones-Correa and Leal (2001), McKenzie and Rouse (2008) Wong (2015). Each of these authors finds race to be a more prominent factor for individuals.

Independents do not align with either of the two major parties. The multinomial regression reveals a shared link between a person's political party preference, church attendance, and religious tradition. Ultimately the Pew data show that even when considering other demographic factors, religious factors and religiosity remain significantly influential in politics.

Table 1: Multinomial Regression-4 Religious Traditions

PARTY. In politics TODAY, do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, or Independent? ^A		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Republican	Intercept	-2.478	.138	323.942	1	.000			
	Race (White)	1.469	.081	325.503	1	.000	4.346	3.705	5.098
	Gender	.389	.073	28.545	1	.000	1.475	1.279	1.702
	Income	.358	.016	523.476	1	.000	1.431	1.388	1.475
	Education	.133	.020	44.469	1	.000	1.143	1.099	1.188
	Age	.077	.009	68.120	1	.000	1.080	1.060	1.100
	Attendance	.124	.023	28.422	1	.000	1.133	1.082	1.186
	Evangelical	1.156	.105	120.133	1	.000	3.177	2.584	3.907
	Mainline	.647	.114	32.227	1	.000	1.909	1.527	2.386
	Historical Black	.527	.193	7.419	1	.006	1.694	1.159	2.475
Catholic	.709	.103	47.212	1	.000	2.033	1.660	2.489	
Democrat	Intercept	-.051	.130	.157	1	.692			
	Race (White)	.055	.077	.503	1	.478	1.056	.908	1.229
	Gender	-.107	.072	2.248	1	.134	.898	.780	1.034
	Income	.319	.015	424.958	1	.000	1.376	1.335	1.418
	Education	.216	.020	121.508	1	.000	1.241	1.195	1.290
	Age	.118	.009	165.912	1	.000	1.126	1.105	1.146
	Attendance	-.103	.023	20.250	1	.000	.902	.863	.944
	Evangelical	-.204	.104	3.837	1	.050	.816	.665	1.000
	Mainline	-.083	.112	.558	1	.455	.920	.739	1.145
	Historical Black	1.445	.167	74.514	1	.000	4.240	3.055	5.886
Catholic	.078	.100	.614	1	.433	1.081	.889	1.315	
Independent	Intercept	.412	.128	10.423	1	.001			
	White	.614	.076	65.032	1	.000	1.848	1.592	2.145
	Gender	.498	.071	49.605	1	.000	1.646	1.433	1.890
	Income	.289	.015	356.077	1	.000	1.335	1.296	1.376

Education	.160	.019	68.109	1	.000	1.174	1.130	1.219
Age	.026	.009	8.286	1	.004	1.026	1.008	1.045
Attendance	-.064	.023	7.998	1	.005	.938	.898	.981
Evangelical	.114	.102	1.245	1	.264	1.120	.918	1.368
Mainline	-.087	.110	.619	1	.432	.917	.739	1.138
Historical Black	.054	.173	.099	1	.753	1.056	.753	1.482
Catholic	.061	.099	.383	1	.536	1.063	.876	1.290

CHAPTER 5

THE DENOMINATIONS

Does the finding that religiosity and religious tradition play an essential role in determining Americans' political preference extend to specific denominations, some with long histories in America and others that have evolved more recently? Church denominations have developed over time within the United States and have birthed new denominations with their own beliefs and practices. Examination of the evolution of these denominations may shed light on the differences in their political stances. Of particular interest is whether more recently branched denominations are the most politically active, and longer-established denominations are the most conservative. Denominational establishment and splits occurred in bursts accompanying economic hard times, the deflationary depressions that followed the Revolutionary War and in the 1840s, 1890s, and the period of enhanced social activism following World War 2 (Table 2).

Table 2: Establishment of Denominations		
Denomination	Year Established	Long-Wave Trough
Episcopal	1789	Period after American Revolution
Orthodox	1794	
African Methodist Episcopal	1816	
Mormon	1836	Period after Mexican American War
Seventh Day Adventist	1843	
Southern Baptist	1845	
Lutheran Church Missouri Synod	1847	
Jehovah's Witness	1870	
Church of God (Cleveland, TN)	1886	Period After Spanish American War
Church of God in Christ	1887	
National Baptist	1895	
Churches of Christ	1904	
Nazarene	1908	
Assemblies of God	1914	
American Baptist	1950	Period After World War II
United Church of Christ	1957	
United Methodist	1968	
Anglican	1968	
Presbyterian Church in America	1973	
Presbyterian Church USA	1974	
Evangelical Lutheran	1987	

The pattern of denominational branching has a deeper, precolonial history. Anglican churches originated in England and broke with Roman Catholicism during the 16th-century Reformation while retaining a hierarchical structure like the Roman Catholic Church. The Episcopal Church was established in 1789 to further the Anglican Church's work in the United States. Two churches, established respectively in 1968 and one in 2008, use the title Anglican rather than Episcopalian. It is not evident within the Pew data which specific church the term refers to, but "Anglican" is what the individuals have identified. Methodist Churches split from the Episcopal movement. The first Methodist groups were established during the economic distress of the 1760s, and the first church was established in 1784. In 1968, two groups merged to form the United Methodist Church, the largest Methodist denomination in the United States. African American members established the African Methodist Episcopalian Church in 1816 as their own denomination of the Methodist Episcopalian Church. The Church of the Nazarene is a Holiness church founded in 1908 by a former leader within the Methodist Episcopal Church. It is known as the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene. Later, the "Pentecostal" part of the name was dropped, so that it would not be confused with denominations that spoke in tongues.

Roger Williams founded the first Baptist church in Rhode Island during the 1630s. The first Baptist church in Philadelphia was founded in 1707. Over the next century, many Baptist denominations arose, but the most significant split occurred in the 1840s over slavery. The Southern Baptist convention split from the former Baptist church and established itself in 1845. In 1907, the Northern Baptist Convention was officially established; and the American Baptist Convention would follow in 1950 as a more liberal denomination, though renamed in 1972. Formed in 1816, the National Baptist Church was an African American Baptist Denomination

intended to serve the black population. Classified in the Baptist family, The Churches of Christ became a new denomination in 1904. These churches are distinctive for their rejection of the use of instrumental music in worship.

Contributing to this denominational diversity, founders established the first Presbyterian church in 1706. The Presbyterian Church in America was created in 1973 by conservative members who were dissatisfied with the more reformed elements of the church; in addition, and a merger of two Presbyterian churches in 1983 created the Presbyterian Church (USA). The first Catholic diocese was established in 1789 in Maryland, although a Catholic mission had existed earlier. Though the Roman Catholic Church is older than the Protestant Church, it arrived later than Protestantism in the United States and never split into many denominations. Most remain part of the Roman Catholic lineage within the United States. The second largest Lutheran denomination in the United States, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, was founded in 1847 by German immigrants in Missouri who did not like the reforms and merges within the Lutheran Church. The Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches was formed in 1976 by ministers and churches that withdrew from the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

Among more recent factions, the Church of God (Cleveland, TN) was founded in 1886 as a Holiness church that was first named the Christian Union. In 1907, the new church selected its current name after its congregation adopted a Pentecostal viewpoint. Other Pentecostal churches include The Church of God in Christ and the Assemblies of God. The Church of God in Christ was formed in 1897 in Mississippi and is the oldest and largest black Pentecostal body in the United States. Assemblies of God was established in 1914 as a non-denominational Pentecostal church to establish a more independent and evangelical denomination.

Table 3: Continued

Evangelical Lutheran	.078	.931	.007	1	.933	1.081	.174	6.701
Nazarene	.021	.675	.001	1	.975	1.022	.272	3.839
Assemblies of God	-.176	1.060	.028	1	.868	.839	.105	6.698
Presbyterian Church (USA)	-5.131	.785	42.712	1	.000	.006	.001	.028
Church of God in Christ	-1.565	1.565	1.000	1	.317	.209	.010	4.490
Churches of Christ	-.234	.900	.068	1	.795	.791	.136	4.617
Lutheran Church Missouri Synod	-.515	.273	3.563	1	.059	.598	.350	1.020
Presbyterian Church in America	.356	.654	.296	1	.586	1.427	.396	5.142
Church of God TN	-.478	.444	1.156	1	.282	.620	.260	1.482
Anglican	-.007	.880	.000	1	.994	.993	.177	5.574
Jehovah's Witness	31.624	505584.802	.000	1	1.000	54194618298414.100	.000	. ^b
Orthodox	-1.277	.268	22.748	1	.000	.279	.165	.471
Southern Baptist	-.174	.169	1.053	1	.305	.840	.603	1.171
American Baptist	-.212	.259	.673	1	.412	.809	.487	1.343
Seventh Day Adventist	-.950	.294	10.457	1	.001	.387	.218	.688
United Church of Christ	-.598	.643	.865	1	.352	.550	.156	1.938
Episcopal	-.232	.309	.564	1	.453	.793	.432	1.454

Table 4: Analysis of Denominational Preferences and Antipathy Toward Political Parties			
	Republican	Democrat	Independent
Preferences For	Mormon	National Baptists	
	Southern Baptist		
	American Baptist		
	Presbyterian Church of America		
	United Methodists		
Antipathy To		Mormon Southern Baptist Catholic Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod Church of God TN	Catholic Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod
No preferences	Orthodox Seventh Day Adventist Presbyterian Church (USA)	Orthodox Seventh Day Adventist Presbyterian Church (USA)	Orthodox Seventh Day Adventist Presbyterian Church (USA)

The multinomial regression reaffirms that those attending church are more likely to support Republicans while the non-attendees are more likely to align with Democrats or Independents. Table 4 illustrates the relationship between denominations and political attitudes, with the results showing significant coefficients. Six denominations have significant positive coefficients: five are Republican, and only one, the National Baptists, is Democrat. A polarization is evident within the coefficients. Negative coefficients in the table reveal five denominations to be strongly anti-Democrat and three to disavow Independents. Three denominations show no political leanings. The data reveal a clear pattern. Except for the

National Baptists, which is a Historical Black church that was, created as a haven for the minority community, new denominations appearing in each depression-era surge have been more conservative than their origin churches. This pattern suggests the attempt to isolate and maintain lifestyles during times of deflationary depression by turning to traditional values. In similar circumstances, those of the most liberal bent have surged into utopian communities located away from settled areas on the periphery, often following charismatic leaders (Berry 1992). While this study focuses on the aspects of economic depressions. Many researchers contend that culture changes play a role in splits in denominations (Wuthnow 2011). This observation leads to the following question: If strong political preferences exist at the denominational level, is this in part a function of church organization?

CHAPTER 6

THE MINISTERS

Do ministers play a role in the relationship between religiosity and political preference? Do denominational requirements in training help shape that role? This chapter presents what the research illustrates about two issues: first, the constraints put on religious leaders to help or hurt their political influence on their congregants which derive from church organizational structure; and second, the requirements for training and educating official leaders within the church denomination. The hypothesis suggests that churches with more formal training and hierarchical leadership structure give religious leaders less discretion to influence their congregations' members beyond the church's official stance. In exploring this hypothesis, the study examines churches as defined by different ways of organizing church leadership and the requirements for individuals to become leaders.

Structure

Researchers have previously classified leadership structure within church denominations. For example, much research relies on the World Christian Encyclopedia to describe the church's structure (Barrett 1982). Both Sullins (2004) and Bender (2016) use this centralization scale to classify church denominations. This approach classifies church as decentralized, moderately centralized, or most centralized.

Another research approach separates denominations into two categories: congregational and hierarchical (Takayama 1974). Churches with a congregational structure allow each church within the organization to operate separately from the others. While local churches may belong

to a larger organization, that organization does not control the training and hiring of leaders within each local congregation. Congregational churches would have more leeway in whom they choose as a leader. Local churches complete ordination, which means each church can decide who is qualified to be ordained and what the ordination process is. Allowing each church to choose its leader gives them the freedom to choose a leader equipped to represent them.

Many churches, by contrast, have hierarchical structures where the leadership is chosen in a top-down approach. These structures are implemented differently in each denomination, but the basic concept is that local churches do not have complete control in the hiring and choosing of leadership. Rather, the formal organization within the denomination exercises control. As an example, the Catholic Church is probably the most hierarchical of all the religious traditions. Once an individual completes seminary, a Bishop ordains a man into a Catholic ministry. After serving as a deacon for six months, that man can then be ordained into a diocesan as a priest to serve a parish. After this, the Catholic Church promotes a person through their hierarchy. For example, the pope appoints a person, which calls on advisors from that country to become a bishop or higher. The individuals at a parish do not get to choose the priest that will oversee that church. The Catholic Church also controls much of what is heard within a parish because the Bible readings on a given day are the same throughout the world (Filteau 2010). As noted by Audi (2020), “Some religions are, to be sure, strongly hierarchical in their authority structure; but even those can encourage or require a measure of partial or local governance” (Audi 2020 p.7).

Table 5: Denominational Leadership		
	Sullins Scale	Takayama Scale
Mormon	Most Centralized	Hierarchical
Nazarene	Decentralized	Congregational
Southern Baptist	Moderately Centralized	Congregational
Lutheran Church Missouri Synod	Moderately Centralized	Congregational
Assemblies of God	Decentralized	Congregational
Presbyterian Church in America	Decentralized	Hierarchical
Church of God TN	Decentralized	Hierarchical*
Anglican	Most Centralized*	Hierarchical*
United Methodist	Moderately Centralized	Hierarchical
Churches of Christ	Moderately Centralized	Congregational
American Baptist	Moderately Centralized	Congregational*
Presbyterian Church (USA)	Moderately Centralized	Hierarchical
Evangelical Lutheran	Moderately Centralized*	Hierarchical*
Catholic	Most Centralized	Hierarchical
Episcopal	Most Centralized	Hierarchical
Seventh Day Adventist	Moderately Centralized	Hierarchical
Orthodox	Decentralized*	Congregational*
Jehovah's Witness	Most Centralized*	Hierarchical*
United Church of Christ	Moderately Centralized	Congregational
Church of God in Christ	Moderately Centralized	Hierarchical*
National Baptist	Moderately Centralized	Congregational*
African Methodist Episcopal	Moderately Centralized	Hierarchical*

*Churches that had not be classified by Sullins (2004) and Takyama (1974) were classified using the characteristics described within the articles that best illustrated the categories. I used other writings of Takayama to place the denominations in categories.

** There are multiple Orthodox churches with differing centralizations, here I characterized them as decentralized because the largest orthodox church in the United States is the Eastern Orthodox Church which Sullins does categorize as centralized.

Political Preferences

The concept of church hierarchy is explored and compared in light of the findings from Chapters 4 and 5. Denominations in Tables 5 and 6 are organized based on the Pew Research in Figure 1. The Sullins Scale categorizes church structure into decentralized, moderately centralized, and most centralized. A comparison of these categories to the 2014 Pew Landscape

Survey (Chapter 4) reveals that the denominations of a majority Democrat are all moderately centralized. None of the churches which fall in the middle of the scale, having no majority political party preference, is decentralized. Decentralization of church structure is likely to coincide with a preference of political party or independence, falling to the political scale's extreme. The results may suggest that church leaders who have less overhead structure can influence church members politically.

The Takayama Scale, which categorizes church structures into hierarchical or congregational, suggests that congregational church members are more likely to be Republican than either Democrat or Independent. Congregational churches are led more by their specific local church, and this structure may influence members toward the Republican party. The religious right has been a significant part of the Republican base, and leaders in congregational churches and leaders in congregational churches have the independence to speak on political issues. The churches with the fewest Democrats within the denomination are peripheral denominations, such as the Mormons and Jehovah's witnesses, both of which are hierarchical churches.

Chapter 5 examines the Pew data on denominations through a multinomial regression with different demographics to determine the significance. Only a few denominations still have a significant preference when viewed against the other demographic preferences. In reference to the Sullins Scale, most denominations that have a significant preference for a denomination are moderately centralized. The churches with no preference are also likely to be moderately centralized and hierarchical according to the Takayama Scale. With the limited number of denominations that have significant preferences for or antipathy to a political party, it is not easy

to find relationships within these structures; but we can see that the most centralized churches are less likely to have a political stance. There are sparse distinctions between churches that are Republican or Democrat. As there is no separation from church structure and political party, this distinction eliminates the factors, thus suggesting that some denominations have a party preference.

Educational and Training Requirements

Educational and training requirements of ordained religious leaders differ even more than denominational organizational structures. Could how denominations train their leaders be a significant factor influencing political preference? Ordination of ministers can be done locally, regionally, or generally. Denominations that ordain ministers at the local level leave it to each local church to determine if an individual qualifies for ordination. Denominations that ordain ministers regionally have regional boards or councils which ordain ministers. There are also denominations where the general conference presiding over all churches within the denomination is responsible for ordaining ministers.

Most denominations sponsor seminaries that teach their distinctive denominational beliefs; and even in some congregational churches, seminary can be a requirement for leadership, even among the autonomous local churches. The two denominations which do not have seminaries are peripheral denominations: Jehovah's Witnesses and Mormons.

Table 6: Denominational Education and Training Requirements			
	Seminary	Ordination Approval	Other Requirements
Mormon	None	Regional	Internal Training
Nazarene	Required	Regional	Minister License
Southern Baptist	Not Required	Local	None
Lutheran Church Missouri Synod	Required	Regional	Service Requirements
Assemblies of God	Required	Regional	Service
Presbyterian Church in America	Required	Local	Internship and Licensing
Church of God TN	Not Required	Regional	Internal Training
Anglican	Required	Regional	Internship
United Methodist	Required	Regional	Internship
Churches of Christ	Not Required	Local	None
Presbyterian Church (USA)	Required	Local	Exams
American Baptist	Not Required	Local	None
Evangelical Lutheran	Required	Regional	Internship
Catholic	Required	Regional	Internship
Episcopal	Required	Regional	Exams
Seventh Day Adventist	Required	General	Internship
Orthodox	Required	Regional	None
Jehovah's Witness	None	Regional	Internal Training
United Church of Christ	Not Required	Local	None
Church of God in Christ	Not Required	General	Licensed and Exams
National Baptist	Not Required	Local	None
African Methodist Episcopal	Required	Regional	Internal Training

*Requirements for each denomination were determined by the official sites of the denominations.

Seminary requirements show a relationship with political party preference. The denominations which fall in the center of the political spectrum require seminary training. The two largest Republican majority denominations do not require seminary. An analysis of the seminary requirements with the nominal regression data from Chapter 5 reveals that the churches with no preference for political parties require seminary. The only two denominations that prefer a political party or show antipathy to a political party both do not require

seminary. It appears that denominations that do require seminary will have fewer political preferences than denominations that have political preferences. Not having a required seminary degree connected to a political preference suggests that these leaders are influencing politics without being guided by formal education. Other requirements that churches may have are exams, licensing, service requirements, internships, or internal training. Denominations with other requirements are more likely to be Republican majority. Specifically, denominations that have internal training or licensing are likely to prefer a political party.

Local, regional or general levels are the different ordination levels used by denominations. The Pew research on ordination suggests a mixed relationship with political support. The most significant connection that appears is that local level ordination shows a low percentage of independent support. Once ordination is examined with the multinomial regression data, it appears that denominations which prefer a political party are more likely to complete ordination at a local level. Churches which have ordination at a regional level are likely to have antipathy toward a political party. Both denominations that have antipathy toward independents complete ordination at a regional level. These findings would support similar findings concerning leadership structure that shows that less control allows leaders to politically influence members, while more oversight makes it more likely there will be less political diversity within the denomination.

Concerning both church structure and training, the research suggests that denominations with independence are likely to have political preferences, while more moderate denominations are likely to be moderate politically. Chapter 7 will examine church structure and training

concerning what ministers are communicating to people to determine if these denominational requirements influence leaders' political communications.

CHAPTER 7

TYPES OF MINISTERIAL INVOLVEMENT IN AMERICAN POLITICS

The resurgence of interest in religion's influence on elections has focused on how religious denominations and church attendance influences how they vote for candidates and policies. The research has indeed shown a correlation between elections and religions, but these studies illustrate the limitations of just using big data to show the relationship between religion and politics. This chapter uses a content analysis method to focus on the messages religious organizations and their leaders are conveying to influence how their congregants vote. Using a qualitative approach to examine political messages from religious entities allows for a deeper understanding of what religious messages are being projected by delving into the actual words used by these organizations and their leaders. Survey data on campaign messages from the pulpit is limited and does not get at the heart of the political messages. Researchers can determine what religious organizations are saying to influence how voters act during elections; however, one cannot understand the impact religion plays on politics without first understanding how religious organizations try to influence their members to participate in elections. If the research cannot show that religious messages are geared toward government and their policies, either directly or indirectly, how can the researchers determine that religion is telling people to vote one way or the other? Religious messages could be another highly correlated variable like race or socioeconomic status. This chapter examines the messages religious organizations and their leaders are conveying instead of examining the results of that influence.

This study examines the social media accounts (Facebook and Twitter) of churches using two sources: The Hartford Institute of Religious Research and the Faith 2020 interest group. The

first group to consider are mega churches with more than 10,000 members, using numbers derived from the Hartford Institute of Religious Research (Databases of the Mega-churches in the U.S.). The churches with the most significant numbers would statistically have the most considerable impact on an election for the simple reason that they have more members than smaller churches. The chapter also examines a list of religious leaders who came out in support of presidential candidate Joe Biden. In fall 2020, a list of religious leaders who supported Joe Biden was publicized by a group known as Faith 2020. The list is comprised of 350 individuals who had signed a petition supporting Joe Biden as of September 1, 2020. These churches have become politically involved and may have a different political presence online than the mega churches. Two hundred and ninety of the individuals who had signed the petition in support were confirmed as supporters, but only 101 of those individuals were current Christian church leaders. Some of the individuals on the list were from other professions, other religions, or retired. Individuals of these churches were not included in the study because they were beyond this study's scope (Faith 2020). By looking at these 215 churches and their leaders' social media accounts, this study can identify influences between churches and politics. Using both lists allows the study to capture more churches and thereby expand the data.

Data was collected by searching the official Facebook and Twitter accounts for each church, using the words 'vote,' 'election,' and 'government.' The same search was then performed for the accounts of the lead minister. Social media has given churches an avenue to share their viewpoints and not just to individuals who show up to weekly services (Auger 2013) Campbell (2012) suggests that social media has enabled churches do many things that it has traditionally done by creating social interaction and community for members in a new medium.

Churches have historically been active in politics; now it is possible for them to use social media to pursue that same goal. These search terms might suggest how these churches and their leader's desire to influence elections and the government. The data from the social media accounts of churches and their leaders was then aggregated for analysis. Coding for the data happens with every new incident being compared to previously viewed data, allowing one to see the differences and similarities (Corbin and Strauss 2012.) The messages were split into a typology, using the procedure illustrated in Kluge (2000) that allows the typology to be transparent and systematic. By developing the variable's dimensions and then grouping the cases, the types show meaningful relationships. Typology allows the data to be placed into relevant categories to inform how churches use social media to influence elections.

Findings

Typology

This study allows for an overall view of how religious organizations and their leaders influence many individuals. By examining the content, we can analyze how religious messages are communicating political influence without interviewing religious leaders. Conceptual themes emerge from the analysis concerning how religious leaders and churches try to influence politics. One way they do this is by providing information, such as how to register and deadlines for registration. Churches also provide information about elections, such as where and when to vote. Lastly, they provide information on candidates, whether through voter guides or just explanations of who the candidates are. This information is important within elections because knowledge of these three things will increase the likelihood of people participating in an election.

This provision of information fits the Civic Voluntarism Model, discussed in Chapter 4, because churches provide the resources people will need to participate in political participation. Churches are giving people the skills and resources to be able to engage civically, mainly via elections. Churches have always shared information about church events and their values with their members through social media. Outlets like Facebook and Twitter provide communication between members and the church. This communication allows churches to speak to their members and members to interact with the church in return. This interaction between followers and the church demonstrates support for churches and their leaders.

Another method of political communication is through encouragement in the election process. Encouraging people to vote or encouraging registration is how many religious leaders can impact politics by influencing their congregants to participate in elections. These messages are forms of communication that can seem nonpartisan. Large organizations may not explicitly support a candidate, because they may fear backlash within their congregation. Large churches are likely to have support for both political parties represented in the congregation. Supporting a particular party or candidate might reduce membership; nevertheless, they have influenced elections by encouraging political participation through mobilizing their congregants. Encouraging political activism can also be seen when members are asked to call representatives or join protests. A study by Sircar and Rowley (2019) conducted in the United Kingdom looked at two of the largest churches within that country; the researchers found that the churches used multiple social media outlets to encourage members to join school events, work for a common cause, and to love others with different opinions. Each church used social media to share both informational posts and posts that expressed their core values.

Churches and ministers have also provided direct help to the election process. One way has been through registration aid. Churches have held voter registration drives at their churches; when people show up to the church, they can also register to vote. In addition, churches also host separate registration drives. Another way they help with voting is to provide free rides to the election polls, so people who may not otherwise be able to get there have transportation.

Churches influence individuals by connecting participation to their religious beliefs through a call to action, by asking them to go out and vote because it is what a person of God would do. Churches present voting not only as a civic duty, but also their Christian duty. These messages connect participating in elections and the democratic process to their religious beliefs and being a good religious practitioner. This message also implies that if a person does not participate, they do not act as a good citizen or practitioner of their faith. Another way churches encourage people to vote is by emphasizing their “Christian values.” There are examples of churches using social media to emphasize the importance of political participation and the idea that being a good Christian also means being a good citizen (Frahm-Arp 2015.) Many churches and ministers use this terminology without reference to a specific political issues; consequently, each church could mean something different by this message.

Churches also stress the importance of specific issues on the election ballot or a decision that a particular politician might make if elected to office as a way to encourage individuals to go out and vote. For example, if they are pro-life, they are encouraged to show up and vote for public officials who are also pro-life. Besides abortion, issues like immigration, LBGTQ+ policies, racial and social justice have been mentioned by ministers to the public through their

social media outlets. Frahm-Arp (2015) and Kgatle (2018) examined churches in southern Africa, showing that churches used social media to share their values and create community.

Some churches also explicitly support a candidate, whether that be Biden, Trump, or some other candidate. There are also examples of church leaders who oppose a candidate outright; even though they may not support a candidate, a church leader might speak out against one. These decisions are important because, as Cheong (2014) has suggested, social media use can bolster the credibility and authority of a pastor. This authority could be concerning because when religious leaders are elevated to a different level, they could take advantage of their position and not have to face the consequences (Weithman 2020.)

Religious leaders could also become public figures outside their church as a way to influence individuals. They may appear on television and at rallies, motivating listeners to respond in a specific way. These can be charismatic leaders, and people flock to them because of their engaging personalities. The influence of these individual leaders can be greater than the church itself, as these leaders can almost achieve cult status. Numerous examples can be cited of religious leaders being put on a pedestal, as with leaders from utopian societies or televangelists whose influence can encompass all aspects of an individual's life. Those who follow them can respond to public policies and participate in the democratic process based on this leader's pronouncements. Many of these leaders show pictures on their social media with political leaders at rallies or the National Day of Prayer Breakfast.

Lastly, religious leaders impact politics by running for public office. Even the office of the President of the United States has had a preacher in the office. President James Garfield was a Disciples of Christ preacher. In the 116th Congress, there were seven ordained ministers and

one within the U.S. Senate (Membership of the 116th: Congress.) After the runoff Senate Election in Georgia for the 117th Congress, Ralph Warnock, a pastor, joined these ministers in Congress. These pastors running for elections present a direct and overt influence over politics. The influence of the religious leaders moves from the private sector of indirectly influencing politics through other people to influencing politics directly and personally. There have always been people who hold religious beliefs who have also held office and made an impact on our government. It is a different story, however, when a religious leader holds that power because they bring the direct experience of leading a body of people and convincing them to believe and behave in specific ways.

While these types of influence are essential in determining the overall impact religion has on politics, it would also be restrictive to say that these are the only ways religious leaders could influence politics; nevertheless, this shows a clear picture of how religious leaders have a wide range of tactics at their disposal to impact the political arena. Table 7 organizes these typologies and gives clear examples of the content of these messages on social media.

Table 7: Church Messaging Typology

Main Category	Subcategory	Definition	Examples
Information	Registration Information	Provided information about voter registration, elections, or candidates	"Today is the last day to register to vote for Election Day in the state of Ohio."
	Election Information		"Today, the polls are open in Virginia, New York, and Kentucky until 9 PM today."
	Candidate Information		"If you would like information on this year's election and the candidates, visit www.ivoters.com ."
Encouragement	Registration Encouragement	Pushed people to register to vote, vote, or participate in political demonstrations	"PLEASE make sure you're registered to vote!"
	Voting Encouragement		"Let your voice be heard. Be a part of the process. Get out there and vote today!"
	Activism Encouragement		"ADVOCATE on behalf of those who are experiencing racism and injustice by contacting your local, elected officials."
Aid	Election Aid	Registered people to vote or helped people to vote	"What a great turnout at our Voter Registration drive today!"
	Registration Aid		"Need a ride to the polls Sunday, October 26, 2014? Just ask at (church twitter account)"
Values	Christian Civic Duty	Suggested that voting was a person's duty as a duty or suggested that people should use their Christian values to vote	"Good Christians are also good citizens. If you haven't done so already, be sure to vote today!"
	Vote Christian Values		"Educate yourself, pray, and vote according to your Christian values!"
	Issue Support		"You can't claim to be #ProLife and also vote to rob millions of healthcare coverage"
Support	Candidate Support	Specifically said they were supporting or opposing a candidate	"My first choice was Ted Cruz, but as Christians we have to do something. When we look at which candidate is closer to our Christian worldview, I have to vote with Donald Trump. "
	Candidate Opposition		"We have no recourse but to vote this person out! He should never have won he should have never been supported by evangelicals. He's a disgrace!!!"
Political Connection	Relationship with Politician	Tied themselves to specific politicians; actually, running for a political office	"Enjoyed seeing my good friend Mike Huckabee today!"
	Run for Office		"Don't forget to stop by and vote for Ed Robb for Township Board, Position 4."

Tradition and Denominational Findings

An examination of these messages according to information from the previous chapters shows some interesting relationships between the message typologies and churches' traditions and denominations. Encouraging people to vote is the most widely used political message over religious traditions, churches, and pastors. Encouraging voting is not surprising as it is nonpartisan, and it also does not comment on any specific issue. It is an easy way to mobilize individuals, giving churches the ability to influence elections without alienating others.

Historical Black churches are more likely to participate in registration than other traditions, especially evangelical churches. Historical movements to stop Black people from registering to vote may have influenced these churches to make sure their congregants and others were not denied their right to register, to get people registered, and to make sure people have all the information they need to register. A study conducted in the United States focused specifically on Black churches found that social media had encouraged members to participate both in elections and other political activism (Barnes and Nwosu 2013.)

In comparing the messages that come from churches and their pastors, information and aid are more likely to be given by the churches' social media while pastors focus more on issues and candidate support or opposition. Churches may be more likely to give information about elections because it provides the resources that their congregants need to participate in elections without alienating others. The pastor is an individual who chooses to support issues or candidates, using their free speech rights and position to influence elections.

It is uncommon for church leaders to run for office, but churches do not mention it in their social media when their pastor is running for office. Not mentioning the campaign is an

intentional choice to ensure that the pastor is not abusing his leadership role in the church by using the church for his campaign. In such instances, overt campaigning occurs on the minister's social media and not the church's social media. The social media accounts of most of the ministers who signed the petition supporting Biden made no mention of support for the candidate.

The messaging that voting is an individual's Christian duty is not found in the Catholic, Historical Black, or unaffiliated traditions. When the message is present, it is found among the political messages of evangelical churches, evangelical pastors, and mainline churches. Pastors differ on their involvement in their politics when it comes to moral guidance (Audi 2020.) Some feel that they must direct their people in the political realm, and while others feel that it is not their place. If people who attend church are listening to those teachings, then religious influence cannot be ignored. When churches and religious leaders speak about politics, the message is held to a higher standard than the average person because it carries more weight due to their place in the religious community (Freeman 2020.)

With many churches choosing to communicate political messages, many churches and pastors represented by this data still choose to communicate no information about politics through social media. These choices are intentional to make sure the church does not alienate any person. Churches have expressed an intention not to involve themselves in politics because they feel it is not their place. Churches and pastors could still be sending political messages, but not through the platforms chosen in this study. Table 8 and their pastors in Table 9 illustrate the findings.

Table 8: Political Messages by Tradition						
	Catholic	Evangelical	Historical Black	Mainline	Unaffiliated	Total
Election Information		6	16	3	2	27
Registration Information		7	9	8		24
Candidate Information		5	4	1		10
Registration Aid		1	4		1	6
Election Aid		4	2		2	8
Voting Encouragement		38	28	15	12	93
Registration Encouragement		1	5	4	1	11
Political Activism Encouragement		1	1	5	1	8
Christian Duty		7		3		10
Vote Values		18		4	3	25
Issue Support	1	12	4	9	3	29
Support Candidate		1	1		2	4
Oppose Candidate		1				1
Political Connections		4	1	2	4	11
Running for Office						0
None	1	40	9	35	12	97

Table 9: Political Messages by Tradition-Pastors

	Catholic	Evangelical	Historical Black	Mainline	Unaffiliated	Total
Election Information	1	7	1	2		11
Registration Information		2	2	1		5
Candidate Information		5		1		6
Registration Aid						0
Election Aid			1		1	2
Voting Encouragement	1	37	15	21	22	96
Registration Encouragement		7	4	4		15
Political Activism Encouragement				3		3
Christian Duty		5				5
Vote Values		15	1	2	3	21
Issue Support	1	13	3	4	5	26
Support Candidate		4	8	13	5	30
Oppose Candidate		4	5	8	2	19
Political Connection		6	2	1	3	12
Running for Office		2		2	1	5
None	1	39	19	26	4	89

Church Structure and Political Messages

Clear patterns emerge when comparing the political message of churches and pastors to church structure and education. The data suggest denominations that require seminary are more likely to have no political messages. They are more likely to send messages of encouragement to express their political connection to politicians. Denominations who ordain their ministers at a local level are likely to have messages of encouragement and values. They have high messaging rates that encourage individuals to vote for their values, vote because it is their Christian duty, and support specific issues. Denominations which ordain at a regional level are more likely to provide information, particularly when it comes to information regarding voter registration. Denominations with no further requirement than seminary and ordination are more likely to spread political messages, particularly when it comes to messages on political values and election aid. The denomination with requirements such as licensing and internships do not have any messages. More formal requirements and a general level of ordination move churches away from speaking out about politics.

When comparing denominations, it is evident that church leaders' messages have similar patterns that their church messages have compared to church structure and training. The Sullins' Scale suggests that decentralized and most centralized are likely to have no moderately centralized political messages. The Takayama Scale suggests that pastors who lead congregational denominations are more likely to have political messages than hierarchical denominations. The messages which are the most likely to occur are messages that include voting a person's values, opposition to candidates, and political connections.

Church leaders who lead denominations that require seminary are less likely to have political messaging than denominations that do not require seminary. Church leaders that are ordained at a local level are likely to send messages which tell people to vote for their values. They are also more likely than regionally ordained leaders to put out opposition messages toward a candidate and more likely to express connections with politicians. The more centralized a church hierarchy is, and the more requirements for ordination to church leadership, the less likely the church and its leader will state political messages. Independence within a denomination increases the likelihood that political messages will appear in their social media accounts.

Table 10: Political Messages by Pew Denomination Churches

Denomination	T	EI	RI	CI	RA	EA	VE	RE	PA	CD	VV	IS	SC	OC	PC	RO	None	Total
Nazarene	E																1	1
Southern Baptist Convention	E	2		2		2	1		1	1	6	3			2		5	19
Assemblies of God	E		1				2			1							3	5
Presbyterian Church in America	E																2	2
Church of God (TN)	E																1	1
United Methodist	M	1	2	1			3				1	1					5	8
Christian Churches/Churches of Christ	E						1			1	2	1					2	4
American Baptist	M		1				1		1			1			1		4	4
Presbyterian Church (USA)	M		1				1			1		1					5	6
Evangelical Lutheran	M																6	7
Catholic	C											1					1	1
Episcopal	M		1					1									1	2
Seventh Day Adventist	E						1	1		1								1
United Church of Christ	M	1	3				5	2	4	2	1	3			1		6	13
Church of God in Christ	HB	1					1											1
National Baptist Church	HB	6		1	2	2	0	3				2	1					11
African Methodist Episcopal Church	HB	3	4	3	1		0					1			1		8	16

*T=Tradition, E=Evangelical, M= Mainline, C=Catholic, HB=Historical Black

*EI= Election Information, RI=Registration Information, CI=Candidate Information, RA= Registration Aid, EA=Election Aid, VE= Voter Encouragement, RE= Registration Encouragement, PA= Political Action Encouragement, CD=Civic Duty, VV=Vote Values, IS=Issue Support, SC= Support Candidate, OC= Oppose Candidate, PC=Political Connection, RO= Run For Office

Table 11: Political Messages by Pew Denomination Pastors																		
Denomination	T	E	R	C	R	E	V	R	P	C	V	I	S	O	P	R	No	Total
		I	I	I	A	V	E	E	A	D	V	S	C	C	C	O	ne	
Nazarene	E																1	1
Southern Baptist Convention	E			1			1			1	7	3	2		3		7	19
Assemblies of God	E	1					1	1				1		1			3	5
Presbyterian Church in America	E																2	2
Church of God (TN)	E																1	1
United Methodist	M	1					5	1			1		3			1	3	8
Christian Churches/Churches of Christ	E	1		1			1				1	1					2	4
American Baptist	M												1			1	4	4
Presbyterian Church (USA)	M						3	1				1	1	2			4	6
Evangelical Lutheran	M	1		1			3					1	1				2	7
Catholic	C	1					2					1					1	1
Episcopal	M						1		1			1					1	2
Seventh Day Adventist	E	1					1						1					1
United Church of Christ	M						5	1			1		3	5			6	13
Church of God in Christ	H B			1			1											1
National Baptist Church	H B	1				1	6	1			1	1	2	1	1		5	11
African Methodist Episcopal Church	H B			1			3						3				12	16

*T=Tradition, E=Evangelical, M= Mainline, C=Catholic, HB=Historical Black

*EI= Election Information, RI=Registration Information, CI=Candidate Information, RA= Registration Aid, EA=Election Aid, VE= Voter Encouragement, RE= Registration Encouragement, PA= Political Action Encouragement, CD=Civic Duty, VV=Vote Values, IS=Issue Support, SC= Support Candidate, OC= Oppose Candidate, PC=Political Connection, RO= Run For Office

Can churches even endorse candidates?

One issue which has been alluded to is whether religious organizations are doing anything illegal by discussing candidates or campaigns. In 1954, Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson introduced a law that would prohibit nonprofit organizations who are tax exempt from endorsing or opposing a political candidate or risk losing their tax-exempt status. Most churches are nonprofits and classify themselves under this Internal Revenue Service (IRS) code to be tax-exempt. Being tax-exempt is essential for religious organizations, for there to be a separation between the church and the government. It also allows religious organizations to use the money they would pay to the government for charitable causes. Religious organizations also provide many community services like secular nonprofits, which would support the government's decision to classify them in this way. According to the Johnson Amendment, these organizations are "absolutely prohibited from directly or indirectly participating in, or intervening in, any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for elective public office" (Voyles 1997). People who support the removal of the Johnson Amendment suggest that churches have a special status compared to other tax-exempt organizations. Churches have historically been a part of the political and social dialogue within the United States, and the courts should distinguish the unique role they play by considering them different (Greenawalt 2020.) An argument supporting the Johnson Amendment is that the government is not stopping a church from speaking out against the government; however, if they want the tax exemption, then the churches should consider this to be a tradeoff. If religious organizations are campaigning for or against a candidate, this could be creating

entanglement between religion and government, thereby creating a hostile, coercive influence in elections.

Only one church has been punished for violating the rule, and that was in 1992 when the Church at Pierce Creek campaigned against Bill Clinton. Pierce Creek felt that they were being singled out for their more conservative beliefs, arguing that many other churches had engaged in similar campaigns without being sanctioned. They also argued that losing their tax exemption went against the clause in the Religious Freedom Restoration Act that states the government would use the “least restrictive means of furthering that compelling government interest” because the IRS took the most severe punishment instead of the less severe punishments they could have taken. In the court case *Branch Ministries, Inc v. Rossotti*, the court upheld the revocation of the church’s tax exemption status because the church had the opportunity to set up another organization like a political action committee. This action would not have violated the tax code. The courts also affirmed that the code was not in violation of the First Amendment and freedom of religion because making political statements were not a religious tenet.

In 2017 President Donald Trump removed any punishment with an executive order, upholding one of his campaign promises. The Presidential Executive Order Promoting Free Speech and Religious Liberty does not remove or change the Johnson Amendment but only directs the Department of Treasury to not enforce the law against churches, thus allowing religious leaders and churches to speak for or against candidates without fear of government repercussions. Now that the Johnson Amendment is not holding churches back, this study hopes to examine the political messages churches and

their leaders present.

Conclusion

While religion is only one aspect of a person's reason to vote, it can play a significant factor because it creates a value system that influences many of the decisions people make. Religious leaders do use their messages to frame policies and to define the characteristics of candidates to be supported in elections. The religious characteristics of some policies are sharply defined within the American political realm, e.g., abortion and the definition of marriage. Most policies have no specific religious stance, yet religion may influence individuals' moral thinking within society and give them directional morals about how they perceive all government policies. By influencing what their congregants view as moral and upright, churches could effectively impact who and what they support on Election Day. Religious leaders not only influence the decisions they are making, but also if they make any decision at all. Religious leaders can encourage their congregants to participate in the political process, which could effectively change politics and encourage them as to which direction they should vote by how they frame the election. Religious organizations that are encouraging their members to participate in politics can influence an election and maybe even control the election based on how many members they can convince to utilize their vote. Churches can be very active in encouraging members to vote. Morality issues are highly salient, simple, and require little information, and activists could place these issues on a ballot to increase voter turnout.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

The paper has examined different ways in which religion has influenced and shaped politics at varying levels. It was essential to examine religion according to these different levels to gain a holistic view of how these institutions shape their viewpoints on politics. An exclusive focus on congregants only allowed a small glimpse into religious influence. This focalized view may be why many studies find religion to be non-influential. This study was able to show a multi-layered approach to religion and politics, using denominational history, congregant stances, church structure, and social media communication. The study found an intertwining of religion and politics that is still very active today.

When examining the Christian traditions in the United States Catholic, Evangelical Protestant, Mainline Protestant, and Historical Black churches, the study found significant correlation with determining political party. It is essential to analyze the relationship between individuals' religious alliances and political parties while including other variables to determine if religion is the cause and not another characteristic that is driving the relationship. Using a multinomial regression and using data from the 2014 Pew Research U.S. Religious Landscape Survey, it was determined that Evangelical Protestants are likely to support the Republican Party while Historical Black Churches are likely to support the Democrat Party even when factoring in other demographic variables. In these regressions, church attendance was significant in determining political parties. People who had higher levels of identification with a political party are more

likely to support the Republican Party, while people who have lower church attendance levels are more likely to support the Democrat Party or be Independent of a political party. These broad tradition classifications start pulling back a layer of religion and its influences on politics in the United States.

One traditions are examined, the study goes further and looks at Christian denominations examine the same results found in a more detailed layer of religion found in the traditions. Denominational establishments and splits occurred in bursts accompanying economic hard times, such as the deflationary depressions. These denominations developed to conserve traditional beliefs or values or expand progressive beliefs. While these splits have developed religious beliefs, these developments also impact political stances. There are only a few denominations that remain significant in the multinomial regression when factoring in demographic variables. Five denominations (Mormon, Southern Baptist, American Baptist, Presbyterian Churches of America, and United Methodist), support the Republican Party. There is only one denomination, National Baptist Church, that supports the Democrat Party. It is also clear that some denominations are against a political party. Mormons, Southern Baptists, Catholics, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, and the Church of God (TN) were all found not to support the Democrat Party. The Catholic Church and the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod also had an antipathy toward being Independent of a political party. No churches have an antipathy toward the Republican Party. There are, however, three churches—Orthodox, Seventh Day Adventists, and Presbyterian Church (USA)— that have no preference or antipathy to the Republicans, Democrats, or Independents. These findings

suggest that once the other demographic factors are considered, many denominations are not significant influencers in determining political party, while some denominations show significant political leanings. These denominations with definite political leanings may be driving the political leanings of the Christian Traditions. Church attendance remained important as a factor when determining political parties. As we become more specific in examining denominations, the data still shows that religion can be significant when determining denominations; other times, however, it has no bearing on which party people support.

One of the examined layers that shed some light on religious influence on politics was denominational structure and training, the objective being to identify possible correlations with political party alignment. Denominations structure their leadership in various ways. The Sullins and Takayama Scales are two different scales that examine church hierarchy. Other researchers have used these scales in conducting research. The study examines scholars' education and training, exploring seminary requirements, level of ordination, and other ordination requirements. Neither denomination structure nor training appears to influence whether individuals in a denomination support a given political party.

After analyzing religious leaders and churches' social media accounts, some themes emerged concerning how religious organizations seek to influence elections. The messages are sent to give information about elections, encourage members to vote, and tell them how to vote. Religious leaders and churches even directly tell people whom to support or oppose. Churches have long played a role in American politics, but the recent

suggestions that religion plays less of a role in politics are not valid when applied to their political communications. These messages suggest that religious organizations are still influencing politics through the mobilization and support of candidates. Critics see this as an entanglement between religion and politics that should not exist, with many churches choosing not to participate because of the stigma. By creating a typology of the religious messages, one is able to see how churches are speaking of religion and how they are influencing politics. When comparing the typologies with church hierarchy and education, the data showed that churches with more autonomy were more likely to have political speech. Churches with less organizational overhead are more likely to mobilize their members and have a political impact.

In future research, more religious and political variables are needed to determine other aspects of politics that religion is influencing. Future research should take time to examine church hierarchy to understand better how it influences politics. The two scales in this study were chosen because of their use in academic research. These scales existed before a few current denominations existed, so they had not yet been categorized. It would be essential to update and expand these structure classifications to understand better how the denominations structures could influence politics. Continuing research of political messages done by church denominations and leaders would be ideal, expanding the number of churches and denominations examined to enlarge the picture of religious influence on politics.

The party polarization within this country has sustained the religious presence in politics. The 2020 U.S Presidential Election showed political messages from religious

institutions and connected religion and politics in multiple ways. The importance of this research is to show the multiple ways religion has impacted politics, how institutions shape the way their leaders and members respond to elections, how religions have mobilized their members, and the candidates and causes they are supporting at the polls.

APPENDIX

PEW RESEARCH 2014 LANDSCAPE STUDY

The Pew Research 2014 Landscape Study interviews more than 35,000 Americans across all fifty states. These interviews are done by telephone in both English and Spanish. When using the entire group of 35,000, there is a margin of error of less than 1%, but when examining smaller groups within the entire sample, the margin of error can increase. At least 300 telephone interviews were done in each state and the District of Columbia. The large sample size was to create greater accuracy in estimating the religious composition in the U.S, and it allows for a full sample size margin of error of .6%. The large sample size also allows for examining smaller religious groups that make up a small percentage of the U.S. population. Three groups did data collection: Abt SRBI, Princeton Survey Research Associates (PSRAI), and the Social Science Solutions (SSRS). The sampling was done by Marketing Systems Group (MSG), and Abt SRBI provided the weights.

MSG used a random digit dialing method to call individuals. The percentage of cellphones and landlines used in their survey matched the percent of cellphones or landlines usage within the state. States were oversampled and undersampled according to their proportional allocation to get the minimum of 300 interviews. The samples than would be weighted by states proportional to the population of the nation. Weighted estimates were done in two states. First, the proportionality of cellphones to landlines and the respondent rate per household. MSG also oversampled cellphone numbers flagged as active and unknown and undersampled cellphone numbers that were flagged inactive.

Inactive cellphone numbers would also be weighted so that they are proportional. Secondly, data were weighted based on demographics (i.e., gender, education, race). These demographic proportionalities came from the 2012 American Community Survey created by the Census Bureau. Weighted data were customized for each state. The margin of error within the survey includes the sampling error created when using weighted samples. While the margin of error when studying the entire survey is .6%, using smaller groups increases the error margin. For the interviews, telephone numbers were called up to seven-time to complete interviews. If individuals did not complete the interview within one call, some were called back up to two more times. Refusal conversion was a tactic used when individuals would refuse the survey. People interviewed on cellphones were offered a reimbursement of \$5 to pay for cellphone minutes. Bilingual interviews were used in areas where there were sizeable Hispanic populations to increase the chances of interviewing individuals who spoke primarily Spanish. They also flagged landline services with predominantly Spanish-speaking clients. 3.8% of interviews were done in Spanish. The response rates for landlines were 11.1%, and cellphones were 10.8%

REFERENCES

- Audi, Robert. "Religion and Democracy: Interactions, Tensions , Possibilities." *Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences "Religion and Democracy"*, vol. 149, no. 3, Sept. 2020.
- Auger, Giselle A. "Fostering Democracy through Social Media: Evaluating Diametrically Opposed Nonprofit Advocacy Organizations' Use of Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube." *Public Relations Review*, vol. 39, 2013, pp. 369–376.
- Baker, Joseph O'brian, and Buster Smith. "None Too Simple: Examining Issues of Religious Nonbelief and Nonbelonging in the United States." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 48.4 (2009): 719-33
- Barnes, Sandra L. "Black Church Electoral and Protest Politics from 2002 to 2012: a Social Media Analysis of the Resistance Versus Accommodation Dialectic." *Journal of African American Studies*, vol. 18, 2014, pp. 209–235.
- Barnes, Stuart J., et al. "Segmenting Cyberspace: a Customer Typology for the Internet." *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 41, no. 1/2, 2007, pp. 71–93., doi:10.1108/03090560710718120.
- Barrett, David B. *World Christian Encyclopedia: a Comparative Study of Churches and Religions in the Modern World AD 1900-2000*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1982.
- Berry, Brian. Joe Loble. *America's Utopian Experiments: Communal Havens from Long-Wave Crises*. University Press of New England, 1992.
- Braman, Eileen, and Abdulkader H. Sinno. "An Experimental Investigation of Causal Attributions for the Political Behavior of Muslim Candidates: Can a Muslim Represent You?" *Politics and Religion*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2009, pp. 247–276., doi:10.1017/s1755048309000224.
- Campbell, David E. "Perils of Politicized Religion." *Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences "Religion and Democracy"*, vol. 149, no. 3, 2020, pp. 87–104.
- Campbell, Heidi A. "Understanding the Relationship between Online and Offline in a Networked Society." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, vol. 80, no. 1, Mar. 2012, pp. 64–93.
- Canetti-Nisim, Daphna. "Two Religious Meaning Systems, One Political Belief System: Religiosity, Alternative Religiosity and Political Extremism." *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 4.3 (2003): 35-54.

Cheong, Pauline Hope. "Tweet the Message? Religious Authority and Social Media Innovation." *Journal of Religion, Media and Digital Culture*, vol. 3, no. 3, Dec. 2014, pp. 1–19.

Clarke, Harold D., Sanders, David., Stewart, Marianne C., and Paul Whiteley. *Performance Politics and the British Voter*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Clawson, Rosalee A. and Zoe M. Oxley. 2012. *Public Opinion: Democratic Ideals, Democratic Practice*, 2nd edition. Los Angeles, CA/Washington, D.C.: Sage Publications/Congressional Quarterly Press.

Corbin, Juliet M., and Anselm L. Strauss. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. SAGE, 2015.

"Database of Megachurches in the U.S." *Database of Megachurches in the US*, hrr.hartsem.edu/megachurch/database.html.

Driskell, R., Embry, E., & Lyon, L. (2008). Faith and politics: The influence of religious beliefs on political participation. *Social Science Quarterly*, 89(2), 294-314. *Faith 2020*, www.faith2020.org/biden-harris.

Djupe, Paul A. and Christopher P. Gilbert. 2003. *The Prophetic Pulpit: Clergy, Churches, and Communities in American Politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. ISBN: 0742511936

Djupe, Paul A. and Christopher P. Gilbert. 2002. "The Political Voice of Clergy." *The Journal of Politics* 64(2): 596-609

Farnsley II, Arthur Emery, "Congregations, Local Knowledge, and Devolution," *Review of Religious Research*, Vol. 42, No.1(Sep.,2000), pp.96-110

Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. "Religious choice and competition." *American Sociological Review* 63.5 (1998): 761-766.

Froese, Paul, and Christopher Bader. 2010. *America's Four Gods: What We Say about God – And What That Says about Us*. Oxford University Press.

Froese, Paul, and F. Carson Mencken. "A U.S. Holy Way? The Effects of Religion on Iraq War Policy Attitudes." *Social Science Quarterly* 90.1 (2009): 103-16. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Sept. 2014.

Fox, J., and S. Sandler. "Quantifying Religion: Toward Building More Effective Ways of Measuring Religious Influence on State-Level Behavior." *Journal of Church and State* 45.3 (2003): 559-88

Frahm-Arp, Maria. "The Political Rhetoric in Sermons and Select Social Media in Three Pentecostal Charismatic Evangelical Churches Leading up to the 2014 South African Election." *Journal of the Study of Religion*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2015, pp. 115–141.

Freeman, Samuel. "Democracy, Religion, and Public Reason." *Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences "Religion and Democracy"*, vol. 149, no. 3, 2020, pp. 37–58.

Greenawalt, Kent. "Religion and Democracy: Some Variations and Hard Questions." *Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences "Religion and Democracy"*, vol. 149, no. 3, 2020, pp. 25–36.

Grummel, John A., "Morality Politics, Direct Democracy, and Turnout," *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 1 October 2008, Vol.8(3), pp.282-292

Hagevi, M. "Beyond Church and State: Private Religiosity and Post-Materialist Political Opinion among Individuals in Sweden." *Journal of Church and State* 54.4 (2012): 499-525

Jones-Correa, Michael A., and David L. Leal. "Political Participation: Does Religion Matter?" Michael A. Jones-Correa, David L. Leal, 2001." *SAGE Journals*, journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/106591290105400404.

Karpov, Vyacheslav. "Religiosity and Political Tolerance in Poland." *Sociology of Religion* 60.4 (1999): 387-402.

Kgatle, Mookgo S. "Social Media and Religion: Missiological Perspective on the Link between Facebook and the Emergence of Prophetic Churches in Southern Africa." *Verbum Et Ecclesia*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2018, pp. 1–6.

Kluge, Susann. "Empirically Grounded Construction of Types and Typologies in Qualitative Social Research." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, Jan. 2000.

Lupu, Ira C., and Robert W. Tuttle. "Federalism and Faith." *Emory Law Journal* 56 (2006): 19-107.

Mangum, Maruice, "Examining the Association Between Church and the Party Identification of Black Americans", *Politics and Religion*, 2008, Vol.1(2), pp.200-215

Martinson, Oscar B., and E. A. Wilkening. "Religious Participation and Involvement in Local Politics Throughout the Life Cycle." *Sociological Focus* 20.4 (1987): 309-18.

- Mccarthy, A. F., N. T. Davis, J. C. Garand, and L. R. Olson. "Religion and Attitudes toward Redistributive Policies among Americans." *Political Research Quarterly* 69.1 (2016): 121-33.
- McKenzie, Brian D. "Self-Selection, Church Attendance, and Local Civic Participation," *Journal for the Scientific Study of religion*, Vol. 40, No.3(Sept.,2001), pp. 479-488
- McKenzie Brian D. and Stella M. Rouse. 2013. "Shades of Faith: Religious Foundations of Political Attitudes among African Americans, Latinos, and Whites." *American Journal of Political Science* 57(1): 58-80.
- "Membership of the 116th Congress: A Profile." *Congressional Research Service*, 17 Dec. 2020, fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R45583.pdf.
- Mclaughlin, Bryan ; Wise, David, "Cueing God: Religious Cues and Voter Support," *Politics and Religion*, 2014, Vol.7(2), pp.366-394
- Morgan, David R., and Kenneth J. Meier. "Politics and Morality: The Effect of Religion on Referenda Voting." *Social Science Quarterly* 61.1 (1980): 144-48.
- Olson, John Kevin. "Religion and Political Realignment in the Rocky Mountain States." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 29.2 (1990): 198-209
- Piazza, Jared. "'If You Love Me Keep My Commandments': Religiosity Increases Preference for Rule-Based Moral Arguments." *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 22.4 (2012): 285-302.
- Pelz, Mikael L., and Corwin E. Smidt. "Generational Conversion? The Role of Religiosity in the Politics of Evangelicals." *JOURNAL FOR THE SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF RELIGION* *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 54.2 (2015): 380-401.
- Pew Research "2014 U.S. Religious Landscape Study"
<https://www.pewforum.org/dataset/pew-research-center-2014-u-s-religious-landscape-study/>
- Schoettmer, Patrick. "Zen and the Science of American Politics: Minority Religious Traditions and Political Engagement." *Politics and Religion* 6.01 (2013): 164-185.
- Sircar, Atish, and Jennifer Rowley. "How Are U.K. Churches Using Social Media to Engage with Their Congregations?" *Journal of Public Affairs*, vol. 20, 2020, pp. 1–10.
- Uslaner, Eric M ; Lichbach, Mark, "Identity versus Identity: Israel and Evangelicals and the Two-Front War for Jewish Votes," *Politics and Religion*, 2009, Vol.2(3), pp.395-419

Verba, Sidney, et al. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Harvard University Press, 2002.

Voyles, Shawn A. “Choosing between Tax-Exempt Status and Freedom of Religion: the Dilemma Facing Politically-Active Churches.” *Regent University Law Review*, vol. 9, 1997, pp. 219–252.

Weber, Max. 1968. “Charisma and Institutionalization in the Sphere of Religion and Culture.” In Eisenstadt, S.N., Editor, Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building. The University of Chicago Press.

Weithman, Paul. “Liberalism and Deferential Treatment.” *Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences "Religion and Democracy"*, vol. 149, no. 3, 2020, pp. 59–71.

Wong, Janelle (2015) The Role of Born-Again Identity on the Political Attitudes of Whites, Blacks, Latinos, and Asian Americans. *Politics and Religion*, 8(4), 641-678

Wuthnow, Robert. 2011. America and the Religious Challenges of Religious Diversity. Princeton University Press.

Wuthnow, Robert and Clifford Nass. “Government Activity and Civil Privatization: Evidence from Voluntary Church Membership,” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol 27, No. 2(Jun., 1988), pp. 157-174

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Christine Millard was born in Dallas, Texas. After completing her schoolwork at Frisco High School in 2005, Christine entered the University of Texas at Arlington. She received a Bachelor's of Art in Political Science in 2008 and a Master's of Art in Political Science in 2010, both from the University of Texas at Arlington. Christine has taught Federal Government and State Government at Collin College since 2010.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Christine Millard

3/20/21

Collin College
Adjunct Professor-Government
Frisco, TX

Education

B.A., Political Science, 2008, University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, TX

M.A., Political Science, 2010, University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, TX

***Currently studied for PhD, Political Science, University of Texas at Dallas
Projected Graduation Spring 2021
Dallas, TX***

Teaching Experience

Collin College 2010-Present

Adjunct Professor

American Government I- Federal Government 2305

American Government II- Texas Government 2306

Dual Enrollment Instructor

Grayson County College 2010-May 2016

Adjunct Professor

American Government I- Federal Government 2305

American Government II- Texas Government 2306

Instructional Connection 2013-Present

Teaching Assistant

American Government I-Texas Government 2312

American Government I-State and Local Government 2301

North Central Texas College August 2016-Present

Adjunct Professor

American Government I- Federal Government 2305

American Government II- Texas Government 2306

Dual Enrollment Instructor

Professional Affiliations

Southern Political Science Association

Western Social Science Association

Texas Community College Teachers Association

Professional and Academic Involvement

Campaign Volunteer 2006; 2008; 2010

Elections Poll Clerk 2008

Southern Political Science Association Conference 2009; 2010; 2011

Constitutional Day Volunteer 2010-2018

Student Mentor Program 2011-2012

Rockin' the Ridge 2012

Planning Committee for Associate Faculty Committee 2012; 2013

Student at University of Texas at Dallas 2013-Present

Academic Decathlon Volunteer 2018-2020

Title IX Training 2019

Adjunct Academy: Classroom Management Pedagogy and Application Process Fall 2019

Western Social Science Conference Presenter 2019

Paper: Religiosity and Political Participation: How communal and individual religious practices influence politics

Adjunct Academy: Engagement Strategies, AD/D Interview, and Teaching

Demonstration Fall 2019

Adjunct Academy: Classroom Management, Pedagogy and Application Process Fall 2019

Professional Development: Building a Foundation for Inclusion - Diversity & Equity 2020

Professional Development: Preparing to Teach Online 2020

Professional Development: Quality Matters Rubric 2020

Virtual Faculty Summit 2020

Professional Development: Dual Enrollment Class Management 2021

Professional Development: Teaching Philosophy 2021