

**Does Size Matter? Measuring the Effects of Congregational Size on the Political Relevance  
of Churches**

Fifth Biennial Symposium on Religion and Politics  
The Henry Institute, Calvin College  
April 23-25, 2009

Richard Ledet

University of Notre Dame  
217 O'Shaughnessy Hall  
Notre Dame, IN 46556  
rledet@nd.edu

Kasey Swanke

University of Notre Dame  
217 O'Shaughnessy Hall  
Notre Dame, IN 46556  
kswanke@nd.edu

*Churches are important institutions of American civil society, and they create one type of social group environment that greatly influences the manner in which individuals associate themselves with the political world. Research into the linkage between church membership and the acquisition of civic skills shows that the two are indeed related, as church membership tends to augment civic participation levels amongst church members. In light of previous research indicating various characteristics relating the effects of group environments on the way in which churches are able to promote their members' civic participation, we investigate whether one understudied church characteristic, congregational size, influences religious organizations' effects on civic skill development. To do so, we empirically examine through a series of models whether the size of one's congregation mediates the relationship that civic skills acquisitions has on whether or not they participate in church functions that have been shown to affect members' participation in politics. The results indicate that size does impact civic skill acquisition, particularly through affecting churches' abilities to provide members with opportunities to participate in small groups that offer the chance to develop and hone civic skills.*

### **Introduction**

Testing the extent to which social environments influence Americans' attitudes and behaviors towards politics is a major priority for political scientists. Social environments structure interpersonal interactions, and the contexts in which these interactions take place influence individuals' orientations toward the political world. In the United States, a prominent manifestation of these social environments is found within the walls of churches. Scholars studying the intersection between religion and civil society accept this notion, as evident in the recent increase in the amount of attention dedicated to the influence of churches over members' political and social orientations. Most generally, churches provide for members various opportunities to interact with others and participate in church functions that subsidize the costs of participating in politics. Since citizen participation in politics is paramount to the functioning of a democracy, churches as participation facilitators thus perform an important function in preserving the health of American democratic governance.

Despite what we know about churches and their impact on politics, there is much scholarly ground to be tilled in terms of identifying the exact mechanisms by which churches

matter. Recent scholarship suggests that not all churches are equal in their ability to affect members' participation in politics. For example, congregations of different faith traditions vary in their capacity for effecting their members' political participation (see, for example, Verba et al. 1995). Additionally, civic skill development in churches varies by the ethnic and racial makeup of congregations (Harris 1999; Jones-Correa and Leal 2006) and the amount of homogeneity with regards to demographic characteristics of congregants belonging to a church (Djupe and Gilbert, 2006). The contributions of the aforementioned studies are important because they demonstrate that not all churches affect their members' social and political orientations equally and because they explain some of the causal mechanisms by which churches impact their members' participation in politics. The causal relationship between citizens and their political participation is further enlightened when scholars identify those specific mechanisms by which churches are able to augment political participation. To this end, this present study investigates whether differences in congregational size account for differences regarding how individual churches affect members' political participation. Church size is a relevant variable to consider because not only does church size vary by religious denominations and by individual congregations, it also varies over time. In particular, data from the 2000 Religion and Politics Survey indicate that among churchgoing respondents, 60 percent had reported that membership in their congregation had been increasing over the past few years<sup>1</sup>. Various other works note the general increase in church size, and this is particularly evident with the rise of mega-churches. The current study asks, does this trend impact the relationship between church participation and political participation?

---

<sup>1</sup> Likewise, 32 percent had reported that membership in their congregation had stayed about the same, while only nine percent had estimated their church size had been decreasing.

In exploring whether or not church size matters for a congregation's ability to impact their members' civic engagement, we first review previous literature that emphasizes the importance of churches as political groups. Furthermore, we highlight the differences in church characteristics demonstrated by previous studies that alter individual congregations' abilities to promote civic engagement amongst their members. Moreover, we offer a theoretical justification for considering church size as another possible contextual variable that may or may not affect a church's ability to promote engagement. Finally, we subject this theory to empirical analysis and demonstrate that while church size does affect members' behavior in church activities, it does not seem to ultimately influence their political engagement.

### **Churches as Political Groups**

Religious organizations serve many important political functions. First, churches are tools for electoral mobilization (Campbell 2004; Fenno 1977; Harris 1999; Jones-Correa and Leal 2006; Wilcox and Sigelman 2001). This is so for a variety of reasons. For example, because church members are mobilized into a group with presumably relatively stable meeting times and places, they are easy targets for political officials to visit and meet with their constituents. Moreover, churches subsidize the costs of their members' participation by providing them with political cues and information.

Second, as Wald, Owen, and Hill (1988) establish, churches function as political communities that influence individual members' attitudes towards candidates and elected officials, policies, and politics in general. Ted G. Jelen (1992) reinforces this finding in claiming that the "social contexts [of churches] have independent effects on individual political beliefs and opinions" (710). Furthermore, Harris (1999) shows that churches provide the impetus for members to act politically by providing them with a moral framework that stresses the

importance of confronting political issues relevant to specific religious denominations.<sup>2</sup> So, churches act like many other voluntary associations in helping to structure members' political preferences through reinforcing their positions on issues relevant to the group's teachings. Since religious doctrines provide guidance in forming political preferences, the strength and direction of those preferences may be translated to church members via means such as the provision of providing voter guides, preaching at the pulpit, and providing formal and informal opportunities for members to discuss political issues amongst themselves. If church members adopt their parishes' strong stances on issues, they then may be more likely to hold their elected officials accountable for those issues that they are passionate about.

Finally, churches also serve as venues for civic engagement in offering members the opportunity to acquire and practice those skills that are necessary for meaningful engagement in society, including those that are necessary for participating in politics. Various scholars (e.g. Djupe and Gilbert 2006; Jones-Correa and Leal 2006; Putnam 2000; Skocpol 2004; Verba et al. 1995) have recognized the ability of churches to augment their members' civic skills development through offering them the opportunity to serve on executive boards, speak in public, organize church functions, and participate in church groups.<sup>3</sup> Such activities avail to members the opportunity to hone skills associated with members' chances to "work together on committees, lead meetings, serve as officers,...develop networks,...[and] write news stories or

---

<sup>2</sup> Wald et al. (1988) also explain that since many members think of the church as an authority figure with regards to thinking about politics, church leaders are able provide their members with the motivation to participate in politics, essentially through pressuring them to conform to the thoughts and actions of their fellow church members and leaders. Through this, churches provide members the solidary benefits of participation that citizens perceive makes them feel as though they are part of a social group of like-minded peers (Maloney et al. 2000). In consequence, churches are able to motivate reelection-seeking public officials to cater to the impassioned preferences of their members.

<sup>3</sup> Church membership also influences the extent to which individuals are involved in the larger community, with evidence of variable effects between faith traditions, but this is not the place to engage in questions about engagement in affairs of the greater community, only civic skill development.

contact public officials<sup>4</sup>” (Wuthnow 1999). Additionally, churches have been shown to nourish within members a sense of self-confidence and efficacy in practicing these skills, and both are important in motivating individuals to participate in politics (Harris 1999). From this, scholars have concluded that churches motivate participation amongst their members by providing them with opportunities to practice skills which can be subsequently transferred to activities associated with participating in politics such as partaking in political demonstrations, donating money to candidates, addressing others with a politically-themed speeches or presentations, volunteering for a campaign, contacting officials, and voting. In other words, congregations function as incubators of civic skills by providing their members the opportunities to hone political abilities through participating in non-political activities at church.

It is crucial to emphasize the relevant differences between churches’ and other voluntary associations’ abilities to foster civic skill development in members. It is well known that active participation in non-religious voluntary associations offers individuals many of the same opportunities to develop civic skills as churches. However, churches are unique types of social groups in that their membership rosters tend not to over-represent citizens who are higher-educated and more affluent as non-church voluntary associations. Likewise, churches are able to mobilize many citizens to participate in politics who otherwise may not. This is because non-church voluntary associations often require a great deal of disposable time and social and occupational connections associated more with middle- and upper-class citizens; thus, they tend to attract members who are, on average, more educated, better connected to many social networks, and more affluent. This is simply not the case with churches since instead, their membership rosters typically include a more heterogeneous group of citizens representing the

---

<sup>4</sup> It is important to note that opportunities to practice civic skills need not be political in nature. Simply helping to organize a church thrift sale, for example, is associated with increased participation in political activities.

entire strata of the socio-economic spectrum. In other words, churches serve as “moderating forces, subsidizing skill deficits for a diverse citizenry without extensive education or professional occupations” (Djupe and Gilbert 2006). Put simply, churches help engage into politics those citizens who, on average, may well have been less engaged otherwise.

The ability of churches to mobilize the participation of those citizens with lower socioeconomic status is crucial given the large literature regarding disparities in the political representation of interests by participating in politics and affluence (Griffin and Newman 2005, Bartels 2002, Gilens 2005). Ergo, because churches are able to strengthen the representational nature of American democracy through mobilizing a wider variety of citizens who would, on average, otherwise not participate, identifying the mechanisms by which they do is important.

### *Churches and Civil Society: Nuanced Models of Churches’ Influences*

In order to understand the effect of churches on civil society, it is important to determine those contextual aspects of churches that add to or detract from their ability to nourish members’ civic skills development. As mentioned above, even though we know that social interactions vary greatly between congregations (Wald, Owen, and Hill 1988) and that church involvement helps individuals acquire and practice the civic skills necessary for effective participation in politics (Verba et al. 1995; Jones-Correa and Leal 2006), there has been much research scrutinizing the actual mechanisms by which churches facilitate members’ acquisition of those skills necessary for meaningful civic and political participation.

One distinction between churches that has been previously studied regards their theological diversity, and scholars have spent much time speculating as to how theological differences matter when examining the relationship between religion and civil society.

Traditionally, accounting for the multitude of theological orientations has involved grouping churches according to the faith traditions they are associated with (Kellstedt et al. 1996; Steensland et al. 2000), though at a minimum, distinctions between Catholics and Protestants are made. For example, Putnam (1993) and Verba et al. (1995) uncover differences between Protestants and Catholics with regards to the attainment of civic skills and trust. Within the U.S. states, higher proportions of Catholics are related to greater levels of social trust as well as informal socializing (Knack 2002). Thus, one might surmise that Catholic churchgoers would be availed with greater opportunities than Protestants to practice civic skills through working together in groups. However, since the Catholic Church is organized hierarchically, Catholic congregations offer their members fewer opportunities to participate in church functions involving, among other tasks, serving on committees and making decisions.

Further categorizations of American churches involve the differentiation between evangelical and mainline Protestant faith traditions. Generally, while mainline Protestants (along with Catholics) are more likely to volunteer and be involved in broader community service, their evangelical counterparts tend not to extend social efforts into the outside community. Robert D. Putnam (2000) explains that “It is that broader civic role that, with few exceptions, evangelical religion has not yet come to play in contemporary America” (77-78). Wuthnow also points out that mainline Protestant versus evangelical churches better succeed at encouraging their members to be active in the community (1999). Not surprisingly, members who attend churches that encourage them to participate in activities outside the church will, on average, be more likely to participate in political activities (Campbell 2004).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> While Campbell’s evidence supports the notion that evangelical Protestant churches’ demands on members to participate in church functions does inhibit members’ participation in politics, his analysis also shows that evangelicals who form tight social networks through church activities may also be intensely politically mobilized.

Beyond the theological dimension of religion that affects the way in which churches in the U.S. foster members' civic skill development, Jones-Correa and Leal (2001) test a sample of Verba et al.'s claims and find that there exist relevant differences within racial and ethnic groups by denomination. For example, in explaining Latino political involvement, Verba et al. conclude that Latinos participate less in politics because a majority of Latinos are Catholic, and Catholic congregations, because of their hierarchical structure, offer their members fewer opportunities to partake in church activities that build civic skills. However, Jones-Correa and Leal argue that instead of denominational differences accounting for the disparity of participation rates between Latinos and whites, it is that whites participate more in activities within the church than do Latinos. Therefore, racial differences in participation are accounted for by differences in the way that Latino and white churches mobilize their members' engagement in politics. Furthermore, Harris (1999) explains that black churches encourage political participation through offering members cultural resources for political activism, including the nourishment within members of an oppositional culture that motivates blacks to act against their marginalization in society as well as to fulfill their civic duties through engaging in democratic processes.

Finally, Djupe and Gilbert (2006) find that congregations as incubators of civic skills vary by the quality of social relationships nurtured within each congregation. Thus, a congregation's capacity to affect civic skill development depends on the level of homogeneity between members within the church. More specifically, these scholars point out that congregations are better able to affect members' civic skill acquisition when they provide members the chance to participate in small groups where they are able to participate meaningfully and possibly hold leadership positions. When the group is homogeneous, members are more likely to develop skills that the group offers either because they identify favorably with

the group or because they tend to enjoy greater access to leadership positions. On the other hand, if tensions exist between group members, including conflicts, power struggles, misunderstandings, or unequal access to various roles, members will, on average, be less likely to develop civic skills.

The abovementioned literature indicates that not all congregations are equal in their ability to cultivate members' individual contributions to a healthy civic society. As mentioned above, this study builds on this literature by testing the impact of congregational size on the use of civic skills through various indicators of political participation.

### ***The Size Effect: Why Congregational Size May Matter***

Our hypothesizing about the effect of church size on political participation through civic skills acquisition reflects two lines of thought, both of which comport with previous literature. First, building off of Djupe and Gilbert's work, so far as a small congregation is homogeneous, cohesive, and offers opportunities for members to participate in small groups, size may be relevant to whether or not a congregant participates in church activities, especially if these conditions are unlikely to hold in larger churches which might harbor a more heterogeneous mix of congregants. Secondly, church size may impact the relationship between civic skill acquisition through church participation and political participation. That is, while church participation's significant effect on political participation is robustly evident in previous studies, this relationship may be mediated by church size. In controlling for church size, we expect to yield one of two possible results. On the one hand, small churches, in line with the foregoing discussion, might, because they are theorized to offer their members more opportunities to participate in civic skill building, influence their members to participate in politics when such

members otherwise may not have. Conversely, results might also comport with Djupe and Gilbert's findings if church size poses a positive effect on civic skill acquisition, for in line with their theory, the total number of congregants in a church might be positively associated with the number of groups that congregants split into. So, large churches may offer a greater number of opportunities for those congregants to form small groups which partake in activities similar to those involved in democratic participation. For example, so-called mega-churches that harbor hundreds or even thousands of members often split their congregants into small groups that facilitate the development of civic skills.

To determine whether or not size matters for a congregation's ability to provide members with opportunities to develop and practice civic skills, we will test whether or not the size of one's congregation predicts involvement in politics controlling for participation in church activities that we know promote civic skill acquisition. Specifically, we test whether the number of congregants that belong to a church impacts a scale of participatory activities. That is, on average, we expect an independent effect for congregational size on opportunities to participate in politics, even after controlling for church participation and other factors that previous literature indicates matters for such opportunities. These theoretical explanations regarding the impact of church size on political engagement yield the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis: Controlling for other relevant factors that affect a citizen's political participation, the instances of participating in politics will vary by the size of the church one attends.

### ***Data and Methods***

In order to test the foregoing hypothesis, we employ statistical techniques to measure the average effect of church size on political engagement using survey data provided by the 2000 Religion and Politics Survey. The survey, conducted by Princeton University's Survey Research Center

from January through March 2000, contains data associated with a nationally-representative sample of 5,603<sup>6</sup> Americans. From these data, the dependent variable, political participation, is generated through constructing a scale composed of the sum of positive responses to various questions regarding respondents' participation in political activities.<sup>7</sup> These data also include a measure of our primary independent variable of church size<sup>8</sup> as well as multiple indicators of church participation<sup>9</sup>. Various control variables<sup>10</sup> were also employed in the regression analysis. To analyze these data, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression is employed. While our dependent variable, the political participation index, only takes on five values, we nonetheless report results from OLS models instead of those generated from ordered logistic models because

---

<sup>6</sup> While there are 5,603 cases in the data set, only 2,837 of them are used in this analysis. Cases were discarded via listwise deletion, and an analysis of the descriptive statistics of both samples reveals that data appear to be missing at random. Thus, the sample of 2,837 respondents likely does not misrepresent the results yielded if all of the cases were without missing data.

<sup>7</sup> Respondents' political participation scores were generated by adding their affirmative responses to survey questions asking whether in the past twelve months they had contacted an elected official, donated money to a political party or candidate, attended a political rally or meeting, and worked for a political campaign or voter registration drive. This scale generates an alpha reliability coefficient of .6055.

<sup>8</sup> The size of the church that a respondent attends is generated from the survey asking them to list the number of members who belong to their congregation. Responses are ordinal and include the options fewer than 100, 100-199, 200-299, 300-499, 500-999, 1,000-1,999, and 2,000 or more.

<sup>9</sup> There are two measures of church participation that are included in the model. The first is generated from responses to the question "During the past twelve months, have you done volunteer work at a church or other place of worship?" The second measure comes from the question "do you hold any leadership positions at your place of worship?" Because these two measures combined do not hold up well in a scale (as indicated by an alpha coefficient of .4990), they are included separately in the model.

<sup>10</sup> Control variables include other factors that previous literature has demonstrated affect political participation that may also affect church participation and the size of the church one attends. These include party identification (as measured through dummies for Republicans and Democrats in the sample, with the largest group, Independents, serving as the reference category) educated (measured ordinally by less than high school graduate, high school graduate, some college, technical/vocational school graduate, college graduate, post-graduate work), marital status (coded 0 if not married and 1 if married), age (in years), and race (scored 1 if white and 0 otherwise). Various other controls and interaction terms were also added to the model but were not significantly related to political participation and compromised the strength of the model in general. These controls include dummy variables for religious denomination, dummy variables for small, medium, and mega churches, interactions between church participation and religious denominations, and square and cubic transformations of congregational size. The effects of each of these are not included in the reported results. Moreover, we created interaction terms between size and each of the religious denomination dummies to test for group differences between denominations in the effect of size on church participation. Nested regression models for both sets of data revealed that each of the interaction terms was insignificant, increased the R-squared values only slightly, and decreased the Global F values in each model containing them. Since each of the models performed better without them, they are not included in the analysis we discuss.

while the results are sufficiently comparable in both models, they are more easily interpretable in the OLS models.

Furthermore, diagnostic tests run on the data reveal that the variables suffer from problems associated with heteroskedasticity<sup>11</sup>. To correct for this in the model, we employ robust standard errors to more accurately assess the statistical significance of each cause on participating in political activities. Finally, diagnostic testing involving scatter plots reveal that our theoretical basis for hypothesizing that small congregations and mega-churches would be most likely to foster opportunities to participate in small groups is unfounded. While we predicted that the distribution of size plotted against both church participation and political engagement would form a U-shaped pattern, it does so only for political participation. Accordingly, a binomial term is added to the model measuring the effect of size on political participation<sup>12</sup>. Table 1 reveals the results<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> For the models run, the Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test yielded a significant chi-square value of 155.81, and the White's test yielded a significant value of 178.27. These relatively high values indicate that heteroskedasticity is a problem in the data.

<sup>12</sup> An additional diagnostic test was run to determine whether or not multicollinearity is a problem. Between the variables employed here, the mean VIF value is 1.20. Therefore, our results do not suffer from problems associated with multicollinearity.

<sup>13</sup> Moreover, see Appendix A for a listing of descriptive statistics for each of the variables employed in both models.

TABLE 1  
 OLS Regression Results  
 Congregational Size Positively Predicts Political Participation  
 Religion and Politics Survey (2000)

	Church Participation Effects	Size Effect Controlling for Denominations	Size Effect Accounting for all Controls
<b>Holding a Leadership Position</b>	.1845*** [.0458]	.2222*** [.0458]	.1421*** [.0466]
<b>Volunteering at Church</b>	.2853*** [.0447]	.2740*** [.0443]	.2226*** [.0457]
<b>Congregational Size</b>		.0664*** [.0099]	.0343*** [.0102]
<b>Church Attendance</b>			-.0037 [.0116]
<b>Rural</b>			.0543 [.0478]
<b>Female</b>			-.1679*** [.0379]
<b>Age</b>			.0056*** [.0011]
<b>Married</b>			.0811* [.0389]
<b>Republican</b>			.0477 [.0455]
<b>Democrat</b>			.0278 [.0467]
<b>White</b>			-.0368 [.0504]
<b>Education</b>			.1525*** [.0123]
<b>Constant</b>	.5348*** [.0354]	.2649*** [.0535]	-.3039** [.0960]
<b>N</b>	2837	2837	2837
<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>	.0280	.0426	.1088

Robust standard errors are in brackets; \*\*\* denotes  $p < .001$ , \*\* denotes  $p < .01$ , \* denotes  $p < .05$ . Coefficients represent the effect of each variable on the dependent variable, political participation.

### ***Results and Discussion***

As the results from the 2000 Religion and Politics Survey indicate in Table 1, size poses a statistically significant effect on whether or not members of churches participate in political activities. The results indicate that on average, as size increases, participation in such activities increases. Moreover, the coefficients themselves indicate the effect of size on church participation is substantive. Specifically, they indicate that controlling for other factors that influence members' participation in politics, on average, a one-unit increase in the size of the congregation that one attends produces a .0343-unit increase in the political participation index. The results also indicate that controlling for the two forms of church participation included in the model, congregational size independently poses a significant effect on whether or not a member participates in politics. Relative to the coefficients associated with other factors that contribute to a churchgoer's propensity to engage in political activities, this is an important result that enlightens our understanding of how the context of congregations affects their abilities to serve as incubators of civic skills for their members. This finding comports with Djupe and Gilbert's conclusion that it is the opportunity for congregants to participate in small groups within a church that matters, and this opportunity does seem to vary by church size.

Following the abovementioned observed trend that congregations are increasing in size, our results are normatively desirable given the importance of churches in mobilizing those who may not otherwise be mobilized. Because our results indicate that bigger churches are better able to motivate members' civic engagement, and because church participation engages those in politics who might not otherwise be mobilized, the political participation that churches cause functions as an equalizing force in American democratic society. Put simply, that congregations

are growing in membership is an encouraging trend with respect to the representational disparity between the preferences of citizens who participate in politics and those of citizens who do not.

### ***Conclusion***

In order for people to become *actively* involved in politics beyond simply voting in elections, there are certain tasks individuals must be able to accomplish above and beyond maintaining a basic awareness and comprehension of politics. Those who possess more civic skills tend to be more effective participants in politics than those with less of them. Even the simplest skills that highly educated citizens may take for granted, such as conducting a meeting or leading a group discussion, are important for meaningful civic engagement and participation in politics. Given the prominence of religion in society today and the extent to which practicing religion through church participation may augment the skills of those who otherwise may not develop them, scholars should continue to address religion's impact on civic engagement and the acquisition of civic skills. Those same participatory skills that are developed and practiced by the affluent in the boardroom can be practiced by others in church, and this can potentially enhance the participatory levels of all members of society regardless of placement on the socio-economic continuum.

As stated above, however, not all churches nourish in their members the civic skills they need to participate in politics. This study has functioned to extend our understanding of what matters for churches' abilities to do. Our results indicate that church size, as measured by the number of congregants within a church, does matter for civic skill building. These results notwithstanding, it is important to underscore the limitations of our finding with regards to how churches impact citizens' abilities to participate in politics. What we have modeled is the effect

of size on only members' behaviors with regards to participating in a finite amount of political activities. Verba et al. emphasize that not only do citizens need resources such as civic skills to participate, they also need to be engaged in politics as well, and they need to be specifically asked to participate (1995). That is, our results indicate that size and church participation predict civic engagement, but it is not clear that variations in church size will account for differences in members' motivations to participate. To the extent that our tests of the effects of church size on members' political participation do not extend to conclusively gauge this requirement associated with participating, our understanding of how church size affects political participation is limited. However, this study does serve to warrant future inquiry into how exactly churches affect their members' participation in politics with regards to either engaging their interest in participating or asking them to do so. Moreover, extensions of this research should test effects other than size, such as the level of political homogeneity within a congregation, the demands placed on congregants in so-called "strict" churches, and the effects of internal bonding occurring within churches at the expense of external bridging.

It is clear through the central importance established in the literature regarding the strong association of religion and participation, the strong association between participation and the representation of one's interests, and especially the ability of churches to mobilize the participation of citizens who would likely otherwise not participate, that such inquiry is worthwhile. Future studies designed to shed light on the relationship between religion and civic participation are both warranted and vital to the development of efforts designed to augment equal participation amongst all types of Americans.

## References

- Bartels, Larry M. 2002. "Economic Inequality and Political Representation." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 29 August, Boston.
- Campbell, David E. 2004. "Acts of Faith: Churches and Political Engagement." *Political Behavior* 26 (2). 155-180.
- Coleman, J. S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (Supplement). S95-S120.
- Djupe, Paul A. and Christopher P. Gilbert. 2006. The Resourceful Believer: Generating Civic Skills in Church. *Journal of Politics* 68 (1). 116-127.
- Gilens, Martin. 2005. "Inequality and Democratic Responsiveness." *Public Opinion Quarterly*: 69(5). 778-796.
- Griffin, John D. and Brian Newman. 2005. "Are Voters Better Represented?" *Journal of Politics* 67 (4). 1206-1227.
- Jelen, Ted G. 1992. "Political Christianity: A Contextual Analysis." *American Journal of Political Science* 36 (3). 692-714.
- Jones-Correa, Michael and David L. Leal. 2001. "Political Participation: Does Religion Matter?" *Political Research Quarterly* 54 (4). 751-770.
- Kellstedt, Lyman A., John C. Green, James L. Guth, and Corwin E. Smidt. 1996. "Grasping the Essentials: The Social Embodiment of Religion and Political Behavior." In Green et al. (Eds) *Religion and the Culture Wars: Dispatches from the Front*. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Knack, Stephen. 2002. "Social Capital and the Quality of Government: Evidence from the States." *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (4). 772-785.
- Leege, D.C. 1988. "Catholics and the Civil Order: Parish Participation, Politics, and Civic Participation." *Review of Politics* 50. 704-36.
- Maloney, W.A., G. Smith, and G. Stroker. 2000. "Social Capital and Associational Life." In *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives* (eds. S. Baron, J. Field, and T. Schuler).
- Steensland, Brian, Jerry Park, Mark Regnerus, Lynn Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, and Robert Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces* 79 (1). 291-318.
- Skocpol, Theda. 2004. *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civil Life*. University of Oklahoma Press.

- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wald, Kenneth D., Dennis E. Owen, and Samuel S. Hill. 1988. "Churches as Political Communities." *American Political Science Review* 82 (2). 531-548.
- Wilcox, Clyde and Lee Sigelman. 2001. "Political Mobilization in the Pews: Religious Continuity and Electoral Turnout." *Social Science Quarterly* 82 (3). 524-535.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 1999. Mobilizing Civic Engagement: The Changing Impact of Religious Involvement. In *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, edited by Theda Skocpol and Morris P. Fiorina. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press/Russell Sage Foundation.

## APPENDIX

TABLE A  
Descriptive Statistics, 2000 Religion and Politics Survey

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>N</b>
Political Participation Index	.6606	.9667	0-4	5565
Holding a Leadership Position	.2626	.4401	0-1	3180
Volunteering in a Church Activity	.5005	.5000	0-1	5602
Congregational Size	4.035	1.936	1-7	3045
Church Attendance	2.881	2.165	0-6	5566
Rural	.1822	.3861	0-1	5520
Female	.5513	.4974	0-1	5603
Age	44.78	18.47	18-99	5603
Married	.5400	.4984	0-1	5525
Republican	.2802	.4491	0-1	5293
Democrat	.3333	.4714	0-1	5293
White	.8141	.3890	0-1	5499
Education	3.527	1.644	1-8	5603