



1970

An Exploratory Study of Church Attendance and Opinions Toward Open Housing Among a Small Sample of Suburban Presbyterian and Bible Church Members

James F. Gilsinan
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Gilsinan, James F., "An Exploratory Study of Church Attendance and Opinions Toward Open Housing Among a Small Sample of Suburban Presbyterian and Bible Church Members " (1970). *Master's Theses*. Paper 2461.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/2461

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © James F. Gilsinan

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE AND OPINIONS
TOWARD OPEN HOUSING AMONG A SMALL SAMPLE OF SUBURBAN
PRESBYTERIAN AND BIBLE CHURCH MEMBERS

James F. Gilsinan

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate School
In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Arts

February 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
The Weberian Controversy--Research Background	
General Statement of the Problem	
Background of the Problem	
The Sociological Complexities of the General Problem	
Conceptualization of the Research Problem	
Review of the Related Literature	
Theoretical Considerations	
Hypotheses	
II. THE METHODS AND TECHNIQUES OF THE STUDY	30
Sample Population and Procedures	
Interview Schedules	
Other Research Problems	
III. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	42
Sociological Characteristics of the Samples	
Comparison of Samples on Opinions Toward Open Housing	
Analysis of Secondary Questions	
Analysis of Ministers' Interview Schedule	
Summary of Chapter Results	
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY.	76
The Problem and Method	
Resume of the Findings and Bearing on the Hypotheses	
Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research	
APPENDICES	88
I. THE GENERAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	
II. THE MINISTERS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	
III. THE OPEN HOUSING ORDINANCE	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	105

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Occupational Level of Presbyterians and Bible Church Members	43
2. Educational Level of Presbyterians and Bible Church Members	44
3. Income Level of Presbyterians and Bible Church Members.	45
4. Social Position of Presbyterians and Bible Church Members on Hollingshead's Two Factor Index	47
5. Age Level of Presbyterians and Bible Church Members.	48
6. Church Affiliation and Opinions Toward Open Housing.	50
7. Differences Between Attenders and Non-Attenders On Opinions Toward Open Housing	52
8. Attitude Toward Open Housing of Presbyterian and Bible Members by Frequency of Attendance and Income	56
9. Lower Middle Incomes (\$4,000 - \$7,999) and Opinions Toward Open Housing of Attenders and Non-Attenders.	57
10. Low Incomes (Under \$4,000) and Opinions Toward Open Housing of Attenders and Non-Attenders	58
11. Opinions Toward Open Housing of Attending and Non-Attending High School Graduates.	59
12. Clerical, Sales, or Similar Occupations by Opinions Toward Open Housing of Attenders and Non-Attenders.	60
13. Attenders and Non-Attenders in the Age Group Fifty to Sixty-Nine by Opinions Toward Open Housing.	62

Table

Page

14.	Attenders and Non-Attenders in the Age Group Seventy and Over by Opinions Toward Open Housing	63
15.	Unmarried Attenders and Non-Attenders by Opinions Toward Open Housing	64
16.	Married Attenders and Non-Attenders by Opinions Toward Open Housing	65
17.	Male Attenders and Non-Attenders by Opinions Toward Open Housing	66
18.	Female Attenders and Non-Attenders by Opinions Toward Open Housing	66

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Weberian Controversy--Research Background. Since religion by its very nature is unscientific, some argue that any study of its results and effects is, therefore, doomed to the limbo of pseudo-science. This argument, however, is not founded upon fact. The attempt to measure the impact of religion upon men's attitudes and values has a long and venerable history in sociological research and tradition. Early theorists such as Simmel, Durkheim, and Weber have dealt with the subject, and renewed interest in the field has been fostered by the works of such researchers as Charles Y. Glock, Rodney Stark, Benjamin Ringer, Joseph Fichter, Gerhard Lenski, and others.

Why have these men considered religion an important area of study? The answer to this question can be found in the early works of Durkheim and Weber. Contrary to the schools of positivism and economic determinism, which viewed religion as an anachronism with negligible influence in modern society,¹ Durkheim saw it as a repository of man's historical and cultural heritage which both shaped and reflected man's psycho-social needs and actions.²

¹Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), p. 3.

²Emile Durkheim, The Elementary Forms of Religious Life, trans. by Joseph Swain (Glencoe: The Free Press, no date).

And while the economic determinists sought to explain the functioning of society solely in terms of the norms and values of the market place,³ Weber maintained that the market place of the capitalist was itself largely the result of a religious movement.⁴

Neither Durkheim nor Weber was, however, trying to replace economic determinism with a type of religious determinism. Both were rather pointing out the necessity for viewing society as a complex, interrelated whole, with changes at one point having significant consequences for all other parts of the system. Thus, for Durkheim, religion was far from being an unfortunate hangover of man's primitive past. Instead, not only was religion an embodiment of some of man's most important insights, but the institution itself performed the very necessary function of helping integrate man into the norms and values of his society, and was therefore a basic and integral element in any stable social system.⁵

Weber, too, argued the futility of uni-causal explanations for the functioning of society. He insisted, for example, that certain societies did in fact manifest a type of capitalism before the advent of the Protestant Reformation.⁶ Certainly the rise of the entrepreneurial role in such settings as ancient Greece, Florence of the Middle Ages, and Spain during its era of

³Lenski, The Religious Factor, p. 3.

⁴Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (New York: Scribner & Sons, 1930).

⁵Durkheim, The Elementary Forms of Religious Life.

⁶Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, p. 55.

conquest, cannot be attributed to the doctrines of Calvin and other reformers. Nevertheless, it was only after the ideas of these men had been promulgated and accepted by many that capitalism emerged as the dominant economic system, with large groups of men committed to the particular role of entrepreneur, with its consequent emphasis on responsibility, calculated risks, and rational decision making. Weber, then, while not denying the importance of the market place, sought to challenge what he regarded as an oversimplified view of society and the processes of social change. He suggested what he considered to be a more adequate alternative to the view offered by the economic determinists.

The Weberian controversy is by no means settled. Two schools of thought have arisen regarding the importance of religion and its impact on society. One school closely parallels that of the positivists and economic determinists cited above. To their theories we can also add those of urbanism and secularization. The complexities of the urban condition force man to live his life in a highly compartmentalized style. The specialization necessary in an urban, industrial community causes an individual to segmentalize the various facets of his life into distinct units, relatively unrelated to each other. In the modern metropolis, then, work, recreation, and family life tend to become distinct aspects in a person's milieu, a situation which is in sharp contrast to the earlier agrarian communities, or even to earlier urban settings.⁷

⁷Lenski, The Religious Factor, p. 10.

According to this classical theory of urbanism,⁸ religion, too, shares in the compartmentalization process. Rather than being viewed as an integral part of man's life, religion is seen as a highly specialized segment, having little or no impact on the larger society and on man's activities within that society.

Specialization with its resultant compartmentalization is not the only consequence of urban living. Another feature of urbanism that might considerably lessen or eliminate altogether the importance of religion in modern life is that of secularization. Since city life requires a certain amount of co-operation, so that the necessary production of goods and services essential to the well being of the total community can take place, the many people of different backgrounds who come into constant and close association to achieve these ends are required to minimize their differences. Hence, norms of tolerance and secularism inevitably arise in urban centers.⁹ Norms particular to one religious group are de-emphasized, and are instead replaced by a common set of norms and values derived from the urban setting.

If this classical theory on the effects of urbanism is accepted, the end result will be a view of religion as something

⁸The major ideas of the classical school can be traced to the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft dicotomy of Ferdinand Tonnies. As Professor Martindale states "...all modern societal typologies-- such as Durkheim's distinction between 'mechanical' and 'organic' solidarity, Park's 'sacred-secular' distinction, Redfield's 'folk-secular' distinction--take Tonnies' conceptualizations as a starting point." Don Martindale, The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory (Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1960), p. 86.

⁹Lenski, The Religious Factor, p. 9.

5

that only mirrors and reflects but does not change or shape the values of the surrounding milieu. However, a second school, a direct descendant of the Weberian tradition, still views religion as a vital force having an impact on men's attitudes and values even in our modern, highly complex, urbanized society. One of the chief proponents of this school is Will Herberg, who asserts that urbanism, rather than diminishing the importance of religion, in fact strengthens it.¹⁰ The very impersonality of modern life causes man to seek out relationships which are of a more communal nature. Men feel a need for identification and participation in groups which are broader than the family, but less narrow than the larger society. Whereas ethnic groups formerly performed this function, now with the rapid disintegration of such groups, men are turning to religious groups for their sense of identification and belongingness.¹¹ Hence, religion becomes an important aspect of man's life, influencing his very sense of identity. Consequently, religious convictions are carried over into the larger areas of society and have an impact on a variety of values and attitudes.

The differing theories surrounding the socio-psychological functions of religion can be summarized as follows: (a) In a modern, highly industrialized setting religion has little or no

¹⁰Will Herberg, Protestant, Catholic, Jew (Garden City: Doubleday, 1955).

¹¹This interpretation of Herberg's views is found in Lenski, The Religious Factor, p. 11.

influence on attitudes or values, and is itself merely reflecting the political, social, economic, and institutional processes of which it is a part; (b) religion is a vital force in shaping and changing men's attitudes and values, and it has an impact on the institutions of the larger society. In expounding either of these two theories, however, a certain amount of caution is necessary. An over commitment to one or the other can lead to a type of social determinism--economic, political or religious. The writer proposes a third alternative, namely, an interdependence between the various parts of the social system, so that religion not only influences, but is in turn influenced by, the existing norms and values of the larger society. The question now becomes one of degree. Which influences what to a greater or smaller proportion?

General Statement of the Problem. The central problem of this study, then, is trying to explore the relationship of religious affiliation-attendance to an attitude toward a social issue, an open housing ordinance in Oak Park, Illinois. Do people who regularly attend a given church (either the First Presbyterian Church or the Harrison Street Bible Church) mirror the values and attitudes of their religious leaders when judging the desirability of such a law, regardless of other sociological factors such as age, sex, income, or education? Moreover, do attenders differ significantly from non-attenders in their attitude toward this issue?

Background of the Problem. In the spring of 1968, Oak

Park, Illinois passed an open housing ordinance.¹² This ordinance was the result of more than a year's study on the part of the Oak Park Community Relations Commission, which was established by the Village Board of Trustees to combat racial discrimination in the suburb.¹³ As might be expected, such pending legislation was the cause of much discussion, both pro and con, among the residents. The Commission, therefore, held a number of open meetings to help determine the views of the population concerning this issue. The first such meeting was held on February 4, 1968. Of the eighty-one individuals who testified, sixty-three favored a fair housing law and eighteen opposed it. Those favoring the proposed ordinance included representatives of such organizations as the Oak Park-River Forest Citizens Committee for Human Rights, the League of Women Voters, and the local chapter of the Association of University Women. Besides these secular bodies, three Protestant Churches, the Jewish Council of Rabbis, and all four Roman Catholic Churches in the village expressed support for the law. The three Protestant Churches included The First Presbyterian Church, The First Methodist Church, and The Unitarian Church of Oak Park.

On the other hand, other groups and organizations were against the passage of the law. Representatives of the Oak Park Real Estate Board and the Property Management Committee expressed very strong opposition to any law that would regulate the sale or

¹²The ordinance is contained in Appendix III.

¹³The Oak Park Community Relations Commission was established on March 18, 1963.

rental of private homes and apartments. Opposition was also voiced by individuals who feared that such legislation would mean inundation rather than stable integration. The specter of rapid racial transition in Austin, a Chicago community immediately east of Oak Park, was evident. To calm the fears of the opposition, it was pointed out that a nationwide survey by the Chicago Human Relations Commission showed that such open housing laws had not been responsible for any radical changes in housing patterns. Oak Park would, in fact, be more likely to attract stable buyers who want to get away from the ghettos, not create new ones. Others argued that fair housing interferes with property "rights." This argument was countered by showing that constructive restrictions on the use of property were vital to the interest of the general public welfare and the community at large. Examples of similar restrictions such as zoning, density codes, sanitation, and electrical requirements restricting property use were given.

On the basis of this hearing, then, and the previous information and opinions gathered by the Commission, a proposed fair housing ordinance was submitted to the Village Board for action. This was not, however, to be the end of the discussion concerning open housing. Immediately after the proposed ordinance had been given to the Village Board for approval, a group of Oak Park citizens formed to supervise the circulation of petitions requesting a referendum on the question of whether or not the Board of Trustees should pass an ordinance regulating the transfer of property on the basis of race. Instrumental in the formation

and supervision of this group was the pastor of the Harrison Street Bible Church, a fundamentalist body located in south Oak Park. He made it clear that he was against any such suggested law. He expressed his views in letters to the editor of the local newspaper and talked to a number of groups about the evils of the proposed ordinance.

This referendum petition caused the Commission, on March 24, 1968, to hold another public meeting in order to reiterate the reasons for recommending an open housing ordinance. At this meeting individuals were also allowed to express their views. After the Commission chairman explained the reasoning behind recommending such a law, members of the audience gave their opinions. The tone of this meeting was decidedly different from the one previously held. Although thirty of the fifty-two people speaking expressed support for the law, the remaining twenty-two seemed to have the support of the majority of the 500 or so people in attendance. While the twenty-two who spoke against the passage of the law received cheers and ovations from most of the audience, those in favor of it were greeted with much derision.

In light of such evident hostility, the Village Board of Trustees held their own open meeting on April 25th, with much the same results. At this meeting forty spoke in favor of the law, while thirty-four spoke against any type of housing legislation. Again, however, those speaking against it seemed to have the support of the majority of the audience. At this meeting it was pointed out to the trustees that the referendum group had been

able to obtain 10,156 signatures on a petition requesting that open housing in Oak Park be put to the vote in the June election. The Board decided, however, that such a referendum would not be in the best interests of Oak Park, and so, despite opposition from this group and a number of very vocal individuals, the open housing ordinance became law on May 5, 1968.

The Sociological Complexities of the General Problem.

While the situation in Oak Park presented an opportunity to study the differences of opinion between members of different churches regarding open occupancy, the problems involved in such an undertaking soon became evident. These problems included the selection of churches to be studied, the definition of the terms "liberal" and "conservative," the separation of the various components of religiosity, and finally a consideration of some of the sociological variables related to church participation and involvement.

The first problem that presented itself, and the one most easily solved, was the choice of the participating churches. Since the one minister who publicly opposed the passage of the law was the leader of a Protestant Bible Church, it was felt that another Protestant denomination should be included to represent those religious groups which supported the law. Therefore, The First Presbyterian Church was chosen for study, together with The Harrison Street Bible Church.

Both The First Presbyterian Church and The Harrison Street Bible Church are part of what Max Weber has termed the "Ascetic

Protestant" tradition.¹⁴ Weber uses this term to denote those denominations which follow Calvinist, Pietist, or Revivalist ideals. This tradition is marked by its emphasis on the concepts of "calling" and predestination, and its rational-manipulative approach to success in this life as a sign of success in the next one. God calls man to be saved, and as a sign of fulfilling this special summons man is expected to live a life of hard work and frugality. Salvation cannot be obtained by the magical powers of sacraments nor by individual good works. It is only in living a genuinely ascetic life that one can show that one has been chosen for eternal glory. Man was, therefore, expected to plan his whole life in accord with God's will. The theologians and philosophers of this tradition broadened the concept of asceticism by bringing it out of its purely monastic surroundings. And, as Weber noted, by doing so they created the ideological underpinnings for capitalism.

While the two churches, then, share in some common theological and historical circumstances, they suffer a division along the liberal-conservative continuum. Observers of the Protestant scene have long suspected that this type of division is of much more consequence than any division along strictly denominational lines.¹⁵ The two churches involved in this study represent

¹⁴Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, p. 171.

¹⁵Robert Campbell, O.P., ed., The Spectrum of Protestant Beliefs (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1968), p. viii.

differing responses of the "left" and the "right" to the social situation. The liberal First Presbyterian Church believes in the Social Gospel approach to life and religion. Any effort to change the hearts and minds of individual men will be largely wasted if the institutions of the society in which they live are immoral or decadent. In order to save man, it is also necessary to reform society, and therefore it is the duty of the true Christian, as a part of his religious responsibility to his fellowman, to act directly upon the social order and work for its reconstruction.

This idea of the religious community having an obligation to pass judgment on the institutions of society is the crux of the Social Gospel,¹⁶ and has deeply pervaded the thinking of the Presbyterian Church. The startling effect that such a philosophy has had on Presbyterianism can be seen by the fact that it almost completely negates the Calvinist doctrine of predestination. If man is predestined and can do nothing to bring about his own salvation, why bother with trying to change society? In fact, while Calvin's teaching is contained intact in the Presbyterian Constitution, a reinterpretation has been added that considerably modifies the original meaning. God is said not to desire the death of any sinner, and therefore no man is condemned except on the grounds of his own sin.¹⁷ Consequently, the church's commitment to the Social Gospel can be justified when predestination is

¹⁶Paul A. Carter, The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1956), pp. 4-5.

¹⁷The Presbyterian Constitution (1966-67), p. 20.

looked upon (or perhaps a better term would be "overlooked") in this light.

The necessity for changing, or at least confronting, the realities of the world in order to help man discover his individual relationship with God formed the basis for the local church's stand on the issue of open occupancy. In a blue ribbon committee report, the mission division of the governing board of the church was charged with the responsibility of identifying issues in the community which required the church's corporate involvement. One of the issues cited for possible action by the church was the lack of equal opportunity for all races and creeds in employment and housing.¹⁸

Seeking to reform society represents the response of the religious "left" to the problems and challenges of the surrounding milieu. A different approach is taken by those on the "right," as is shown by the antipathy of the minister of the Bible Church to the Social Gospel approach. In a number of interviews he expressed the opinion that man-made laws can never accomplish the destruction of evil or injustice. What is required is a change of heart and a commitment to Christ on the part of the individual. Only when all men recognize Christ as their saviour will there be peace and harmony in the world. The emphasis here is on the individual. Once the individual soul has accepted Jesus Christ as his personal savior he is regenerated, born again, saved. This

¹⁸The First Presbyterian Church of Oak Park, Report of a Blue Ribbon Committee, Oak Park, Illinois, 1968 (unpublished report.).

cannot be accomplished through the government's effort of trying to force morality upon people, but can only come about through a personal commitment to God. The sole mission of the church is to reconcile man to his creator, and so the religious organization has no right to try to change society. Moreover, such attempts at promoting change in the world are in direct violation of the scriptural injunction God gave to his people--"Come apart and be separate." As a result of this individualistic theology, the minister of the Bible Church decried any attempt on the part of the government to infringe upon the lives of men, especially in the area of private property where he felt that man should have absolute control of what is his. "Forced" housing laws, therefore, are viewed as morally wrong and totally un-American.

The differing ideological stances of these two churches leads to a second problem involved in research of this type--namely, adequately defining the terms "liberal" and "conservative." The definition of these terms depends, in part, upon the issue being studied. Political or economic liberalism is not the same as social liberalism. This distinction is elucidated by George H. Smith. He found that "liberals" as defined by non-economic or inter-class values (e.g., endorsement of civil rights, internationalism, and opposition to prohibition) tended to be economically well-off and better educated, while "liberals" as defined by approval of certain politico-economic proposals (e.g., more power for labor in the government, government ownership of banks, increased unemployment compensation) tended to be less well-

educated and economically poorer.¹⁹ Since this research proposes to deal with a social issue (i.e., fair housing), the former definition is used when defining liberal. That is, those people who supported the passage of the open housing ordinance will be termed liberal, while those who were against it will be termed conservative. This typology completely disregards any political affiliations, and so limits the use of the terms to social or community orientations.

A third problem that confronts the researcher who studies religiosity is separating the various components of religious commitment. Glock and Stark consider five possible dimensions of religiosity.²⁰ These are the experiential, the ideological, the intellectual, the ritualistic, and the consequential dimensions of religious involvement and behavior.²¹ The experiential dimension deals with the emotional element of religious belonging and assumes that the religious person will at one time or another achieve a kind of communion with "spiritual reality." The ideological dimension is constituted by expectations that the religious person will hold certain beliefs, while the intellectual dimension has to do with the expectation that the religious person will be informed and knowledgeable about the basic tenets of his faith and its sacred scriptures. The ritualistic element deals

¹⁹George H. Smith, "Liberalism and the Level of Information," The Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIX (February, 1948), 65-81.

²⁰Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark, Religion and Society in Tension (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965).

²¹Ibid., pp. 20-21.

with the "practice" of one's faith, insofar as one fulfills the ritual requirements of it. Finally, the consequential dimension encompasses the secular effects of religiosity, and the consequences that such religiosity has on the beliefs, attitudes, and actions of individuals.

In this research the ritualistic dimension is used as the independent variable. This perhaps is the most concrete of the five mentioned and therefore the one most accessible to study. The use of this dimension, however, severely limits the scope of this undertaking, for ritual involvement is just one aspect of religiosity. A study of this type can, however, make some contribution to the field and to the need for continued exploration. Hence, "attenders," defined as those who attend church services more than once a month, and "nonattenders," defined as those who attend once a month or less, form the basic categories against which opinions toward open housing will be measured.

The use of attendance as an index of religious involvement brings to light a final consideration in the conceptualization of the problem under study, namely, the sociological correlates of church participation. Many authors have noted that involvement in religious groups is not randomly distributed among the population, but is instead related to a definite set of sociological factors. Glock, Ringer, and Babbie have noted the relationship between sex and attendance at Episcopalian church services.²²

²²Charles Y. Glock, Benjamin B. Ringer, and Earl R. Babbie, To Comfort and To Challenge (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), p. 41.

They found that women were more likely to attend church on Sundays and more likely to become deeply involved in the church's organizational life than were men.²³ These findings are supported by Michael Argyle, in his Religious Behavior,²⁴ who found that women were more religious than men on all his criteria, including private prayer, membership, attendance, and religious attitudes.²⁵

Religious interest also seems to be related to age.

Joseph Fichter found that among Roman Catholics the age group ten to nineteen had the best record of religious observance, with a falling off in the twenties, the low point reached in the thirties, and then a general upswing through the forties, fifties and sixties.²⁶ These same findings are noted by Glock, Ringer, and Babbie for their sample of Episcopalians,²⁷ and by Argyle for all Christian religious groups on both attendance and belief in God and an after-life.²⁸

Paralleling the differential involvement in church life due to age is change in the life cycle of the individual members. Glock, Ringer, and Babbie noted that involvement is relatively

²³Ibid.

²⁴Michael Argyle, Religious Behavior (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957), pp. 71-79.

²⁵Ibid., p. 78.

²⁶Joseph H. Fichter, Social Relations in the Urban Parish (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 25.

²⁷Glock, Ringer, and Babbie, To Comfort and To Challenge, p. 46.

²⁸Argyle, Religious Behavior, pp. 69-70.

high in pre-marital years, declines sharply with marriage and the birth of children, and recovers as the children reach school age. For women, involvement continued to increase as they and their children grew older, while for men it remained relatively static. This was presumably due to the fact that for women family responsibilities decreased as children grew older, while for men occupational responsibilities remained the same or increased. Hence, women had more time to devote to the church than did men.²⁹

Family status is another possible correlate of religious involvement. Glock, Ringer, and Babbie found that single people were more likely to be involved in the churches than were those who were married and had families.³⁰ They postulated that the church acted as a surrogate for those who were without families. This contention was strengthened by the fact that older women (beyond their fiftieth year) who had incomplete families (widowed and/or childless) were also more involved in the church than those who had fulfilled the normative expectations of family life. This same general pattern was also found among male respondents.³¹

Perhaps one of the most important factors related to religious involvement is social class (determined by education, income, and occupational level), but here the findings are less clear. Some researchers have found an inverse relationship between church

²⁹ Glock, Ringer, and Babbie, To Comfort and To Challenge, p. 59.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 13.

³¹ Ibid., pp. 73-74.

involvement and rising social class. Hollingshead, in Elmtown's Youth,³² found that his data supported this contention when the sample consisted of adolescents in a midwestern community. Glock, Ringer, and Babbie found the same tendency in their sample of Episcopalian women. Among the young, middle-aged, and older women, church involvement decreased with increasing social status.³³

Other authors have, however, found the opposite relationship to be true. The Lynds in their much earlier study of Middletown, for example, noted that the lower class were the least likely to belong to a church or to attend services. They were, however, the most likely to hold traditional religious beliefs.³⁴ Gerhard Lenski found in his sample of the Detroit area that upwardly mobile men were more likely to be regular church attenders than nonmobile men, in both the middle and working classes,³⁵ and Lee G. Burchinal in his study of church attendance in rural and small town areas of several midwestern states indicated that there appeared to be a direct relationship between social class and

³²A. B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949), pp. 459-460.

³³Glock, Ringer, and Babbie, To Comfort and To Challenge, p. 87. The authors noted, however, that churches tended to under-attract the less privileged population generally. Nevertheless, their data showed that those who were members were more highly involved in church life than were middle or upper class members.

³⁴The Lynds quoted in Glock, Ringer, and Babbie, To Comfort and To Challenge, p. 78.

³⁵Lenski, The Religious Factor, p. 103

frequency of church attendance.³⁶

Quite obviously, then, the relationship between status and church attendance is not conclusive. However, the differences in the findings of various researchers could be attributed to the different criteria used to define involvement. H. Richard Niebuhr in his book, The Social Sources of Denominationalism,³⁷ suggests that social class affects the type of religious involvement rather than the degree. Hence, social class played an important role in the formation of various types of religious organizations, with the economically deprived more likely to form or join fundamentalist or sect-like groups, while those who were middle class in orientation tended to form or join churches which were more formal in structure. This difference between church and sect helps to explain the different consequences of social class for religious involvement. Russell R. Dynes in his study, "Church-Sect Typology and Socio-Economic Status,"³⁸ found that churchness [sic] was associated with high socio-economic status and, conversely, that sectness [sic] was associated with low socio-economic status. In other words, as education increased, emotionalism, evangelism, and other sectarian characteristics were increasingly

³⁶Lee G. Burchinal, "Some Social Status Criteria and Church Membership and Church Attendance," Journal of Social Psychology, 49 (February, 1959), 53-64.

³⁷H. Richard Niebuhr, The Social Sources of Denominationalism (Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 1954).

³⁸Russell R. Dynes, "Church-Sect Typology and Socio-Economic Status," American Sociological Review, 20 (October, 1955) 555-60.

rejected. An increase in occupational prestige was also associated with a greater acceptance of the more institutional and liturgical churches.³⁹ The distinction between classes on the type of religious involvement may be attributed, then, to the seeming need on the part of the lower classes for experiencing religion emotionally, rather than simply observing it ritually.⁴⁰

In summarizing the various studies on the effects of social class for religious involvement, most researchers agree that the lower classes are somewhat more resistant to becoming church members, while the middle and upper classes are more likely to belong to institutionalized churches.⁴¹

Conceptualization of the Research Problem. The problem under study can now be more specifically stated: a community issue dealing with the desirability of a fair housing ordinance brought to light a difference of opinion between two churches, the liberal First Presbyterian Church and the fundamentalist Harrison Street Bible Church. The problem, then, is to determine if attendance at these two churches is in any way related to opinions toward open housing, and if attenders are more likely to mirror the attitudes of their religious leaders than are non-attenders, regardless of other sociological characteristics such

³⁹ Ibid., p. 559.

⁴⁰ Glock, Ringer, and Babbie, To Comfort and To Challenge, p. 74.

⁴¹ Differences in the discrepant findings of the studies cited may be a function of different populations studied and of different measures used to define religious commitment.

as age, education, sex, income, or occupational level, noting, moreover, that attendance or nonattendance at either of these two churches is itself related to such variables.

Review of the Related Literature. Perhaps the only definite conclusion one can draw from the literature related to the concomitants of religious involvement, variously defined, on attitudes, also variously defined, is that the Weberian controversy still rages. On the one side there are those sociologists who claim that religion has little impact on values and attitudes.

Wesley and Beverly Allensmith in their study, "Religious Affiliation and Politico-Economic Attitude: A Study of Eight Major U.S. Religious Groups,"⁴² found that their data supported an "economic interest group" theory of class structure. Classifying anyone who identified with a particular church (even non-members who preferred a given denomination) as members of that church, the Allensmiths were able to predict the politico-economic orientations of a religious group from the group's occupational status. Further, it was found that politico-economic differences within a religious group were also associated with the socio-economic stratification of that group.

Glock, Ringer, and Babbie noted that in their sample of Episcopalians, parishioners' actual involvement appeared unrelated

⁴²Wesley and Beverly Allensmith, "Religious Affiliation and Politico-Economic Attitude: A Study of Eight Major U.S. Religious Groups," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXII (1948), 377-89.

to their social ideology. Hence, the data revealed no significant association between the attitudes of parishioners and their ministers on six selected social issues, even among the most highly involved. They concluded, therefore, that the social ideologies of priests are of little importance in determining the corresponding attitudes among the members of their parish.⁴³ Similar results and interpretations are reported by Glock and Ringer in two separate articles, one on the political role of the church as seen by its members, the other on the relationship between official church policy and the attitudes of ministers and parishioners.⁴⁴

Glock and Stark, in their book Religion and Society in Tension, maintain that the way the majority of Americans behave, and what they value, is not informed by religious faith but by the norms and values of the larger society:

Confronted on the one hand by the abstract prescriptions of religion and on the other by the concrete norms and values made explicit by law, by the context in which they labor, and by secular groups, men are almost inexorably led to follow the latter-- partly because these sanctioning systems are more salient, but also because the nature of a religiously inspired choice is not clear.⁴⁵

Finally, Michael Argyle feels that there is too little

⁴³ Glock, Ringer, and Babbie, To Comfort and To Challenge, p. 171.

⁴⁴ Charles Y. Glock and Benjamin B. Ringer, "Church Policy and the Attitudes of Ministers and Parishioners on Social Issues," The American Sociological Review, 21 (April, 1956), 148-56 and "The Political Role of the Church as Defined by Its Parishioners," Public Opinion Quarterly, 18 (1954-55), 337-47.

⁴⁵ Glock and Stark, Religion and Society in Tension, p. 183

evidence to show that people's attitudes and religious beliefs can affect the economic system. Until such evidence can be procured, Argyle maintains that economic variables must generally be considered causal when examining the relative effects of religion and economics on each other.⁴⁶

While these authors seem to doubt the importance of religion in shaping attitudes, either political or social, they are not presenting a uni-causal approach to society. In fact all of them agree that religious affiliation and involvement might act as a latent cross pressure in certain instances of social or political attitude formation. However, if it does, it is of secondary importance, and usually a much more accurate basis for predicting opinions of this type will be occupation, income, or educational attainments.

In contrast to these theories, there are those that view religion not only as one of the primary determinants of opinion and attitude, but also as a causal variable in social and economic mobility. Gerhard Lenski, for example, asserts that church attendance is conducive to upward mobility. His sample from the Detroit area showed that not only were upwardly mobile men more likely to be church attenders than were nonmobile men, but that children of devout Protestant parents were also more likely to be upwardly mobile, and somewhat less likely to be downwardly mobile than were the children of less devout parents.

He concluded, therefore, that a high degree of involvement

⁴⁶Argyle, Religious Behavior, p. 139.

in white Protestant churches more often stimulates upward mobility than the other way around.⁴⁷

Benton Johnson in his study, "Ascetic Protestantism and Political Preference,"⁴⁸ suggests that the liberal and fundamentalist factions within ascetic Protestantism have different political orientations that in part counteract some of the class factors in American politics. If class factors were the single most important determinant of political affiliation and preference, one would expect lower or working class people to be uniformly Democratic, and upper class people to be uniformly Republican. Johnson found, however, that in his sample of Oregon Protestants, while nominal members of fundamentalist and liberal upper class churches expressed a political preference in keeping with their class position, involved members of the two groups deviated from class expectations. Active fundamentalists were more inclined to be Republican than called for by class position, and active members of upper status liberal churches were more inclined to be Democratic than would be expected on the grounds of class or status attributes alone.

Finally, as has been previously indicated, Will Herberg considers religion an important element in the self identification and social location of the individual, especially with the decreasing importance of the ethnic group in fulfilling this

⁴⁷ Lenski, The Religious Factor, pp. 104-105.

⁴⁸ Benton Johnson, "Ascetic Protestantism and Political Preference," Public Opinion Quarterly, 26 (1962), 35-46.

function.⁴⁹

In summarizing the related literature, it is found that the Allensmiths, Glock, Ringer, Babbie, and Stark, and Michael Argyle view religion as a factor of secondary importance in the formation of attitudes, either political or social. On the other hand, Benton Johnson, Gerhard Lenski, and Will Herberg are of the opinion that religion is of primary importance in the formation of these types of attitudes, and for Lenski, at any rate, religious involvement functions as a causal factor in upward social mobility.

In light of these diverse findings, it should be interesting to see if church involvement, as measured by attendance or nonattendance at services, is in any way related to opinions on open housing. While the studies cited dealt with the influence of religion on political propensities or on abstract social issues, this study proposes to deal with a specific issue which is more emotional and somewhat closer to the people than their more general political or social inclinations.

Theoretical Considerations. An individual's value system in large measure determines the way he views the world around him. It does this in part by providing him with attitudes which can be defined as fairly consistent and lasting tendencies to behave in certain ways--primarily positively or negatively--toward persons, activities, events, and objects.⁵⁰ Attitudes are in

⁴⁹Herberg, Protestant, Catholic, Jew, p. 5.

⁵⁰S. Stansfeld Sargent and Robert C. Williamson, Social Psychology (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1958), p. 407.

turn reflected in opinions which are specific judgments on a particular issue.⁵¹

This research deals in part with the last of these three components, namely opinions toward the specific issue of open occupancy. However, the values and attitudes of the individual respondents cannot be ignored, for the opinions expressed are in a degree a function of these other two factors. Values and attitudes are formed through the socialization process which is carried out by the various institutions and groups in society. Particularly germane to this process are the family, the church, the school, and the peer group. Like all groups and institutions, however, each of these has its own set of vested interests, and so many times they come into competition with one another over the allegiance of the individual. While, ideally, they should reinforce one another in their quest to instill a particular set of values, this is not always the case. Nevertheless, successful socialization depends upon a synthesis of all the various ideas and concepts a person is exposed to during his formative years so that he can ultimately form his own system of beliefs and values. This final synthesis results in a personal world view, against which new ideas and concepts are judged.

In light of these considerations, it is unlikely that the opinions expressed concerning open occupancy will be the simple result of attendance or nonattendance at church services. While

⁵¹ Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, Sociology (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 236.

memberships and attendance preceded the issue of open housing, the temporal sequence of church membership and an overall humanitarian liberal view or a more individualistic conservative view is less clear. It would seem, though, that liberal or conservative tendencies formed a part of the basic value system of the individuals interviewed, and that these tendencies were or are expressed in such things as political affiliation, church attendance, and opinions toward open housing. The institutions or groups to which the individual belongs serve to reinforce these basic, underlying standards. If they should cease backing up the personal value system of some of their members, they will in all probability lose the allegiance of these particular people, dependent upon the salience of the particular values violated and the degree of commitment to the institution or group.

In light of these considerations, then, the following hypotheses are proposed:

- Hypotheses:
- 1) Respondents who attend the Presbyterian Church regularly will show a greater tendency to favor open housing than will nonattenders, regardless of other sociological characteristics such as age, sex, income, occupation, or educational level.
 - 2) Respondents who attend the Bible Church regularly will show a greater tendency to be against open housing than will non-attenders, regardless of the sociological factors cited above.
 - 3) While opinions expressed on this issue will show

some relationship with type of church affiliations and attendance, the two variables are not causally related, but are rather indicative of generally liberal or conservative attitudes which express themselves in church affiliation-attendance and opinions toward open housing.

CHAPTER II

THE METHODS AND TECHNIQUES OF THE STUDY

Sample Population and Procedures. The two churches selected for the purposes of this study were chosen because: (1) The minister of each church had made public statements regarding the issue of open housing. (2) These statements represented opposing points of view concerning the desirability of such a law. The Presbyterian minister strongly favored this legislation, while the Bible Church minister strongly opposed it. (3) Each church shares in some of the common historical conditions of ascetic Protestantism. (4) Finally, each church represents opposite ends of the ideological continuum found within Protestantism.

In September, 1968, the total membership lists were obtained from the minister of each church. The congregational rolls from the Presbyterian Church contained approximately 600 entries, including both family units and individual members. All of those who lived outside the village were eliminated from this original list, and from the remaining 520, every tenth entry was randomly chosen for inclusion in the project. This yielded a sample of fifty-two units, twenty-four of which were families. Another twenty-four were single women, and four were single men. Of the twenty-four families, one was a single parent family with only

the male head listed, and two were single parent families with only the female head listed. It was decided that only one person in the family units would be interviewed.¹ There would be an equal number of males and females (twenty-six each) if all the male heads of households could be interviewed. Therefore, it was stipulated that whenever a male head was present in a family, an attempt would be made to set up an appointment with him. If the male head of the household would be unable or unwilling to be interviewed, then the wife would be asked to take part in the study. With these stipulations, then, each person was telephoned to determine if he or she would be willing to be interviewed, and appointments were made with those who agreed to participate. During the appointment, the schedule contained in Appendix II was administered, with each interview lasting about ten to fifteen minutes. In this manner, twenty-eight completed interviews were obtained from members of the Presbyterian Church, during a period lasting from early October through the middle of December, 1968. Thirteen of these were male respondents, and fifteen were female.

There appeared to be some reluctance on the part of people in the Presbyterian Church to participate in this undertaking. Ten of the people contacted simply said that they did not want to be bothered, while five others indicated that they were invalids and would prefer not to have any visitors. Six

¹ During the actual interview, other members of the family were allowed to be present, but they could not answer for nor advise the respondent.

more people had moved and were no longer living in the village. Finally, three people were unable to be contacted. Repeated phone calls were made at different times of the day and early evening hours during the three month interviewing period without success. After December, no further effort was made to reach these members.

Unquestionably, then, some bias was introduced into the sample. In order to ascertain the extent of this bias, the minister of the Presbyterian Church was asked if he could give some information concerning the non-respondents. Of the twenty-four who fell into this category, inquiries were made regarding thirteen of them. Those who had moved or who were invalids were excluded from consideration since they were no longer involved in the community. Of the remaining thirteen, eight were either inactive or unknown to the minister. These eight included four male heads of family units, one single male, and three single females. Five of the non-respondents were still active in the church. Two were male heads of family units, and three were single females. The minister described all five as older people (early sixties and older) who, while not actively opposed to the church's stand on the issue of open occupancy, were certainly apprehensive and in all probability against the passage of the law. The fact that all five were older attenders who were most likely against the law should be kept in mind when reviewing the data on age, church attendance, and opinions toward open housing in the next chapter. However, any bias in the sample should not

be overemphasized. There were people interviewed who had formerly been very active in the church, but who had dropped out because of its stand on open occupancy. There were also completed interviews obtained from people still active but not too favorable toward the church's position on this issue.

The problems of sampling in the Bible Church were of a somewhat different nature. Due to the size and structure of the Harrison Street Bible Church this sample was of necessity small. The Church had only about fifty members altogether. If families were treated as single units, thirty-one members lived in Oak Park. Of these, six were unwilling to be interviewed, and one had moved. Three others were unable to be contacted. Hence, only twenty-one completed interviews were obtained from members of this church, eighteen of which were female respondents.

This large proportion of female respondents seems to reflect the overall distribution of females in the total membership of the church. Of the thirty-one members living in Oak Park, ten were listed as family units. Of these ten, two were single parent families with only the female head listed. Of the remaining twenty-one entries, six were single males, and fifteen were individual females. Again, when setting up appointments with complete family units, an attempt was made to interview the male head of the household. This was successful in only three cases. Of the single males in the sample, three were unwilling to be interviewed, and three were unable to be contacted.

Another problem in the sampling of the Bible Church was

discovered after the interviews were completed. Only five members could be classified as non-attenders. The reasons for this seem to lie in both the theological and governmental aspects of the Bible Church. Theologically, fundamentalist groups do not admit of nominal members. To be a member requires an act of faith and commitment and therefore participation in church life. Those who cease to be active automatically cease to be members in the theological sense. Also, because of the congregational type of government within the church, wherein all members have an equal voice in determining policy, the church rolls are kept very much up-to-date. People who no longer attend services or give of their time to religious projects are ordinarily dropped from the membership list, lest the government of the church fall into the hands of those who are no longer following the "Christian" way. Both politically and theologically, then, there cannot technically be nominal members of the Bible Church. Three of the five members who were classified as non-attenders were members who did not go to services because of age or health reasons, but who still contributed money to the church and kept an active interest in its affairs. Only two people, then, were non-attenders who apparently had little interest in church life, and as the minister pointed out, their membership status was in doubt.

The locations of the two churches are reflected in the geographical distribution of the samples. The First Presbyterian Church is located in north Oak Park, an upper-middle income area, while The Harrison Street Bible Church is in the heart of south

Oak Park, a lower middle income area. All of those interviewed from the Bible Church lived in south Oak Park, while nineteen out of twenty-eight in the Presbyterian Church lived in north Oak Park.

After the sampling of members from both churches was completed, each minister was interviewed in early February of 1969 with the revised schedule contained in Appendix III. This represented the final step in the interviewing phase of the research.

The Interview Schedules. The schedule used in interviewing the samples from the Presbyterian and Bible churches contained twenty-three questions. Questions 1 through 5 dealt with the degree of involvement of individual members in their respective churches. The first question asked the number of times one attends church services. There were seven possible choices ranging from never to more than once a week. The second question dealt with the person's contributions to the church, and inquired whether the person contributed regularly or not. Questions 3 through 5 dealt with involvement in the organizational life of the church, and asked whether or not the person belonged to any church clubs or organizations, if the person held office in any of these groups, and how many functions sponsored by the church, other than worship services, the person attended. Although all of these questions focused on degree of involvement in both the religious and social life of the church, only the first question concerning attendance was used as a measure of the independent variable. The numbers of people in the other categories were not

large enough to permit extensive comparisons between, for example, officers and non-officers of groups. Hence these categories did not serve to differentiate significantly between respondents. Therefore, opinions toward open housing will, in the next chapter, be compared to attendance and non-attendance primarily, with comparisons between other sub-categories being made only when numbers are large enough to warrant them.

Question 6 sought to determine the person's knowledge of his church's position, and question 7 inquired whether or not the person remembered his minister's speaking either in support of open housing or against it from the pulpit. Question 8 asked if the person felt his church's stand influenced his own opinion toward the issue. These three questions focused on the possible influence the church may have had in forming the opinions of its members concerning open occupancy. If any influence is to be postulated it would be expected that the person influenced would (a) have a correct knowledge of the church's position; (b) remember whether or not the minister spoke in favor of the law or against it; and (c) be aware of the church's influence on his opinions.

Questions 9 through 15 dealt with the sociological characteristics of the respondents, measuring such things as age, sex, marital status, occupational level, income, and extent of education. All of these variables are important factors in opinion formation. The central problem of this research is to explore the relationship between church attendance and opinions

toward open housing, noting where possible the influence of those other factors. Therefore, church attendance and opinions toward open housing will be compared with each of these other variables.

Questions 16 through 20 sought to measure involvement and commitment to the village. Question 16 asked if the person owned or rented his home or apartment. The rationale underlying this inquiry was based upon the premise that those who owned property in Oak Park would have a greater stake in its future and would stand to lose the most if property values declined, while those who rented probably did not have such an investment and would not be as concerned regarding what happened in the village in terms of racial change.

Questions 17 through 19 dealt with the length of residency in Oak Park. Question 17 asked how long the respondent had lived in the village. If the answer was five years or less, question 18 sought to determine from what area they had moved, while question 19 asked the reason for moving. These questions were meant to sort out those who recently arrived in the village, and to pinpoint any of those who had come from changing neighborhoods.

Question 20 dealt with the number of children in the village schools, and was also aimed at determining commitment or involvement in village life. Unfortunately, due to the small sample size, this question and the four preceding it did not prove relevant to the study, or at least did not differentiate between people who had opposing views on open occupancy. Therefore,

these questions will be termed secondary, and while the responses made to them will be reported, no extensive comparisons will be made between these and opinions toward open occupancy.

Question 21 asked the respondent how he felt about open occupancy. There were five choices, ranging from strongly in favor, through no opinion, to strongly opposed. Related to this inquiry was question 22, which asked if the person had signed the petition that sought a referendum on open housing.

Finally, question 23 sought to find out how the person interviewed felt about the chances of successful integration in the village. The expectation underlying this question was that those who felt the chances to be very good or good would be more likely to favor the law, while those who felt that the chances of successful integration were not so good would be more likely to be unfavorable to the law.

The interview schedule used with the ministers was a revised, shortened form of the one used with the sampling of church members. It contained eight questions. The first question asked what the official stand of the church was regarding open occupancy, while the second inquired as to whether the issue was ever mentioned from the pulpit.

Questions 3, 4, and 5 dealt with sociological characteristics, and included inquiries on educational background, income, and age. The rationale for these questions was to determine if the ministers reflected the sociological characteristics of those sampled from their respective churches, or if they differed

markedly on any one item.

Question 6 asked length of residency in the village, and again the inquiry was aimed at determining the extent of similarity between the ministers and those sampled from their congregations.

Question 7 asked how the minister personally felt about open housing, while question 8 asked his opinion concerning the chances for successful integration in the village.

Other Research Problems. During the tabulating and coding stage of the research one serious omission was noted in some of the interview schedules. For four of the respondents in the Bible Church, occupation or previous occupation was not recorded. Two of these had indicated housework as their primary occupation (both lived alone), while one had said that she lived off social security. One other was simply coded as retired. Since the respondents remained anonymous, with the only identifying characteristic being church affiliation, there was no way to rectify this error. While the categories that were coded for these respondents (housework, social security, or retired) may show some relationship to age and present income, they are indicative of little else. Hence, when reporting the data on church attendance, opinions toward open housing, and occupation, or data on occupations alone, these four people will not be included. However, their opinions will be reported separately.

A second major problem in this research is sample size. There were only forty-nine people interviewed. With such a small

number, statistical analysis of the data was impossible. Therefore, when reporting the results of the interview schedules, significant relationships between the variables will not be proposed. This research, then, is in the nature of an exploratory study, and hence only tendencies and possible relationships between variables will be reported. Moreover, the sample size necessitated a case study approach to the data. That is, instead of comparing opinions toward open housing and attendance with other factors such as age, sex, income, or education on an individual basis, opinions and attendance will be compared with only those categories that have a sufficient number of cases to make such comparisons feasible.

One last comment should be made concerning the mode of presentation in Chapter III. The first set of tables (1 through 3) will compare the samples from the two churches on the sociological factors of occupation, education, and income. These three variables constitute the social class characteristics of the respondents. After they have been compared on each of these separately, the respondents will then be compared by using Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position, which combines education and occupation in order to determine social class.² After these data have been reported, the marital status of the respondents will be given together with their age groupings. Then differences of opinion on open housing and church

²August B. Hollingshead and Frederick G. Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958), pp. 387-397.

affiliation will be presented, together with differences between attenders and non-attenders at the two churches. Next, opinion, attendance, and the sociological categories that have large enough numbers will be compared. Whenever possible, differences between the sub-categories of church involvement will be presented although when reporting this data, no comparisons will be made with other sociological variables. Responses on the secondary questions (16 through 20, and questions 22 and 23) will then be given, along with the results of the ministers' interview schedules. Finally, the results of the data and their influence on the hypotheses will be discussed. Particularly germane to this discussion will be the responses on questions 6, 7, and 8 of the general interview schedule.

CHAPTER III
FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Sociological Characteristics of the Samples. As Benton Johnson and others have noted, the ideological chasm between the religious left and the religious right is paralleled by an economic division, with the churches of the liberal segment appealing chiefly to the middle and upper classes and those of the fundamentalist, appealing primarily to the working classes.¹

This same parallel was found when comparing the samples from The Harrison Street Bible Church and The First Presbyterian Church. As can be seen from Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4, the sample from the Presbyterian Church fell primarily into an upper-middle social class grouping, while the sample from the Bible Church was considerably lower on all indices of social and economic class.

Question 11, the results of which are reported in Table 1, had six possible occupational categories. Due to the size of the sample, however, these were combined into three categories; professional, owner, or manager; sales, clerical, or similar; and craftsman, skilled workers, etc. As can be seen from this table, the occupational level was generally higher for Presbyterians,

¹For a review of some of the studies dealing with this question, see the article by Seymour Martin Lipset in Religion and Social Conflict, edited by Robert Lee and Martin E. Marty, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 68-120.

with the majority being professionals, owners, or managers. While seven respondents from this church were in clerical, sales, or similar type work, three of these were salesmen, a presumably more lucrative and somewhat higher status position than clerical or secretarial work. On the other hand, nine of the ten from the Bible Church who were in this category indicated that they did clerical or general office work. Finally, only two Presbyterians were in the last category, craftsman or skilled worker, compared with five respondents from the Bible Church.

TABLE 1

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF PRESBYTERIANS AND BIBLE CHURCH MEMBERS

Occupational Level	Presbyterian		Bible Church	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Professional, Owner, Managers	19	68	2	12
Clerical, Sales, or Similar	7	25	10	59
Craftsman, Skilled Workers, Etc.	2	7	5	29
	N = 28		N = 17 ^a	

^aThe four respondents for whom occupation was not recorded were not included in this table.

Table 2 demonstrates that respondents from the Presbyterian sample were also considerably higher in the amount of formal

education acquired.

TABLE 2

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF PRESBYTERIANS AND BIBLE CHURCH MEMBERS

Educational Level	Presbyterian		Bible Church	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
College Degree or Beyond	12	43	0	0
Some College	12	43	2	9
High School Graduate	3	11	9	43
Less Than High School Graduate	1	3	10	48
	N = 28		N = 21	

Questions 12 and 13 dealt with the educational background of the respondents. The six categories in these questions were again combined this time into four groupings. As can be seen from the table, the majority of Presbyterians (86 per cent) were college educated, while the majority of the Bible Church members (91 per cent) had high school or elementary school attainment. Nobody from the sampling of the Bible Church had graduated from college, compared with twelve from the sampling of the Presbyterians who had. It is interesting to note that the largest number of Bible Church respondents is in the "less than high school graduate" category. Of these ten, three had only grammar

school or less. On the other hand, of the twelve respondents from the Presbyterian Church who had a college degree or beyond, four had graduate or professional training.

Table 3 shows that the income level of respondents from the Presbyterian Church is also much higher than the income level of respondents from the Bible Church. When the six categories in question 14 were combined into four groupings, over half of the Presbyterians sampled (68 per cent) had incomes of \$8,000 or above, while well over half of the Bible Church sample (81 per cent) received less than \$8,000 annually.

TABLE 3

ANNUAL INCOME LEVEL OF PRESBYTERIANS AND BIBLE CHURCH MEMBERS

Income Level	Presbyterian		Bible Church	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
\$12,000 +	12	43	2	10
\$8,000 - \$11,999	7	25	2	10
\$4,000 - \$7,999	6	21	10	48
\$2,000 - \$3,999	3	11	7	33
	N = 28		N = 21	

The differences in income level between the samples from the two churches can be highlighted by noting the income figures for those who were retired. Of the seven Presbyterians who were no longer working, one was in the \$12,000 and over bracket, three

had incomes between \$8,000 and \$11,999, one was in the \$4,000 to \$7,999 grouping, and two were in the lowest grouping, \$2,000 to \$3,999. There were ten Bible Church members who were retired. Six of these had incomes between \$2,000 and \$3,999, while the remaining four were in the \$4,000 to \$7,999 grouping. In other words, even though 25 per cent of the Presbyterians sampled were retired, they still had incomes equal to or above the 52 per cent of the Bible Church members who were still working.

In order to summarize the data on class factors, Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position was utilized.² This index uses occupation and education as the two most important variables for ascertaining class position. Occupation is presumed to reflect the skill and power of the individual in performing the many maintenance functions in society, while education is believed to reflect not only knowledge, but also cultural tastes. Each of these variables is given a factor weight of seven and four respectively. The factor weights are then multiplied by the scale scores of the occupation and education of the individual, and then these figures are added to obtain a final score which falls into one of five class ranges.

Table 4 shows that when the two factor index of social position was used, the majority of Presbyterians sampled were in the first three classes (89 per cent), while the majority of Bible Church respondents were in the lower two classes (82 per

²Hollingshead and Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness, pp. 387-397.

cent). The first class position (I) might be termed upper, the next two might be termed the middle class positions, and the last two the lower class positions.³ If this typology is accepted, it is to be noted that most of the Presbyterians sampled were middle class, with equal numbers being upper middle and lower middle, while the majority of Bible Church respondents were upper-lower or working class. These data, then, support the findings of Benton Johnson and others who contend that churches within the liberal spectrum of Protestantism appeal primarily to the middle classes, while those within the conservative or fundamentalist spectrum appeal chiefly to the working classes.

TABLE 4

SOCIAL POSITION OF PRESBYTERIANS AND BIBLE CHURCH MEMBERS
ON HOLLINGSHEAD'S TWO FACTOR INDEX

Social Class	Presbyterian		Bible Church	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
I	3	11	0	0
II	11	39	1	6
III	11	39	2	12
IV	3	11	13	76
V	0	0	1	6
	N = 28		N = 17 ^a	

^aThe four respondents for whom occupation was not recorded were not included in this table.

³Hollingshead and Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness, pp. 69-135.

In the previous chapter the family status of the original populations was noted. These figures closely correspond to the family status of those actually interviewed. Of the twenty-eight respondents in the Presbyterian Church, half (fourteen) were married, and half were single, divorced, or widowed. In the sample from the Bible Church, seven respondents were married, while fourteen were single, divorced, or widowed.

The last sociological variable respondents will be compared on is age. When the six categories in question 15 were combined into four groupings, it was found that the sample from the Bible Church was on the whole somewhat older than that from the Presbyterian Church. As can be seen from Table 5, the largest number of Presbyterian respondents (eleven or 39 per cent) were in the thirty to fort-nine age grouping, while the largest number of Bible Church respondents (ten or 48 per cent) were fifty to sixty-nine years of age.

TABLE 5

AGE LEVEL OF PRESBYTERIANS AND BIBLE CHURCH MEMBERS

Age Level	Presbyterian		Bible Church	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
20 - 29	1	3	2	9
30 - 49	11	39	3	14
50 - 69	9	32	10	48
70 +	7	25	6	29
	N = 28		N = 21	

Summarizing some of the sociological characteristics of the respondents, then, the average Presbyterian in the sample was likely to hold a professional or managerial position, to have an income of \$12,000 or more, and to have attended college. The Presbyterian respondent was also likely to be somewhere between thirty to forty-nine years of age, and had an even chance of being either married or unattached. As was indicated in the last chapter, this respondent was slightly more likely to be female. On the other hand, the average respondent from the Bible Church was likely to hold a clerical job, to have an income between \$4,000 and \$7,999 and to have completed three years or less of high school. Moreover, this respondent was likely to be between fifty and sixty-nine years of age, and to be an unattached female.

Comparison of Samples on Opinions Toward Open Housing.

Now that the sociological characteristics of the respondents have been reported, it is appropriate to briefly restate part of the hypothesis, namely that despite these other variables, attenders at the two churches will be more likely to mirror the opinions of their religious leaders in regard to the issue of open occupancy than will non-attenders. Even though the sample size is small, the patterns that emerge are in the direction indicated by this hypothesis.

Table 6 shows that Presbyterians were more likely to favor the open housing ordinance than were Bible Church members, regardless of attendance or non-attendance at church services. Of the Presbyterians sampled, 64 per cent expressed their support

for the law, compared with 14 per cent of the Bible Church members.

TABLE 6
CHURCH AFFILIATION AND OPINIONS TOWARD OPEN HOUSING

Opinions Toward Open Housing	Presbyterian		Bible Church	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Strongly in favor of it	5	18	0	0
In favor of it	13	46	3	14
Against it	6	21	13	62
Strongly Opposed	0	0	4	19
No Opinion	4	14	1	5
	N = 28		N = 21	

On the other hand, 81 per cent of the fundamentalists sampled were opposed to the law, compared with 21 per cent of the Presbyterians in the sample. Moreover, while 18 per cent of the Presbyterians sampled strongly favored the law and actively sought support for it, nobody interviewed from the Bible Church was in this category. However, 19 per cent of the fundamentalist sample strongly opposed the passage of the law and actively sought to stop this legislation. Nobody from the Presbyterian group was in this category.

The "no opinions" among the Presbyterians are somewhat

difficult to interpret. There are two possible explanations. The most obvious one is that the person interviewed did not want to express an opinion contrary to that of his church. This is not, however, the only explanation, for it is possible that the respondent did not know too much about the law and its passage, or that he or she simply didn't care. It is the latter explanation that seems to fit at least three of the four people in this category. Two of them were older women, who were widowed, and did not seem to be particularly concerned or aware of what was happening in the village. The third person was a younger woman, single and planning to move out of the village. In fact, the interview took place in Maywood, where the respondent was helping paint her Negro friend's apartment.

If attendance at church services is considered, the patterns that emerge are again in the direction indicated by the hypothesis. Table 7 shows that a larger proportion of regularly attending Presbyterians in the sample favored the law when compared to the non-attenders in this group. Thirteen out of sixteen attenders (81 per cent) favored the law, as against five out of twelve non-attenders (42 per cent). Further, a larger proportion of non-attending Presbyterians in the sample reacted negatively when questioned about their opinion toward this issue, than did attenders. Only one person who attended services regularly was opposed to the open occupancy law, as compared to five people who did not attend church regularly. The tendency that appears in this table is in the direction indicated by the

TABLE 7

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ATTENDERS AND NON-ATTENDERS ON OPINIONS TOWARD OPEN HOUSING

Opinion Toward Open Housing	Attenders				Non-Attenders			
	Presbyterian		Bible		Presbyterian		Bible	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Strongly in favor of it	5	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
In favor of it	8	50	3	19	5	42	0	0
Against it	1	6	8	50	5	42	5	100
Strongly opposed	0	0	4	25	0	0	0	0
No opinion	2	13	1	6	2	0	0	0
	N = 16		N = 16		N = 12		N = 5	

hypothesis. Regular attenders in the Presbyterian sample are more likely to favor open housing than are non-attenders. This tendency is underscored by noting that all five of those who regularly attended church were strongly in favor of the ordinance and actively sought support for it. None of the non-attenders in the Presbyterian sample was in this category. Attendance at church services, then, does seem to be more related to a positive opinion than does non-attendance.

For the Bible Church a somewhat paradoxical pattern seems to emerge, especially when the strong opposition to the law on the part of the minister is considered. While the majority of regularly attending fundamentalists sampled were against the law (twelve or 75 per cent), three were favorable and one expressed no opinion. Yet all of the non-attending respondents from this church were opposed to open housing. There are a number of ways in which the favorable opinion on the part of some active members could be interpreted. One possible explanation could be that a negative response might be viewed as being against the Negro, which some people did not want to indicate. Also, as was noted in the last chapter, this study was carried out approximately four months after the law had been passed, and at least one of the respondents who was favorable lived in close proximity to a Negro family. Her children played with the Negro children, and she was very much impressed with them. As she herself stated, "People take to them," so that her positive attitude might have come about after she had had contact with members of

the minority group.

Finally, there may have been an ambivalence on the part of some. The minister was against the law because he was against government interference, but he said that he was not fighting against the quest for equal rights. For his parishioners, however, the distinction between individualism and an un-Christian attitude toward Negroes might have been blurred. Some respondents went to great lengths to state that they were not against Negroes, and the one respondent who expressed "no opinion" said that she was "fighting the good fight" with herself over this issue. She stated that she was sometimes Christian enough to let "them" be accepted, but sometimes she was not. This ambivalence could result from a confrontation between the separatist-individualist ideal of fundamentalism, and the "love your neighbor" ideal of Christianity.

While the above discussion may help explain why some attenders in the Bible Church sample were in favor of the law, the fact that all five non-attenders were against the ordinance runs contrary to the hypothesis. However, the theological position of fundamentalist churches regarding non-attenders which was pointed out in Chapter II must be considered. Such churches do not ordinarily consider non-attenders to be members of the congregation, especially if such non-attendance is indicative of little concern with church affairs. Non-attendance in this sample, though, was for the most part not due to non-interest. Three of the five respondents so classified were non-attenders

because of circumstances (age, ill health, etc.), not because of choice. They were nevertheless interested in church affairs, and while they were unable to donate time, they did donate money when and if they could. Therefore only two respondents from the Bible Church did not attend services regularly, apparently because of choice. Hence, since the sample of Bible Church non-attenders was so small, and because of the special circumstances most of them were in, it is impossible to state definitively that the data on this group contradicted the hypothesis. However, the data on attenders in this sample does seem to support the contention that frequent attendance at this church is related to a negative opinion toward open housing, especially in light of the fact that all four of those who were strongly opposed to the law regularly went to church services.

The above discussion utilized the operational definition of attenders and non-attenders as described in Chapter I. Attenders were those who attended services more than once a month, while non-attenders were those who went to services once a month or less. Such inclusive definitions of attendance and non-attendance were necessary because of the small sample size. A further breakdown of church attendance would yield little additional information on respondents' opinions toward open housing.

Chapter II noted the difficulties involved in comparing opinions toward open housing and attendance at church services with other sociological variables on an individual basis. The futility of any such comparison is shown by Table 8, where

TABLE 8

ATTITUDE TOWARD OPEN HOUSING OF PRESBYTERIAN AND BIBLE MEMBERS
BY FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE AND INCOME

Income Level and Frequency of Attendance	Favorable	Unfavorable	No Opinion
---	-----------	-------------	------------

Presbyterians:\$12,000 +

attends frequently	6	1	0
attends infrequently	3	2	1

\$8,000 - \$11,999

attends frequently	3	0	0
attends infrequently	2	1	0

\$4,000 - \$7,999

attends frequently	3	0	2
attends infrequently	0	1	0

\$2,000 - \$3,999

attends frequently	1	0	0
attends infrequently	0	1	1

Bible Church:\$12,000 +

attends frequently	0	1	0
attends infrequently	0	1	0

\$8,000 - \$11,999

attends frequently	0	1	0
attends infrequently	0	0	0

\$4,000 - \$7,999

attends frequently	2	7	0
attends infrequently	0	2	0

\$2,000 - \$3,999

attends frequently	1	3	1
attends infrequently	0	2	0

N = 21

N = 23

N = 5

opinions toward open housing of Presbyterians and Bible Church members are examined in relation to frequency of attendance and income. Obviously, a forty-eight cell table does not show much when there are only forty-nine people in the sample. However, the trends noted earlier continue to appear if like groups are compared rather than individuals. For such comparisons, though, it will be necessary to combine the five variations of opinion into three groups, favorable, unfavorable, and no opinion.

In Tables 9 and 10, those respondents who had incomes of \$4,000 to \$7,999 and \$2,000 to \$3,999 are compared on opinions toward open housing and frequency of church attendance to see if attendance still tends to show some relationship to opinions toward open housing.

TABLE 9

LOWER MIDDLE INCOMES (\$4,000 - \$7,999) AND OPINIONS TOWARD
OPEN HOUSING OF ATTENDERS AND NON-ATTENDERS

Opinions Toward Open Housing	Attenders		Non-Attenders	
	Presbyterian	Bible	Presbyterian	Bible
Favorable	3	2	0	0
Unfavorable	0	6	1	2
No Opinion	2	0	0	0
	N = 5	N = 8	N = 1	N = 2

Table 9 shows that three of the five Presbyterians who attended

church regularly and who made between \$4,000 and \$7,999 were favorable toward the ordinance compared with two of the eight Bible Church members who were in the same income category and attended services regularly. There were no Presbyterian attenders in the sample from this income group who expressed a negative viewpoint, while six of the attenders from the Bible Church did. The one Presbyterian who was inclined to be unfavorable to the issue of housing legislation was an infrequent attender.

TABLE 10

LOW INCOMES (UNDER \$4,000) AND OPINIONS TOWARD
OPEN HOUSING OF ATTENDERS AND NON-ATTENDERS

Opinions Toward Open Housing	Attenders		Non-Attenders	
	Presbyterian	Bible	Presbyterian	Bible
Favorable	1	1	0	0
Unfavorable	0	3	1	2
No Opinion	0	1	1	0
	N = 1	N = 5	N = 2	N = 2

In Table 10 the same pattern emerges. There were three Presbyterians who made less than \$4,000, and the one who attended services regularly viewed the ordinance positively, while the two who did not attend services regularly were either in the "no opinion" category or were unfavorable. In terms of the fundamentalist group, three of the five regularly attending members were unfavorable toward the law, while one of the remaining two

was favorable and the other expressed no opinion. Because of the small numbers no clear relationship between attendance and opinion can be asserted. Some may even question the validity of stating that any kind of trend is present. However, if comparable groups are examined in light of a number of other variables (for example, educational attainment, occupational category, age, sex, or marital status), and regularly attending Presbyterians still show a greater tendency to favor open housing than do those who attend infrequently, while attenders in the Bible Church still appear to be unfavorable, a trend might be said to be emerging.

For instance, Table 11, which compares high school graduates from both religious groups, shows that of the three Presbyterians who were at this level of formal educational achievement, one attender expressed a favorable opinion of open housing, while two non-attenders were either unfavorable or gave no opinion. For the Bible Church, of the six regular attending high school graduate members, four were unfavorable, while one favored the law and one gave no opinion.

TABLE 11
OPINIONS TOWARD OPEN HOUSING OF ATTENDING AND
NON-ATTENDING HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

Opinions Toward Open Housing	Attenders		Non-Attenders	
	Presbyterian	Bible	Presbyterian	Bible
Favorable	1	1	0	0
Unfavorable	0	4	1	3
No Opinion	0	1	1	0
	N = 1	N = 6	N = 2	N = 3

In Table 12, where adherents to the two churches who had occupations of clerical, sales or similar type of work are compared, the same trends are present. There were seven Presbyterians in the clerical, sales, or similar category. Of these, three attended church regularly, with two expressing a favorable opinion toward open housing and one giving no opinion.

TABLE 12

CLERICAL, SALES OR SIMILAR OCCUPATIONS BY OPINIONS TOWARD
OPEN HOUSING OF ATTENDERS AND NON-ATTENDERS

Opinion Toward Open Housing	Attendees		Non-Attendees	
	Presbyterian	Bible	Presbyterian	Bible
Favorable	2	2	2	0
Unfavorable	0	7	1	1
No Opinion	1	0	1	0
	N = 3	N = 9	N = 4	N = 1

The one no opinion in this group was the respondent who was helping paint her Negro friend's apartment. The remaining four members of this occupational category were non-attenders. Two were favorable to open housing, one was against, and one expressed no opinion. For the Bible Church, nine of the ten members who had clerical, sales, or similar type positions were frequent attenders. Of these, the majority were unfavorable to the passage of the open housing law. Seven expressed a negative opinion, while only two

were favorable to open housing.

The previous four tables compared respondents in the sample on the social class characteristics of occupation, education, income, attendance, and opinions toward open housing. If Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position is used to compare respondents, little further information is obtained regarding church attendance and opinions on this issue. As has been seen previously, there is little similarity between the social class positions of the Presbyterian and Bible Church members who were sampled. However, if the respondents in Social Class IV (defined as upper lower class or the working class position) are compared, it is found that of the three Presbyterians in this category, two favored the law and one gave no opinion. The two favorable responses came from attenders, while the one "no opinion" came from a non-attender. In the Bible Church, thirteen respondents were in Social Class IV. Of these thirteen, twelve were unfavorable to the law, ten of whom were classified as attenders and two as non-attenders. The Bible Church respondent in Social Class IV who favored the ordinance was classified as an attender.

In Table 13, where attenders and non-attenders who were between the ages of fifty to sixty-nine are compared, the trends noted above continue to appear. In fact, they emerge somewhat more strongly in this table than in the four previous ones because there are more cases to work with. There were ten Presbyterians in this age grouping. Of these, five were classified as attenders and five as non-attenders. All five of the attenders

favored the law, while four of the five non-attenders were unfavorable. One non-attender expressed no opinion. For the Bible Church sample, six of the seven attenders between fifty and sixty-nine years of age were against open housing, while only one in this category favored it. All three non-attenders were against the law.

TABLE 13

ATTENDERS AND NON-ATTENDERS IN THE AGE GROUP FIFTY TO SIXTY-NINE
BY OPINIONS TOWARD OPEN HOUSING

Opinions Toward Open Housing	Attenders		Non-Attenders	
	Presbyterian	Bible	Presbyterian	Bible
Favorable	5	1	0	0
Unfavorable	0	6	4	3
No Opinion	0	0	1	0
	N = 5	N = 7	N = 5	N = 3

Table 14, which compares members who were seventy years of age or over, shows the same trend. Of the seven Presbyterians in this age category, the three who regularly attend services favored the law. Two of the four non-attenders were favorable, while one each was either unfavorable or expressed no opinion. In the Bible Church sample, six respondents were seventy years of age or over. Of the five who were regular attenders, four were unfavorable to open housing and one expressed no opinion. The one non-attender

in this group was also unfavorable.

TABLE 14

ATTENDERS AND NON-ATTENDERS IN THE AGE GROUP SEVENTY AND OVER
BY OPINIONS TOWARD OPEN HOUSING

Opinion Toward Open Housing	Attenders		Non-Attenders	
	Presbyterian	Bible	Presbyterian	Bible
Favorable	3	0	2	0
Unfavorable	0	4	1	1
No Opinion	0	1	1	0
	N = 3	N = 5	N = 4	N = 1

Tables 9 through 14 seem to show a possible pattern emerging. While it is not possible to say that church attendance is directly related to opinions toward open housing, nevertheless, a tendency in this direction does appear, especially if the results of comparison are taken together on all the variables. Whether education, income, occupation, or age level is held constant, regularly attending Presbyterians indicate that they favor the law, and regularly attending Bible Church members indicate that they are unfavorable. Furthermore, for the Presbyterians in the sample, attendance at church does seem to be more related to a positive opinion than does non-attendance. It would be overstating the case, of course, to say that attenders at this church are more likely to favor the law than are non-attenders.

Tables 15 and 16 compare respondents by marital status on attendance and opinions toward open housing. Table 15 deals with single, divorced, or widowed respondents. In the Bible Church sampling, fourteen of the twenty-one people interviewed were either single, divorced, widowed or separated. Of these, seven who were frequent attenders were unfavorable to the law, one expressed no opinion, and three were favorable. All three of the non-attenders in this group were unfavorable to the law. Half of the Presbyterians sampled (fourteen) were also unattached. Of this group, seven who were frequent attenders favored the law, and two expressed no opinion. None of the attenders in this group were unfavorable. Of the non-attenders two were unfavorable, two supported the law, and one expressed no opinion.

TABLE 15

SINGLE, DIVORCED, AND WIDOWED ATTENDERS AND NON-ATTENDERS
BY OPINIONS TOWARD OPEN HOUSING

Opinion Toward Open Housing	Attenders		Non-Attenders	
	Presbyterian	Bible	Presbyterian	Bible
Favorable	7	3	2	0
Unfavorable	0	7	2	3
No Opinion	2	1	1	0
	N = 9	N = 11	N = 5	N = 3

Table 16 on married respondents shows the same tendencies.

The majority of regularly attending Presbyterians favored the law, while the majority of regularly attending Bible Church members were unfavorable. Of the four who were unfavorable in the Presbyterian sample of this grouping, three were non-attenders.

TABLE 16

MARRIED ATTENDERS AND NON-ATTENDERS BY OPINIONS
TOWARD OPEN HOUSING

Opinion Toward Open Housing	Attenders		Non-Attenders	
	Presbyterian	Bible	Presbyterian	Bible
Favorable	6	0	3	0
Unfavorable	1	5	3	2
No Opinion	0	0	1	0
	N = 7	N = 5	N = 7	N = 2

Tables 17 and 18 compare males and females from the two churches on attendance and opinions toward open housing. The results of these tables are in the direction indicated by the hypothesis.

There were four questions in the interview schedule which dealt with what might be termed sub-categories of church involvement. Because of the sample size, extensive comparison between respondents on these questions was not possible. However, differences in opinion and responses on these four inquiries will be noted. Question 2, which dealt with monetary contributions to

TABLE 17

MALE ATTENDERS AND NON-ATTENDERS BY OPINIONS TOWARD OPEN HOUSING

Opinions Toward Open Housing	Attenders		Non-Attenders	
	Presbyterian	Bible	Presbyterian	Bible
Favorable	6	0	3	0
Unfavorable	1	3	3	0
No Opinion	0	0	0	0
	N = 7	N = 3	N = 6	N = 0

TABLE 18

FEMALE ATTENDERS AND NON-ATTENDERS BY OPINIONS
TOWARD OPEN HOUSING

Opinions Toward Open Housing	Attenders		Non-Attenders	
	Presbyterian	Bible	Presbyterian	Bible
Favorable	7	3	2	0
Unfavorable	0	9	2	5
No Opinion	2	1	2	0
	N = 9	N = 13	N = 6	N = 5

the church, found that of the twenty-one Bible Church members sampled, eighteen contributed regularly to the church, while three did not. The three who did not contribute regularly to the

church were non-attenders who were opposed to open occupancy. Of the remaining eighteen, sixteen were regular attenders at the church. Three were favorable to the law, one expressed no opinion and twelve were unfavorable. Two people who regularly contributed to the church were non-attenders opposed to open housing. In the Presbyterian sampling, twenty-two regularly contributed to the church. Of these, fifteen were classified as attenders. Thirteen of these regularly contributing attenders expressed support for the open housing ordinance, one was against it, and one gave no opinion. The remaining seven contributors were non-attenders. Three were favorable to the law, two expressed no opinion, and two were unfavorable. Of the six who were non-contributors to the church, five were also non-attenders. Of these five, three were against the law and two were for it. The one attender who was a non-contributor expressed no opinion concerning open occupancy.

Questions 3, 4, and 5 dealt with organizational involvement in the church. In analyzing the responses on these questions, it was found that those who were highly involved in the organizational life of their religious groups overwhelmingly mirrored the opinions of their religious leader regarding open occupancy. For example, in the Presbyterian sample there were nine respondents who could be classified as organizationally involved. That is, they attended functions at the church other than worship services (Question 3), they were members or officers of church related groups (Question 4), and they belonged to one or

more such groups (Question 5). Of these nine, seven supported open housing, and two expressed no opinion. There was nobody in this group unfavorable toward the law. Moreover, two of the five in the Presbyterian sampling who strongly favored the law and actively sought support for it were classified as organizationally involved.

In the Bible Church there were twelve respondents who were organizationally involved. Nine of these were against the law, of whom one was strongly opposed to it and actively sought to stop its passage. Two were favorable, and one expressed no opinion.

Analysis of Secondary Questions. As has been noted previously, there was a number of questions in the interview schedule that did not prove relevant to the study or at least did not differentiate between people who had opposing views on open occupancy. Question 16 which sought to measure involvement and commitment to the village by seeking to ascertain if a person owned or rented his own home was one of these. Of the twenty-eight Presbyterians interviewed, fourteen owned their own home and fourteen rented. It was expected that those who owned property would be more apprehensive concerning open housing legislation, and at first glance the figures presented seemed to suggest this was so. Eight of those who owned their own homes expressed a favorable opinion toward open housing, with five expressing a negative viewpoint, and one having no opinion. Of those who rented, ten were favorable to the law, one was against, and three

had no opinion.

It seems then, that those who own property are more likely to be against the law than are those who rent. However, of the five home owners expressing negative opinions, only one was classified as an attender. Among those positively inclined toward open housing in this group, six were regular attenders at the church, and two were not. The one who had no opinion also regularly attended church services.

On the other hand, three of the ten in the rental category who were favorable were non-attenders, as were two of the three who expressed no opinion. The one who was against the passage of the law was also a non-attender. What is suggested, then, is that among these ritually active church members owning or renting seemingly makes little difference in opinions expressed toward open housing. Among the non-attending church members, however, those who own property are perhaps more likely to express a negative opinion, while those who rent are somewhat more inclined to either favor the law or to have no preference one way or another. In the Bible Church an exact comparison of this type was not possible, since a large majority owned their own home. Of the twenty-one interviewed, only six fell into the rental category. Of those in the rental category, four were unfavorable to the law, one had no opinion, and one supported it.

Questions 17, 18, and 19 dealt with length of residency in the village, what area recent arrivals had moved from, and the reasons for moving. The median length of residency in the

village was exactly thirty years for the samples of both churches. Originally, these questions were meant to determine if any respondents had come from a changing neighborhood. However, as can be seen from the median number of years each group lived in Oak Park, relatively few people were recent arrivals. In the Bible Church, only one person had lived in the village less than five years. In the Presbyterian sample, six people had been in Oak Park five years or less. Nobody from this group had, however, moved from a changing neighborhood. All had come to Oak Park either because of job relocation or because of the well-established school system. In the Bible Church, the only respondent who had been in the village less than five years had moved here because she wanted to get closer to the church, although she did indicate that the area from which she had moved was undergoing a racial transition. However, contrary to expectations, most of the members who were interviewed from this fundamentalist denomination were old, well-entrenched residents of Oak Park, and had not come here seeking escape from the "advancing ghetto."

Question 22 dealt with the referendum petition which was circulated immediately preceding the passage of the open housing law. Of the twenty-eight Presbyterians interviewed, five had signed the petition, twenty had not, and three did not remember. Interestingly enough, of the five who signed the petition, only one was unfavorable to the actual passage of the law. The other four expressed a positive stand on the issue. This was probably due to the fact that the petition was presented in a somewhat

confusing manner so its actual purpose was not fully understood. In the Bible Church, another surprising result appeared on this question. While it was true that of the twenty-one people interviewed, twelve had signed their names to the petition, eight did not. Given the strong support of the petition on the part of the pastor, one would expect that more than twelve would have signed it. This proved not to be the case, however.

Finally, Question 23 sought to find out how the person interviewed felt about the chances of successful integration in the village.⁴ Contrary to expectations, this question had little relationship to opinions toward open housing. A number of those who favored the law indicated that they thought integration would be fought "tooth and nail" by many of the residents and that successful integration would be an uphill battle. On the other hand, some of those who were unfavorable to the law, expressed the viewpoint that "it's going to come, and you'll wear yourself out trying to fight it." As a result, many of these indicated that they thought the chances were good, "unfortunately."

Analysis of Ministers' Interview Schedule. When the results of the two ministers' interview schedules were analyzed it was found that they closely paralleled the samples from their

⁴The term "successful integration" was defined as an increase in the number of black residents without the destruction of stable housing patterns. To illustrate the term more clearly, it was contrasted with inundation, as has occurred in some neighborhoods east of Oak Park, and with exclusiveness, no black families moving into the area, as is exemplified by the town of Cicero, which is immediately south of Oak Park.

congregations on a number of items. For example, the Presbyterian minister had an income of \$12,000 and over. This was the same income category that 43 per cent of those sampled from his church was in. The minister of the Bible Church had an income of between \$4,000 and \$7,999, the same income category as 48 per cent of those sampled from his church.

The age of each minister also corresponds to the ages of those sampled from his church. The Presbyterian minister was in the thirty to forty-nine age grouping. This was the same category that contained the largest number of Presbyterians (eleven). The Bible Church minister was between fifty and sixty-nine years of age. Again this was the same grouping that the largest number of Bible Church respondents were in (ten).

The two ministers also differed in educational background. The Presbyterian minister had attended Harvard, and had graduated with an A.B. in political science. He then went on to earn a B.D. from McCormic Theological Seminary. The Bible Church minister had received a B.A. in liberal arts from a small, church-related college (The University of Dubuque, in Iowa), and had a B.D. from The Moody Bible Institute. This particular finding is in line with Benton Johnson's contention that the clergy of the high status churches are somewhat better educated (or at least more broadly educated) than their counterparts in the lower status fundamentalist groups.⁵

⁵Benton Johnson, "Ascetic Protestantism," p. 39.

The minister from the Bible Church had lived in the village fifteen years, while the Presbyterian minister had lived there six years.

Finally each minister pointed out that he felt the same way about the law as when the study was undertaken. The Presbyterian minister indicated that he strongly favored the law and actively sought support for it, that he preached about it from the pulpit, and that he thought the chances of integration in the village were good. The Bible Church minister strongly opposed the ordinance and actively sought to stop its passage. While he did not preach about the law from the pulpit during the regular Sunday services, he did mention it during the Wednesday night prayer services. Nevertheless, he too felt that the chances of successful integration in the village were good.

Summary of Chapter Results. To briefly summarize the results of the data thus far, the tendencies shown were in the direction indicated by the hypotheses. The majority of regularly attending Presbyterians in the sample said that they favored the law, while the majority of regularly attending Bible Church members who were interviewed said that they were unfavorable to the law. These tendencies were still present when attendance and opinions toward open housing were compared to other sociological variables held constant such as age, sex, marital status, occupation, education, and income. Moreover, for the Presbyterians sampled, attendance at church did seem to be more related to a positive opinion than did non-attendance. It could not be stated,

however, that attenders at this church were more likely to favor open housing than were non-attenders. Contrary to the expectations of the hypotheses, all five of the non-attenders in the Bible Church sample indicated that they were unfavorable to the open housing ordinance. Nevertheless, the hypotheses cannot be rejected solely on these grounds since the characteristics and size of this sample were such, that little information was obtained.

The third section of the hypotheses maintains that even though there will be some tendency toward a relationship between attendance and opinion, this relationship is not causal. Rather, opinions and attendance are indicative of overall liberal or conservative attitudes. These attitudes are expressed in how one feels about particular issues, how one votes, the type of church one goes to, and so on. Hence, it was stated that church attendance did not cause either favorable or unfavorable opinions toward open housing. The results on questions 6, 7, and 8 seem to support this contention.

Question 6 asked the respondent how he thought his church stood on the issue of open occupancy. In the Bible Church, of the twenty-one people interviewed, thirteen said that they thought the church (defined as the official governing body of the congregation) was opposed or strongly opposed to the issue. Eight respondents, however, indicated that they either did not know the church's position (5), or that they thought the church favored the law (3). Of these eight, six were unfavorable to the law, one

expressed no opinion, and one supported it. Four of the eight were frequent attenders, and four were non-attenders.

All but one of the twenty-eight respondents in the Presbyterian sampling indicated that they thought the church was strongly in favor of the law or in favor of it. The remaining respondent did not know where the church stood on this issue.

Question 7 asked the respondent if he remembered the minister preaching either for or against the ordinance from the pulpit. In the Presbyterian Church, where the minister did give sermons supporting open housing, nineteen respondents remembered his doing this, seven did not, and two said the issue was not mentioned in church. Of the nine respondents who either did not remember or remembered incorrectly, seven were non-attenders and two were attenders.

Of the twenty-one interviewed in the Bible Church, eighteen said that the minister did not mention the issue from the pulpit. This was correct. Of the remaining three, two said that he did mention the issue, and one could not remember.

It appears then, that most of those sampled were aware of their church's stand on open occupancy. It might be supposed, therefore, that since most of the respondents had a correct knowledge of their church's position, they were influenced by this. The results on question 8, however, show that this was not the case. Twenty-three of twenty-eight in the Presbyterian Church and seventeen of twenty-one in the Bible Church felt that their church's position on open housing had no influence on their own

opinion toward this issue. Most said that they had already made up their minds as to the value of open housing, before their church took a position on it, and that no matter what stand the churches had taken, they themselves would not have been affected by it.

The conclusions drawn from this finding will be discussed more thoroughly in the next and final chapter.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY

This last chapter has three major purposes. First, it will give a brief review of the problem and methods of this study. Secondly, it will attempt to synthesize the data and to report the effects of the findings on the hypotheses proposed in Chapter I. Finally, the limitations of the study together with suggestions for further research will be presented.

The Problem and Method. In its broadest terms, the problem dealt with in this thesis has been the possible relationship between church affiliation-attendance and a selected social viewpoint. The function of religion in the formation and development of people's attitudes, values, and opinions together with the place of the religious institution in the maintenance of society has been a central issue in much sociological research. Early theorists have dealt with the subject, as well as a host of modern researchers. A review of the various studies done in the field, brings to light two schools of thought on the importance of religion for both society and the individuals within society. On one hand, there are those social scientists who claim that religion has little or no impact on attitudes or values, and is itself merely reflecting the political, social, economic, and institutional processes of which it is a part. These scientists are

the direct descendants of the early schools of positivism and economic determinism which viewed religion as an anachronism of negligible force in modern society. On the other hand, there are those researchers who maintain that religion is a vital force in shaping and changing men's attitudes and values, and that it does have an impact on the institutions of the larger society.

It was noted in Chapter I that an overcommitment to one or the other of these schools can lead to a type of determinism, either economic, social, or religious. Social reality requires a third alternative, namely an interdependence between the various parts of the social system, so that religion not only influences but is in turn influenced by the existing norms and values of the larger society. The question then becomes one of degree.

The answer to such a question can only be arrived at through systematic research. Hence, this particular undertaking focused on the differences in opinion toward a social issue (i.e., open housing) between attenders and non-attenders at two churches.

The passage of an open housing law in Oak Park, Illinois, in the spring of 1968 was the cause of much discussion among the residents. Many people favored the law, while many others were opposed to it. In the ensuing debate over this issue, two churches, each sharing some of the common historical conditions of Ascetic Protestantism, came out with differing views on the desirability of such a law. The minister of the liberal, high status First Presbyterian Church strongly favored open housing,

while the minister of the fundamentalist Harrison Street Bible Church was strongly opposed to the passage of any law which sought to regulate the sale or rental of property. Here then, was a situation in which a further examination could be made of the influence of the religious institution in the lives of its members.

The complexities of such a problem, however, soon became apparent. Primary among these was to determine an adequate measure of religious commitment. This research centered on ritual adherence to the two churches as an index of religious involvement and commitment. While granting that the ritualistic dimension was only one aspect of religiosity, it was felt that this was more concrete and hence more accessible to study than such factors as the emotional, ideological, intellectual, or consequential dimensions of religious involvement and behavior. Therefore, "attenders," defined as those who attended church services more than once a month, and "non-attenders," defined as those who attended once a month or less, formed the basic categories against which opinions toward open housing were measured.

The use of attendance and non-attendance as the independent variables brought to light a second problem involved in research of this type. Many authors have noted that this type of involvement in religious groups is not randomly distributed among the population, but is instead related to a definite set of sociological factors, among which are age, sex, social class, and type of family unit.

Finally, a third problem that arose was in defining the terms "liberal" and "conservative." The differing ideological stances of the two churches which were a part of this undertaking led to the consideration of this problem. It was noted that the definitions of the terms "liberal" and "conservative" depended upon the issue being studied. "Liberals" as defined by non-economic or inter-class values (e.g., endorsement of civil rights) tend to be economically well-off and better educated, while "liberals" as defined by approval of certain politico-economic proposals (e.g., more power for labor in the government) tend to be less well educated and economically poorer.¹ Since this research dealt with a social issue (i.e., fair housing), the former definition was used when defining liberal. That is, those people who supported the passage of the open housing ordinance were termed liberal, while those who were against it were termed conservative. This typology completely disregarded any political affiliations, and so limited the use of the terms to social or community orientations.

Once the various complexities involved in this study had been noted, a more specific formulation of the research problem was made. A community issue dealing with the desirability of a fair housing ordinance brought to light a difference of opinion between two churches, each sharing the common historical origins of the Ascetic Protestant tradition. This tradition is, however,

¹ George H. Smith, "Liberalism and the Level of Information," p. 68.

by no means a unitary one, and has suffered a bifurcation into two prominent branches, the liberal faction and the fundamentalist faction. The First Presbyterian Church, with its emphasis on the Social Gospel and man's responsibility to reform the institutions of society, represented the liberal end of the continuum, while The Harrison Street Bible Church, with its highly individualistic theology and its disdain of government intervention in the area of private property, was representative of the fundamentalist end of the continuum. The problem, then, was in determining if attendance at these two churches was in any way related to opinions toward open housing, and if attenders were more likely to mirror the attitudes of their religious leaders than were non-attenders, regardless of other sociological characteristics such as age, education, sex, income, or occupational level. Moreover, it was noted that attendance or non-attendance at either of these two churches was itself related to such variables.

After each minister agreed to participate in the study, the membership list was obtained from each church. From the 520 entries on the Presbyterian list who lived in Oak Park, every tenth entry was randomly chosen for possible inclusion in the project. This yielded a sample of fifty-two, of which twenty-eight were eventually interviewed. In the Bible Church, all thirty-one members who lived in the village were considered for inclusion in the study. Twenty-one completed interviews were obtained from this population. The problems involved in interviewing are covered in Chapter II. The forty-nine people were inter-

viewed using the schedule contained in Appendix I.

After the sampling of members from both churches was completed, each minister was interviewed with the revised schedule contained in Appendix II. This represented the final step in the interviewing phase of the research.

Due to the small sample size, no tests for significant relationships between the variables could be made. Instead, this research was in the nature of an exploratory study, and so only tendencies and possible tendencies were noted. Further, the sample size necessitated a case study approach to the data. For example, when examining differences between respondents on church attendance, opinions toward open housing, and income, only those income levels that had large enough numbers were included in the tables contained in Chapter III. This same procedure was used for educational, occupational, and age categories.

Resume of the Findings and Bearing on the Hypotheses.

Whether income, education, occupation, age, sex, or marital status was considered in relation to church attendance and opinions toward open housing, Presbyterians in the sample were more likely to favor open housing than were Bible Church members. Moreover, among the Presbyterians sampled, attendance at church services seemed to be more related to a favorable opinion toward open housing than did non-attendance. In the Bible Church, all five non-attenders were unfavorable to the law, a result contrary to the first hypothesis. Due to the small number in this category, however, and because of the special circumstances most of these

non-attenders were in (i.e., non-attendance due to sickness or old age), no definite statement could be made concerning this part of the hypothesis. While the small numbers in the total sample did not permit either acceptance or rejection of the other hypotheses, tendencies did emerge in the expected direction. Hence, briefly restating the hypotheses and the results of the data, it was found that (1) respondents who attended the Presbyterian Church regularly did show a greater tendency to favor open housing than did non-attenders, regardless of other sociological factors; (2) Bible Church members in the sample were overwhelmingly against open housing, although the expected differences between attenders and non-attenders were not present.

The third hypothesis stated that while the opinions expressed on this issue would show some relationship to type of church affiliation and attendance, the two variables were not causally related, but were rather indicative of generally liberal or conservative attitudes which expressed themselves in church attendance and opinions toward open housing.

While there was little concrete evidence obtained to prove this contention, supporting tendencies can be seen in the data at hand which seem to validate this hypothesis. In the first place, when the samples from both churches were compared on Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position, it was found that 89 per cent of the Presbyterians were in the upper-middle or middle class positions, compared with 18 per cent of the Bible Church respondents. On the other hand, 82 per cent of

the Bible Church sample were in the working class positions, while only 11 per cent of the Presbyterian respondents were in this category. Given the findings of George H. Smith, cited earlier, that those who are termed socially liberal are usually upper or middle class people, while socially conservative individuals are more likely to be members of the working class,² it would seem that social liberalism is more indicative of a class position rather than a religious one. Further, the findings of Russell R. Dynes and H. Richard Niebuhr, noted in Chapter I, seem to indicate that type of church affiliation is itself influenced by class factors. For example, Dynes found that as educational level and occupational prestige rose, there was a rejection of such sectarian characteristics as emotionalism, evangelism, and the like. On the other hand, acceptance of more institutional and liturgical churches increased with increasing social status.³

Secondly, the results on Question 8 showed that most of the people in the sample felt that their church had little or no influence in forming their opinions toward open housing. Twenty-three of twenty-eight in the Presbyterian Church and seventeen of twenty-one in the Bible Church stated that the church's stand did not affect their own opinion to any significant degree. Most said that they had already made up their minds concerning the value of open occupancy, before their church's position had been

²Ibid.

³Russell R. Dynes, "Church-Sect Typology and Socio-Economic Status," pp. 559-560.

known to them.

When dealing with attitudes and opinions, the value of personal reports might be seriously questioned. The effect of institutions on a person's values, attitudes, and opinions may be so subtle, that the individual is largely unaware of that effect. Consequently, the rationale for Questions 6 through 8, presented in Chapter II, may be challenged. It was stated that if the church was expected to have a possible influence on the opinions of its members, the person influenced would (a) have a correct knowledge of the church's position (Question 6); (b) remember whether or not the minister spoke in favor of the law or against it (Question 7); and (c) be aware of the church's influence on his opinions (Question 8). While granting, then, that the effect of the religious institution on values and attitudes may be of such a nature that a particular person would be unaware of it, it would seem that when dealing with a specific, concrete issue, and the opinions toward such an issue, an individual would be more conscious of any influence. In short, it would appear that the general values and attitudes we possess are the result of a synthesis of the various ideals and concepts we have been exposed to during our formative years. Hence, the source of these attitudes would be largely unknown. Yet the opinions derived from values and attitudes are more immediate and closer to the surface, and so any direct influence on these opinions would be realized. The conclusions of this research, then, do not claim that religion, or more specifically the religious institution, has no

consequence for individual behavior. What is suggested, instead, is that in terms of specific issues the churches have little effect in determining the opinions of their members. However, the church may exert an influence on the underlying values and attitudes from which specific opinions arise. Again, though, as was noted in Chapter I, the socialization process is not smooth and uniform. A person is exposed to many different standards and ideas. Ascertaining which of the many persons, groups, and institutions involved in the socialization process is the most influential in terms of developing an overall liberal or conservative viewpoint is beyond the scope of this one research effort. Family background, economic condition, religious beliefs, and educational attainments may all be salient factors in determining such viewpoints. What this research seems to indicate, however, is that once liberal or conservative tendencies have been developed, they are expressed in such things as type of church affiliation, frequency of church attendance, and opinions toward such social issues as open occupancy.

Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research. The limitations of this study have been noted as they have related to specific issues in the text. Hence a brief summary of these should suffice.

The major hindrance in this research, of course, was sample size. The three hypotheses could be neither proved nor disproved, and only possible tendencies could be shown which seemed to be in the direction indicated by the hypotheses.

Secondly, the research dealt with only one aspect of church involvement and religious commitment, namely attendance at services.

Finally, attendance was compared with an opinion toward a specific issue. The issue was open housing, and it was assumed that opinions expressed concerning it were indicative of generally liberal or conservative tendencies, liberal or conservative being defined in terms of non-economic or inter-class values.

From the limitations cited, it is comparatively simple to make suggestions for further research. In the first place, a similar study could be carried out with methodological improvements, including a much larger sample size. Further research along these lines could also consider other aspects of religious involvement, and compare these with opinions toward a social issue. Finally, questions might be asked concerning the views of those interviewed on other social issues such as war, the United Nations, internationalism, etc. This would provide a more solid basis for terming people either socially liberal or socially conservative.

This thesis, then, has perhaps raised more questions than it has answered, and in doing so has underscored the need for continued research in the area. If religious institutions are to be more than merely exclusive "Sunday clubs," it is important to understand the relationship between the effects of church involvement and the ideology of church members. Only when the interplay between these factors has been understood, can churches begin to

institute programs that are truly relevant to the needs of their members. This research has hopefully contributed to such an understanding.

APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE GIVEN TO RESPONDENTS

First, I'd like to ask you some questions concerning your church membership.

1. About how many times a year do you attend church services?

(1) About once or twice a year (e.g., Christmas or Easter) _____

(2) Every two or three months _____

(3) About once a month _____

(4) More than once a month, but not every Sunday _____

(5) Every Sunday _____

(6) Never _____

(7) More than once a week _____

2. Do you contribute regularly to your church?

(1) Yes _____

(2) No _____

3. How many functions have you attended at your church, other than worship services, within the last two years (e.g., meetings, picnics, discussion groups, etc.)?

(1) 0 _____

(2) 1-3 _____

(3) 4 or more _____

4. Are you a member or an officer of any church related organization(s)?

- (1) No _____
- (2) Member _____
- (3) Officer _____

5. How many church related organizations do you belong to?

- (1) 0 _____
- (2) 1-2 _____
- (3) 3 or more _____

6. How do you think your church felt about the open housing ordinance? Do you think it was in favor of it or against it? (Interviewer show Card A)

- (1) Strongly in favor of it, and actively sought support for it _____
- (2) In favor of it, but did not actively support it _____
- (3) The Church expressed no opinion _____
- (4) It was against it, but did not actively try to stop its passage _____
- (5) Strongly opposed, and actively sought to stop its passage _____
- (6) Don't Know _____

7. Did your minister ever preach for or against the ordinance from the pulpit?

- (1) Yes _____
- (2) No _____
- (3) Don't remember _____

8. Do you think your church's stand influenced your own attitude towards open housing to any significant degree?

- (1) Yes _____
- (2) No _____
- (3) No Opinion _____

9. (Interviewer record sex.)

- (1) Male _____
- (2) Female _____

10. Marital Status

- (1) Single _____
- (2) Married _____
- (3) Divorced _____
- (4) Widowed _____
- (5) Separated _____

11. What kind of work does the head of your household do? (Interviewer: write in respondent's answer and then code below) _____

- (1) Professional _____
- (2) Semi-Professional _____
- (3) Proprietor, manager, official _____
- (4) Clerical, Sales, or Similar _____
- (5) Craftsman, Foreman, or Similar _____
- (6) Protective Service Work _____

12. What was the last year of education your husband (wife) completed?

13. What was the last year of education you completed?

MALE

FEMALE

_____	GRAMMAR SCHOOL	_____
_____	SOME HIGH SCHOOL	_____
_____	HIGH SCHOOL	_____
_____	SOME COLLEGE	_____
_____	COLLEGE	_____
_____	GRADUATE WORK	_____

14. Would you look at this card and tell me which number best indicates your total family income? (Show Card B)

(1) \$2,000-\$3,999	_____
(2) \$4,000-\$5,999	_____
(3) \$6,000-\$7,999	_____
(4) \$8,000-\$9,999	_____
(5) \$10,000-\$11,999	_____
(6) \$12,000 and over	_____

15. Into what age category do you fall? (Card C)

20-29 _____	50-59 _____
30-39 _____	60-69 _____
40-49 _____	70 + _____

16. Do you own your home or do you rent?

(1) Own	_____
(2) Rent	_____

17. How long have you lived in the village?
_____ years

18. (If 17 is 5 years or less) From what area did you move?

19. (If 18 is answered) Why did you move?

20. Do you have any children in the Village schools?
How many?

Yes _____ 0 _____

No _____ 1-2 _____

3 or more _____

21. How did you feel about the proposed open housing law in Oak Park? (Show Card D)

(1) Strongly in favor of it, and actively sought support for it _____

(2) In favor of it, but did not actively support it _____

(3) No Opinion _____

(4) Against it, but did not actively try to stop its passage _____

(5) Strongly opposed, and actively sought to stop its passage _____

22. Did you sign the petition that sought a referendum on the open housing issue?

(1) Yes _____

(2) No _____

(3) Don't remember _____

23. What do you think the chances of integration are in the village?

(1) Very Good

(2) Good

(3) Not so good

(4) No chance at all

(5) Don't know

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND TROUBLE.

APPENDIX II

REVISED SHORT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR MINISTERS

1. What was the official policy or stand of the church regarding the open housing law here in the village?

(Show Card A)

(1) Strongly in favor of it, and actively sought support for it _____

(2) In favor of it, but did not actively support it _____

(3) The church expressed no opinion _____

(4) Against it but did not actively try to stop its passage _____

(5) Strongly opposed, and actively sought to stop its passage _____

2. Did you (or any minister under you) ever preach for or against the ordinance from the pulpit?

(1) Yes _____

(2) No _____

3. Where did you receive your theological training?

Where did you receive your undergraduate training?

Do you have a recognized degree?

What is it?

(1) Yes _____

(2) No _____

_____ degree

Do you have a degree, other than one in theology?

- (1) Yes _____ degree
 (2) No _____

4. Would you look at this card and tell me which number best indicates your total family income. (Card B)

- (1) \$4,000-\$5,999 _____
 (2) \$6,000-\$7,999 _____
 (3) \$8,000-\$9,999 _____
 (4) \$10,000-\$11,999 _____
 (5) \$12,000 and over _____

5. Into what age category do you fall? (Card C)

- 20-29 _____ 50-59 _____
 30-39 _____ 60-69 _____
 40-49 _____ 70 + _____

6. How long have you lived in the village?

_____ years

7. How did you personally feel about the open housing law in Oak Park? (Card D)

- (1) Strongly in favor of it, and actively sought support for it _____
 (2) In favor of it, but did not actively support it _____
 (3) Against it, but did not actively try to stop its passage _____
 (4) Strongly opposed, and actively sought to stop its passage _____

8. What do you think the chances of integration are in the village?

(1) Very Good

(2) Good

(3) Not so good

(4) No chance at all

APPENDIX III

FAIR HOUSING ORDINANCE

BE IT ORDAINED by the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Oak Park, Cook County, Illinois, that Chapter 24-1/4 entitled "Fair Housing" be added to the Code of the Village of Oak Park, said Chapter to read as follows:

Sec. 24-1/2.1. Policy:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Village of Oak Park and the purpose of this Ordinance, in the exercise by the village of its police and regulatory powers for the protection of the public safety, for the health, morals, safety, and welfare of the persons in and residing in the village, and for the maintenance and promotion of commerce, industry and good government in the village, to secure to all persons living or desiring to live in the village a fair opportunity to purchase, lease, rent, or occupy housing regardless of race, color, religion or national origin.

Sec. 24-1/2.2. Severability:

If any provision of this Ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Ordinance and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 24-1/2.3. Definitions:

For the purpose of this Chapter, the following words and phrases are defined as follows:

ADMINISTRATOR - The employee in the Planning and Development Department of the Village of Oak Park designated by the Board to administer the provisions of this Ordinance.

BOARD - President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Oak Park.

COMMISSION means the Commission on Community Relations of the Village.

DISCRIMINATE means to discriminate on the basis of religion, race, color or national origin.

LEASE includes sub-lease, assignment, and rental and includes any contract to do any of the foregoing.

LENDING INSTITUTION means any bank, insurance company, savings and loan association, other persons in the business of lending money or guaranteeing loans, any person in the business of obtaining, arranging or negotiating loans as agent or broker, and any person in the business of buying or selling loans or instruments for the payment of money which are secured by title to or a security interest in real property.

OWNER means any person holding any interest in property which may be used for dwelling purposes.

PURCHASE includes any contract to purchase.

REAL ESTATE BROKER - Any person who for a consideration acts as an employee or agent to manage, or to negotiate the sale, purchase or rental of any real property or any interest therein. Real estate broker includes but is not limited to all persons required to be licensed pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 114-1/2 of the Illinois Revised Statutes 1967.

REAL ESTATE SALESMAN means any person licensed as a real estate salesman in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 114-1/2 of the Illinois Revised Statutes, or is required thereby to be so licensed.

REAL ESTATE TRANSACTION means the purchase, sale, exchange or lease of any real property or interest therein or any negotiations in connection therewith.

Sec. 24-1/2.4. Licenses:

Before the license of a real estate broker is issued or renewed as provided in Chapter 10 of this Code, the applicant shall file a signed statement with the Village Clerk that he has read this Ordinance and intends to comply with its provisions and that each real estate salesman employed by him has read and intends to comply with this Ordinance.

Sec. 24-1/2.5. Unlawful Real Estate Practices:

It shall be unlawful for any real estate broker either by himself or his officers, employees or real estate salesmen to:

A. Make any substantial misrepresentation or engage in untruthful advertising in connection with any real estate transaction.

B. Use any trade name or insignia of membership in any real estate organization of which he is not a member.

C. Act for more than one party in a transaction without the knowledge of all parties for whom he acts.

D. Fail to furnish copies upon request of all documents related to a real estate transaction to all parties executing the same.

E. Pay a commission or any consideration to any person for acts or services performed in violation of this article.

F. Employ any person as a means of evading the law.

G. Display a "for rent" or "for sale" sign on any property without the written consent of an owner or his authorized agent, or advertise that any property is for sale or for rent in a newspaper or other publication without the consent of the owner or his authorized agent.

H. Fail, within a reasonable time, to provide information requested by the Board or Commission or Administrator in connection with a complaint of a violation of this Chapter.

I. Any other conduct which constitutes dishonest dealing.

Sec. 24-1/2.6. Discrimination Prohibited:

It shall be unlawful for any owner, real estate broker, salesman, lender, financial institution, or advertiser either by themselves or through their officers, employees, agents, or salesmen, or for any other person to:

A. Discriminate against anyone in connection with any real estate transaction.

B. Publish or circulate, or cause to be published or circulated, any notice, statement or advertisement, or to announce a policy, or to use any form of application for the purchase, lease, rental or financing of real property, or to make any record or inquiry in connection with the prospective purchase, rental or lease of real property, which expresses directly or indirectly any limitation, specification or discrimination, or any intent to make any such limitation, specification or discrimination.

C. Discriminate by overcharging any person for real property or by changing conditions or privileges of any kind

relating to a real estate transaction.

D. Discriminate in connection with borrowing or lending money, guaranteeing loans, accepting mortgages or otherwise obtaining or making available funds for the purchase, acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, repairs or maintenance of any real property in the village.

E. Solicit or to enter into an agreement for the sale, lease or listing for sale or lease, of any real property within the village on ground of loss of value due to the present or prospective entry into any neighborhood of any person or persons of any particular race, color, religion or national origin or ancestry.

F. Distribute or cause to be distributed, written material or statements designed to induce any owner of any real property in the village to sell or lease his or her real property because of any present or prospective change in the race, religion, color or national origin or ancestry of persons in the neighborhood.

G. Make any misrepresentations concerning the listing for sale or the anticipated listing for sale or the sale of any real property for the purpose of inducing or attempting to induce the sale or listing for sale of any real property by representing that the presence or anticipated presence of persons of any particular race, religion, or national origin in the area will or may result in the lowering of real property values in the block, neighborhood or area in which the property is located.

H. Refuse to sell or rent real property or any interest therein because of race, color, religion or national origin.

I. Refuse to show to any person who has specified his needs, and affirmed his ability to finance the purchase or lease of real property, the list or other records identifying all real properties reasonably meeting such specifications.

J. To aid, abet, incite, or coerce a person to engage in unlawful housing practice.

K. Willfully to obstruct or prevent a person from complying with the provisions of this Ordinance or an order issued thereunder.

Sec. 24-1/2.7. Limitations and Exclusions:

A. This Chapter shall not apply to the rental of any room in any owner-occupied single-family dwelling.

B. Nothing in this Chapter shall require an owner to offer for sale or lease real property to the public at large, nor shall this Chapter be deemed to prohibit discrimination for any reason other than religion, race, color, or national origin and not otherwise prohibited by law.

C. Nothing in this Chapter shall require a broker or owner to offer real property for sale or lease or to show real

property to any person if such person is not negotiating for the purchase or lease of such real property in good faith.

Sec. 24-1/2.8. Duties of Community Relations Commission:

It shall be the duty of the Oak Park Community Relations Commission to initiate, receive and investigate complaints charging discrimination; and seek conciliation of such complaints, seek compliance by violators, hold hearings, make findings of fact, issue recommendations and publish its findings of fact and recommendation in accordance with the provisions of this Ordinance.

Complaints and Enforcement

(a) Any person aggrieved in any manner by a violation of any provision of this Chapter may file a written complaint with the Administrator. The complaint shall be under oath, addressed to the Commission, and shall state (1) the name and address of the complainant, (2) the name and address of the person against whom the complaint is brought, if known to the complainant, and (3) the facts surrounding the alleged violation of this Chapter. Such complaint shall state the name and address of all persons believed to have knowledge concerning the alleged violation. The Commission shall provide a printed form of complaint for the use of aggrieved persons.

(b) The complaint shall be accompanied by a filing fee of \$10.00. If, in accordance with the procedures hereinafter set forth, the Commission shall determine that probable cause exists for the complaint, or if the alleged violation or complaint is eliminated by conference, conciliation or persuasion, or if any of the charges alleged in the complaint are sustained, the Village Treasurer, upon recommendation of the Commission, shall return the filing fee to the complainant. If it is determined that probable cause does not exist for the complaint, or the charges alleged in the complaint are not sustained, the filing fee shall be retained.

(c) After the filing of the complaint the Administrator shall serve a copy of the complaint personally or by certified mail on the party or parties charged and shall furnish a copy to the Chairman of the Commission.

(d) The Administrator shall investigate the complaint and if he determines that probable cause exists in support of the allegations of the complaint, he shall set a date for a conference and notify the parties of the time and place thereof. At such conference the Administrator shall interview the complainant and the person or persons

against whom the complaint has been directed and shall attempt to resolve the complaint by conciliation.

(e) If the Administrator is unable to conciliate the complaint he shall so notify the Chairman of the Commission within thirty (30) days of the filing of the complaint and the Commission shall thereupon hold a hearing on the complaint either by the full Commission or by a three member panel thereof as determined by the Chairman.

(f) Hearing by Commission or Panel. Such hearing shall be conducted upon notice by certified mail to all parties. The Commission shall provide a court reporter to take a transcript of the hearing. All evidence shall be under oath administered by an officer authorized to administer oaths. All parties may be represented by counsel at their election and shall have the right to call witnesses and to cross examine witnesses.

If the hearing is conducted by a three member panel, the panel shall furnish the Commission with:

- its findings of fact
- its recommendations
- a summary of the evidence taken
- a transcript of the hearing if requested by the Commission.

(g) Action by the Commission. At the close of the hearing the Commission may take any one or more of the following actions:

- (1) Resolve the complaint by conciliation.
- ((2) Dismiss the complaint.
- (3) Make findings and recommendations to the Board regarding revocation of license.
- (4) Instruct the Village Prosecutor to file a complaint in the Circuit Court for a fine or a complaint to enjoin the violation or a complaint for any other appropriate relief.
- (5) In the case of any violation of this Chapter by any person in the course of performing under a contract or sub-contract with the State or any political subdivision or agency thereof, or with the United States of America or any agency or instrumentality thereof, to notify by certified mail such contracting agency for the purpose of causing it to terminate such contract or any portion thereof, either absolutely or on condition of compliance with the provisions of this Chapter.

(h) Action by Administrator. If in the judgment of the Administrator immediate court action is necessary, he may

at any time instruct the prosecuting attorney to file a complaint in the Circuit Court for a fine, injunction or other appropriate relief. Such action may be taken even though administrative hearings of the complaint are still pending before the Administrator or the Commission.

(i) Action by Complainant. At any time after final action by the Commission or after dismissal of a complaint by the Administrator or in the event of the failure of the Administrator or Commission to act on a complaint within the time limits herein set forth, the complainant may file a complaint in the Circuit Court for appropriate relief for the alleged violation of the Ordinance.

(j) Limitation of Time to File Complaints. Any complaint shall be barred from consideration unless it is filed with the Commission within thirty (30) days after the alleged discriminatory practice occurred. However, it is recommended that all complaints be filed within seven (7) days of the first knowledge of the alleged discriminatory practice.

Sec. 24-1/2.9. Exempt Locations:

The Commission may exempt locations, buildings and transactions from the provisions of Sections 24-1/2.6 - A, B, H and L of this Chapter. Before granting exemptions the Commission shall consider the following:

- A. Concentration of racial groups in adjoining or surrounding areas.
- B. The extent to which the location or building involved is integrated.
- C. The number of properties being offered for sale in the location.
- D. The number of vacancies in rental units in the building or location.
- E. The extent to which schools in the area have been integrated.
- F. A plan of development adopted by an applicant for an exemption that is designed to prevent or eliminate de facto segregation and is found by the Commission to be reasonably designed to prevent de facto segregation. In the event the Commission approves such a plan of development, the exemption hereunder may be revoked by the Commission at any time if it is found pursuant to a complaint filed under Section 8 hereof that the applicant has not pursued the voluntary plan in good faith.
- G. Exemptions may be revoked by the Commission at any time, provided if the exemption has been granted pursuant

to a plan of development, the applicants for the original plan of development shall be notified and be heard by the Commission before the revocation of the exemption. The hearing procedure shall be as set forth in Section 8 hereof.

Applications and hearings in connection with the granting of exemptions shall be conducted as provided in Section 8 of this Ordinance.

Nothing in this Section 9 shall be considered as encouraging discriminatory practices, but its purpose is to allow owners and realtors to adopt voluntary plans of integration which accomplish the goals of this Ordinance.

This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption, approval and publication as provided by law.

ADOPTED THIS _____ day of _____, 1968, pursuant to a roll call vote as follows:

AYES: _____

NAYS: _____

APPROVED by me this _____ day of _____, 1968.

Village President

ATTEST:

Village Clerk

Published by me according to law this _____ day of _____, 1968.

Village Clerk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Books

- Argyle, Michael. Religious Behaviour. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.
- Broom, Leonard and Selznick, Philip. Sociology. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Campbell, Robert, O. P. (ed.). Spectrum of Protestant Beliefs. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1968.
- Carrier, Herve, S. J. The Sociology of Religious Belonging. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1965.
- Carter, Paul A. The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1956.
- Durkheim, Emile. The Elementary Forms of Religious Life. Translated by Joseph Swain. Glencoe: The Free Press, no date.
- Fichter, Joseph, S. J. Social Relations in the Urban Parish. The University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Glock, Charles Y.; Ringer, Benjamin B.; and Babbie, Earl R. To Comfort and To Challenge. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
- Glock, Charles Y. and Stark, Rodney. Religion and Society in Tension. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965.
- Hardon, John A., S. J. The Protestant Churches of America. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1957.
- Herberg, Will. Protestant, Catholic, Jew. Garden City: Doubleday, 1955.
- Hollingshead, A. B. Elmtown's Youth. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949.
- Hollingshead, A. B. and Redlich, Fredrick G. Social Class and Mental Illness. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

- Knudten, Richard D. The Sociology of Religion: An Anthology. New York: Appleton, Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Lee, Robert and Marty, Martin E. (eds). Religion and Social Conflict. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Lenski, Gerhart. The Religious Factor. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961.
- Martindale, Don. The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory. Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1960.
- May, Henry F. Protestant Churches and Industrial America. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1949.
- Miller, Park Hays. Why I Am A Presbyterian. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1956.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. The Social Sources of Denominationalism. Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 1954.
- Sargent, S. Stansfeld and Williamson, Robert C. Social Psychology. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1958.
- Schneider, Louis (ed.). Religion, Culture, and Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Schroeder, W. Widick, and Obenhaus, Victor. Religion In American Culture. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1964.
- Simmel, George. Sociology of Religion. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1959.
- Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Scribner, 1930.

I. Articles and Reports

- Allinsmith, Wesley and Allinsmith, Beverly. "Religious Affiliation and Politico-Economic Attitude: A Study of Eight Major U.S. Religious Groups." Public Opinion Quarterly, 12 (1948), 377-389.
- Burchinal, Lee G. "Some Social Status Criteria and Church Membership and Church Attendance." Journal of Social Psychology, 49 (February, 1959), 53-64.
- Constitution and By-Laws of the Harrison Street Bible Church, Oak Park, Illinois. Adopted April 12, 1950.

The Constitution of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia: Office of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1966-1967.

Dillingham, Harry G. "Protestant Religion and Social Status." American Journal of Sociology, 70 (January, 1965), 416-422.

Dornbusch, Sanford M. and Isle, Roger D. "The Failure of Presbyterian Union." American Journal of Sociology, 64 (January, 1959), 352-355.

Dynes, Russell R. "Church-Sect Typology and Socio-Economic Status." American Sociological Review, 20 (October, 1955), 555-560.

Feagin, Joe R. "Prejudice, Orthodoxy and the Social Situation." Social Forces, 44 (September, 1965), 46-56.

Glock, Charles Y. and Ringer, Benjamin B. "Church Policy and the Attitudes of Ministers and Parishoners on Social Issues." American Sociological Review, 21 (April, 1956), 148-156.

Information Bulletin: Bulletin #43. 1966 Special Census of Population in Oak Park. Department of Planning and Development, Village of Oak Park, Illinois.

Johnson, Benton. "Ascetic Protestantism and Political Preference." Public Opinion Quarterly, 26 (1962), 35-46.

Photiadis, John D. "Overt Conformity to Church Teaching as a Function of Religious Belief and Group Participation." American Journal of Sociology, 70 (January, 1965), 423-428.

The Proposed Book of Confessions of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia: Office of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1966.

Report of the Blue Ribbon Committee, 1967, of the First Presbyterian Church of Oak Park. (Mimeographed.)

Ringer, Benjamin and Glock, Charles. "The Political Role of the Church as Defined by Its Parishoners." Public Opinion Quarterly, 18 (1954-55), 337-347.

Smith, George Horsley. "Liberalism and Level of Information." The Journal of Educational Psychology, (February, 1948), 65-81.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by James F. Gilsinan has been read and approved by members of the Department of Sociology.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

12/30/69
Date

E. M. Lurie
Signature of Advisor