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ABSTRACT

This study was designed as an empirical investigation into attitudes of racial prejudice amongst Mississippi Methodist clergymen. Based on Durkheim's theories of the importance of surrounding cultural factors upon religious life, causal relationships for this target group were sought within the context of both regional (southern) and national cultural norms.

Basic hypotheses were that clergy prejudice would vary directly with age, fundamentalism, and perception of prejudice of parishioners and community; and inversely with education, urban location of ministry, social actionist stance and agreement with denominational policy. It was also predicted that the mean prejudice score would decrease over the time period involved.

The data used in the study were generated by two surveys, the first administered to all white Methodist clergy at the Mississippi Annual Conference of 1889, and the second presented to all Methodist clergy present at district conferences during the summer of 1880. Other data sources used were official financial records of the target conference and observations of the researchers.

The statistical procedures in the study included factor analysis as a means of constructing the composite variables which were employed in the theoretical model. The relationships between these variables were then tested through the use of Pearson's $r$ for zero order
relationships, and of regression analysis. The financial and observational data were used as supportive material to elucidate and validate the results. Such efforts at triangulation enhance the reliability of the study.

The financial data suggested that prejudice levels may have risen precipitously between the two surveys with the advent of the integration of Mississippi's black and white conferences, with a subsequent lessening to the present level.

The study concludes with a discussion of the limitations of the data and possible future implications.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

Introduction

Since the founding of this nation, Americans have tended to equate human rights and the democratic way with religious systems of one sort or another. At least, a majority would parallel the concepts of human rights and equality with those of the will and dictate of God. In an address to the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights, W. Melvin Adams speaks of the "fundamental convictions of our Founding Fathers in religious liberty" as the spark which ignited the bold experiment in democracy, the cornerstone of which was the "natural or inalienable rights of its citizens" (1979:2). Because of this feeling, many share the common misconception that organized religious denominations and groups must, therefore, be champions of these natural or inalienable rights. Such a notion is inaccurate because while some religious groups may champion some areas of civil rights, others are neutral, while still others are opposed to any such stand. In still other cases denominations have been split by such issues.

During the late 1950's and early 1960's, religious organizations in American society experienced what Hadden (1967) refers to as "The Gathering Storm in the Churches." In Hadden's view the church
America has experienced a crisis situation because of its insistence "to come to grips with itself in a modern, secular world." Since the modern secular world of the 1960's included conflict between black and white Americans over the civil rights of blacks, the crisis of the church was also a "struggle to come to grips with the racial crisis" (Hadden, 1967). Perhaps in no other religious group in American society was the crisis more apparent than in American Methodism, beset as it was with problems and conflicts generated by the proposed integration of the black and white races.

Although blacks were technically freed by the Proclamation of Emancipation in 1863, in some respects their situation was only made worse. Many Southerners were embittered by the devastation of their lands and homes and tended to take out their frustrations and aggressions on their former slaves. As Kitano states: "defeated Southerners still maintained their feelings about the inferiority of their former slaves, and violence, both legal and illegal, was a common solution to racial problems" (1990:131). Thus, the regional cultural context of the internal crises of American Methodism in the South was one of bitterness, hatred, and violence.

The nature of this conflict over issues of racial equality within the Methodist Church will be explained more fully in following sections. At this point, however, it may suffice to say that the church, existing as it did within its cultural milieu, could not be expected to remain untouched by the battle being waged within the
context of that culture.

**Statement of the Problem**

Some work has been done on the subject of the impact of integration on the country as a whole, and the South in particular (Silver, 1963; Wirt, 1970; Howard and Brent, 1966; Yinger, 1965; Reed, 1974; Cash, 1941; Heco, 1965; and Bartley, 1969). There have also been some good publications in the area of its impact upon religious organizations (Haston, 1959; Cunningham, 1980; Mathews, 1985; and Campbell and Pettigrew, 1959). Less, however, has been done in the way of studies which seek to compare current attitudes concerning integration with those which existed in the 1960's when the topic commanded considerable attention (Namoroto, 1979, being one notable exception). It is important to consider attitudes since, if they are adequately polled, there will be an interrelation between attitude and action.

One factor bearing upon the subject of this situation within the church is the relationship between church and pastor, and between pastor and hierarchy. The pastor is usually considered to play a central role as the mediator of official policies to the rank and file of the organization. Especially in connectional systems of church organization, it is assumed that the relationship of pastor to church is characterized by the element of leadership. That is to say, the pastor is the recognized leader of the church, primarily in the area
of spiritual matters. This also overlaps into more practical considerations, particularly as these have moral or spiritual connections.

Glock and Ringer (1956) have noted that the "minister of the local parish is — the crucial link in communicating church policy to the church membership." At the same time, however, "his position is such that he becomes the individual most subject to cross pressures where conflict arises between church policy on an issue and how his parishioners feel on this issue" (1956:155).

Therefore, a major part of understanding the problems associated with Methodist Church integration in Mississippi is the understanding of the pastors' attitudes and perceptions regarding this area, and that which motivates their stand on this issue.

Since some attitudinal studies have been done in the past on the impact of integration on religious organizations, and since little has been done more recently, it would seem that a considerable gap exists in the literature. In order to bridge this gap, new research focusing on clergy attitudes toward integration within the organizational structures is necessary. Because of the central role of pastors as mediators within these organizations, their attitudes should be of central importance as indicators of both laity and hierarchy. This study, therefore, proposes to examine the current attitudes on racial prejudice of Mississippi Methodist clergymen with regard to integration. These will be compared with past attitudes of the clergy
in regard to racial prejudice as well as other variables. In addition, an assessment of church response to racial concerns over a ten year span will be ascertained by analyzing the patterns of withholding of funds by the churches within the Mississippi Annual Conference. Indirectly, the withholding of funds is a crude measure of clergy attitudes toward integration.

The major source of attitude comparison will be a 1969 study by Cunningham of racial integration issues. In this study Methodist ministers in Mississippi were compared by rural-urban residence in reference to prejudicial attitudes toward blacks. It was expected that ministers serving rural congregations would be more prejudiced toward blacks than their urban counterparts. In addition, other factors such as age, level of education (seminary vs. non-seminary training), and religious fundamentalism were assessed as variables determining prejudicial attitudes of ministers.

The data were collected by questionnaires employing fixed alternative response items. The sample consisted of 118 white male ministers attending the Mississippi Methodist Annual Conference in the summer of 1969.

Scalogram analysis was used to construct two six-item indexes measuring (1) prejudice toward Blacks, and (2) religious fundamentalism. These and the remaining independent variables (i.e. residence, age, and education) were dichotomized for the analysis. The analysis, employing chi square and gamma (Yule's Q for 2 X 2
tables), showed that the best predictor of prejudice was education (seminary vs. non-seminary), followed by fundamentalism (high vs. low), which was followed in order by residence (rural vs. urban), and age (young vs. old).

Since this study proposes to look at these same variables, the comparison should be valuable in a longitudinal sense. The formerly segregated Mississippi Conferences are now integrated. Accordingly, the present population is comprised of black as well as white clergy.

Given the inherent problems in Mississippi Methodism, this research has as its major goal an assessment of the changes occurring over an eleven year time period. Specifically, the objectives of the study are as follows:

To assess levels of giving to such causes as the Interdenominational Cooperative Fund, World Service Benevolence Fund, and race relations projects by Mississippi Methodist churches. Contributions to these projects serve as an indicator to the extent to which churches in Mississippi agree or disagree with the national position of integration. In addition, these indicators may be regarded as an auxiliary method to appraise the general attitudinal aspects of Mississippi Methodist parishioners toward racial issues.
To ascertain the extent to which clergy in the Methodist Conference in Mississippi hold prejudicial attitudes and the extent to which they support the general church position on an inclusive church. Differential levels of prejudice from the 1980 sample of clergy are compared to the extent to which the 1969 sample of clergy expressed racial prejudice and agreement with church policy. This will determine whether change has occurred among the clergy in regard to both prejudice and church policy.

To discover what factors are related to prejudicial attitudes of clergy, attention is given to the relationship between prejudice and such independent variables as (1) Age, (2) Education, (3) Religious Fundamentalism, (4) Urban-Rural Parish, and (5) Clergy Perception of conflict with (a) Parishioners, (b) Community, (c) Organization. Since the first three of these variables were used in the 1969 Cunningham study, it should be possible to also compare these results over this time period.

To compare prejudicial attitudes of white clergy with those of black clergy from the 1980 sample to ascertain differences that may exist in the two groups.
In relation to the first point, the connection between racial prejudice and contributions in support of integrationist policies may be expressed this way: if laity and clergy do not approve of a given policy, then they will probably not give of their financial resources in order to support such policies and/or their organizational implementation. In addition, as previously pointed out, given the pastor's place of leadership in his church, these contributionary records may be considered as not only a valid overall indicator of attitude, but also, more specifically, of clergy attitude. They should then serve as a good supplementary indicator of both clergy and collective disposition on the subject of integration. Since these records are available on a yearly basis for the period of time in question, they may be regarded as a kind of temporal change or progress check.

**Historical Overview of Methodism**

To set the stage for the following discussion of Methodist clergy, a brief account of the history of the Methodist Church is appropriate in order to get some notion of organizational precedent norms within the denomination.

Methodism "arose as a consequence of the preaching of John Wesley in England in the middle of the eighteenth century" [Zeno, 1928:332]. Its earliest origins may be traced to "The Holy Club" [Stuber,
1949:181), a derogatory name given to an academic club to which the young Wesley, his brother Charles, and George Whitefield belonged. Because of the methodical nature with which the group conducted its affairs, the name applied to it was changed to the "Methodists." As sometimes happens, that which was intended as derision was accepted in the nature of a challenge, and the name stuck with the subsequent followers of Wesleyan tradition. John Wesley's preaching and the following methodist movement came largely as "a reaction against English rationalism and the general spiritual and moral decline of the English nation" (Qualben, 1958:368).

England had undergone remarkable changes during the eighteenth century, including the shift from an agricultural to a largely industrial economy, the growth of large cities, and an increasingly unequal distribution of material prosperity. These rapid changes brought about the general decline of moral and religious principles which the Anglican church seemed to be unwilling or unable to cope with. "Methodism satisfied to a large extent the religious needs which the Angelican church had failed to meet, and this accounts in part for the worldwide scope and the international character of the Methodist Church" (Qualben, 1958:369). Actual organization was accomplished in 1744, when the Wesleys met their workers in the first annual conference. It was not until 1795 that they separated from the Anglican Church" (Stuber, 1949:182).
Soon after its origin, Methodism was "brought over into the American colonies by Phillip Embury, Barbara Heck, and Thomas Webb, (1788)" (Zenoe, 1928:332). In this setting its growth was so phenomenal that Wesley, "aware of the rapid spread of the movement in America, sent emissaries to take charge, among them Francis Asbury" (Mead, 1956:148).

Beginning with its formal organization in Baltimore in 1784, and continuing through the next several decades, by 1830 Methodism "had become one of the largest Protestant denominations in the New World" (Qualben, 1958:539). It did not escape schism, however, splitting in 1844 over the issue of slavery. This began with Bishop James O. Andrew of Georgia, who had by marriage become a nominal slaveholder. By law at that time, neither he nor his wife could free their slaves, so at the general conference of 1844, the "northern delegates forced a resolution which advised Bishop Andrew to 'desist from the exercise of office' so long as he continued to hold slaves" (Qualben, 1958:547). The dissention over this issue resulted in the formation of the two separate bodies: the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Although several more splits were to follow for more doctrinally related reasons during the 1890's, a reunification of American Methodism was to take place in 1939 when "the Methodist Episcopal Church, South and North, and the Methodist Protestant Church merged in organic union with a combined membership of about 7,850,000 or about
85 percent of American Methodism" (Quelben, 1958:553). Negro churches were not yet included, but despite this it was the largest single historic step towards unity of Methodism in the United States.

In 1864 the General Conference of the Methodist Church adopted the policy that the church was an inclusive body that would accept all persons regardless of color into its fellowship and instructed the annual conferences to move toward a merger of the black annual conferences with the all white annual conferences.

Annual conferences in the southern region of the church utilized stalling tactics to delay the merger of the black and white conferences. Advocates of both sides of the merger issue adopted stances which heightened the crisis over racial integration of the church. Consequently, schism again developed within the Methodist Church, with the southern annual conferences becoming focal points in the dispute.

The Mississippi Annual Conference of the Methodist church was at the forefront of this controversy, and it was not until 1873 that black and white conferences here merged. Dispute raged as some churches threatened withdrawal while others split into two factions. Some members withdrew and formed independent Methodist Churches. Other congregations withheld funds to the general budget of the national body.

Since the history of Methodism has not been characterized by the kind of racial prejudice evidenced within the southern conferences,
and since such beliefs and behaviors do not originate in a social vacuum, it is necessary to look at the general phenomenon of this prejudice as a product, not of the church per se, but rather of the southern culture as a whole. This task will be undertaken in Chapter II.

**Impetus for the Study**

With regard to the theoretical construction of this research, it may be noted that although many studies before have worked with elements of Durkheimian Theory, the addition of White (1972), and Berger (1969), which will be presented as a basis for the variables considered, may be a novel approach. It will be suggested that White's theory may be extended to include not only national norms which will tend to have the effect of decentralization upon an organization in times of stress, but also regional norms which may serve the same purpose in decreasing spheres of analysis. It is also possible to increase the sphere of analysis to broader areas of theoretic importance.

The impetus for any sociological study should have included in it one or both of two elements: (1) The empirical testing and verification of existing theory, and/or (2) The extension of existing areas of theory through new conceptualizations or recombinations of theoretic systems already in existence. This study sets out to accomplish something in both these areas. First, through an analysis of the attitudes in question it is intended to compare the theories to
be discussed with the actual situation. Second, it is expected that the end result will include an empirical check of this comparison in the context of a longitudinal study of attitudes of racial prejudice.

Although this study deals primarily with the attitudes of racial prejudice of white Methodist clergymen, it still undertakes the task of making some observations and comments in the area of race relations. As Joseph Himes (1973) has pointed out, this subject area may be approached from the point of view of only one of the races involved in what he terms as a social conflict situation (p. VII). Whereas Himes has made the "black community the locale of investigation" (p. VII), this study explores that of the whites.

The significance of the inquiry into race relations for sociology is well documented by Graham Kinloch (1974) in Chapter two of his book, The Dynamics of Race Relations. In relation to the "sociological significance" (p. 11) of the study of race relations, Kinloch lists ten indices which relate this area of study to "the society's social structure, its internal social flexability and change" (p. 11). Specifically, these relate race relations study to: social tension, social structure, social flexability, social conformity, the relationships between attitudes and behavior, and needs and behavior, the effects of industrialization, the historical development of the social sciences, sociological theory, and social policy.
Given the position of central import posited by some sociologists concerning the part played by religion in the formulation of American Culture (Bellah, 1967; Lenski, 1961; Herberg, 1960; and R. Niebuhr, 1957), as well as the importance of the study of race relations as mentioned above, part of the significance of this study may include the possibility of finding some new insights in the areas of one or more of Kinloch's indices.

**Summary**

It has been the aim of this chapter to focus the reader's attention upon the subject of black and white relationships within the Methodist Church. Beginning with a brief general introduction on the nature of prejudice and Christianity, the need for study in the area of racial prejudice within religious organizations was pointed out, particularly prejudicial attitudes held by clergy. Cunningham's 1969 study was briefly presented and the objectives of this study outlined. These objectives generally center around the attempt to assess levels of prejudice among Mississippi Methodist clergy with relation to such variables as age, education, religious fundamentalism, urban-rural parish, and perception of attitudes of laity and hierarchy. A short historical overview of Methodism was given in order to set an
organizational context for the study. As an introduction to the later theory chapter, White and Berger are mentioned as important theoretical inputs based upon earlier work of Durkheim.
Footnotes

1 The term church is used in a generic sense to refer to the Christian Church, and as such it is inclusive of most major religious organizations.

2 This is to say that the setting in which attitudes are expressed in written or verbal form should be as close to the action setting as possible. As A. W. Wicker points out: "The more similar the situations in which verbal and overt behavioral responses are obtained, the stronger will be the attitude—behavior relationship" (1969). An analogue of this argument is defended and enlarged upon in Chapter twelve of Irwin Deutscher's book: What We Say/What We Do. In addition, this argument will be further explored in Chapter II in the relationship between prejudice and discrimination through use of stereotypes.

3 In the case of financially supporting a given moral value and/or organizational policy which is not approved of in terms of reference group and personal convictions, Ullman (1965) theorizes that role action chosen will probably be that associated with the reference group having the highest priority. Thus, groups choosing not to contribute are making a statement not only on their positional agreement/disagreement but also upon reference group priorities and
role priorities. This will be discussed in more detail in the theory section.

4 It was at this first formal conference that Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury were jointly appointed and elected as superintendents of the American Methodist movement (Mead, 1956; Stuber, 1949; Desilver, 1871; & Harmon, 1953).

5 It should be noted that although the split of 1844 was the most major for Methodism, it was neither the first nor the last. A smaller schism had taken place in 1828 resulting in the Methodist Protestant Church, and in the 1880's the organizational phenomenon known as the holiness movement began and resulted in more than 25 groups breaking away, largest of which was the Church of the Nazarene. Probably none of these splits could be said to be the result of only one issue, and Harmon (1982) points out that although slavery was indeed a major issue at the 1844 conference, there were other contributing debates of an organizational nature which helped to bring about the division in the denomination.
6 As regards what might be termed as Black Methodism, two divisions are notable. One group, or more accurately series of groups, elected to leave the Methodist Episcopal Church and become separate organizations. (An excellent brief treatment of these is given by Mead, 1956). The second group were those who remained within the body of mainstream Methodism. These were largely recognized from an official standpoint as existing as separate conferences but with little real representation. Not until 1920 were two Black general superintendents or bishops elected on a separate ballot (Harmon 1962, p. 52 and 175).
CHAPTER II

PREJUDICE AND ITS SOUTHERN ROOTS

The Nature of Prejudice

The relationship mentioned previously between attitude and action is the relationship between prejudice and discrimination. In this particular case discrimination (acts or behavior that have a negative impact on minority groups) may be viewed "as a creature of", or as an outgrowth of prejudice (Feagin and Feagin, 1978:1), while prejudice may be said to be "simply a negative attitude toward a group of people" (Luhman & Gilman, 1980:61). This negative attitude is not without its foundational justifications, which typically appear to be entirely legitimate and reasonable to those who hold them. All too often, however, these justifications are based upon stereotypic thinking. What is stereotype? It is said to be "a piece of knowledge (an idea or belief) about a piece of the social world" (Luhman & Gilman, 1980:60). Are stereotypes always directed to negative ends such as prejudice? No, because the basic element of a stereotype is simply an abstraction of an important commonality from an array of persons, things, or ideas that may otherwise be unmanageable by virtue of their complexities. For example, the term "taxi" may refer to many different vehicles having two or more wheels powered by a variety of
sources and capable of transportation under a great many dissimilar settings. The word taxi, however, generally ignores all such differences in favor of the one thing which all presumably have in common, namely their use. Much like the designation of taxi, the label "black people ignores differences in favor of calling attention to similarities that are thought important" (Luhman & Gilman, 1980:60). Thus, we might say that discrimination is the end product of prejudice which is, in turn, often based on the utilization of stereotypes as exonerating mechanisms used to justify what would otherwise be considered reprehensible behavior.

This complex in a more radical form is sometimes termed racism, which Wilson (1973:32) defines as "an ideology of racial domination or exploitation that (1) incorporates beliefs in a particular race's cultural and/or inherent biological inferiority and (2) uses such beliefs to justify and prescribe inferior or unequal treatment for that group." Most authorities in this field of study would probably agree on the usage of the terms prejudice, discrimination, ethnocentrism and racism as: (1) beliefs concerning inferiority of another racial cultural group, (2) the resulting action taken to keep this other group "in its place", (3) a combination of these two elements in comparatively mild form, and (4) the practice of extreme discrimination such as murder, genocide, or etc.

Racism is not a recent phenomenon in the human experience. No doubt the earliest groups of human kind looked down upon other
"inferior" races or tribes not identified with their own. Recorded history is full of examples of this attitude, revealed in such terms as primitives, barbarians, and etc. Perhaps the darkest hour of racism occurred during World War II when Hitler's fervor that his super race of Aryans remain unmixed with inferior stock prompted him to attempt the genocide of the Jewish race.

Attempts to explain discriminatory behavior have ranged from those leaning to the psychological end of the continuum and focusing on types of personalities (Adorno, 1950), reactions to frustration (Dollard et. al., 1939; Hovland and Sears, 1940; and Berkowitz, 1962), and the maintenance of self worth or esteem (Levin, 1975:50), to those of a more sociological nature, such as reference group pressure (DeFleur & Westie, 1959), the desire to protect the power and privilege of one's own group (Rose, 1958), and social structural explanations involving not only the existence of the social structuring of society (Kaufman, 1957, and Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1950), but also the ways in which group power imbalances have instituted and set up this structure in its present form (Hechter, 1975). These are only a few of the many hypothesized causes of discrimination. Most of these theorists, however, tend to agree that whatever the nature of its beginnings, the socially solid nature of discrimination as a cultural phenomenon, added to by the effect of intergenerational socialization, makes it a formidable problem.
Obviously, the question of how this problem is to be solved will depend in large measure on the frame of reference in which the individual is operating and in which the analysis of the problem was conceived. Among the theoretical assumptions of causal agents which will help to solve the problem are: education of the white majority (Jones, 1969) presumably to the groundlessness of prejudice), actual contact of blacks with whites as equal status groups (Gordon, 1964), and the gaining of economically equal class status for blacks (Wilson, 1978). Basically, there are those who are optimistic and who feel that progress is being made, and those who feel that no progress has been made. If the former position is true, then given the importance of socialization as a mechanism which perpetuates cultural values, age ought also to be a factor. This would follow because if any progress is being made, then this change should be being passed along to the younger generation. But is progress being made? How quickly does culture change, and what is the nature of culture relative to this problem? In order to get some indication of the answer to this latter question, we must turn to the area of culture, not in a national sense, but in a regional perspective. What is the nature of prejudice as it exists in the South?

Prejudice as a Southern Cultural Phenomenon

Scholarly works on the South with its problems of slavery,
prejudice, and desegregation (in something of rough time sequence) have been approached from a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives. Although some purport to be purely objective chronicles of historic fact, few, if any, have achieved that goal. The majority, however, do not pretend to be anything but subjective in their approaches to the history, as well as the perceived problems of the South. The scope of such studies, as well as the methods used to obtain data, vary widely. Some endeavor to chronicle black history over the entire South from the inception of slavery in the 1600's until the present (Brawley, 1970), while others zero in on a particular geographic location with respect to one major variable over a relatively short period of time (Wirt, 1979).

Brawley's book (1970) does a good job by way of introduction and provides for a broad historical base from which to discuss racial relations. A black man himself, Brawley emphasizes the social aspects of black history in the United States, beginning with the earliest inception of English slave trading in 1530 (6), through the first importation of slaves to the American colonies in 1619, and to the present day (copyright on this volume was 1921).

He breaks this time roughly up into four general periods: the colonial period (1619 to 1775) in which what he refers to as servitude actually became slavery; the period extending from the Revolutionary War to the Civil War wherein the black man was recognized as a person rather than a property and, thus, became subject to lynchings and
other reprisals; the third period, (1865 to 1895) wherein the supposedly emancipated Black was disenfranchised and subject to outrages from all quarters, especially from the Ku Klux Klan; the last period (1895 to World War I) in which blacks were increasing numerically and slowly gaining the rights of citizens.

Although the events of slavery, such as historic inception, relevant political legalization, and geographic distributions are presented, the emphasis of the book is the aspect of social injustice, evidenced by detailed accounts of lynchings and massacres guaranteed to upset any reader with a queasy stomach. Brewley's conclusion is that what is needed is "a stern adherence to law" (389) until such time as man's law is subsumed by that of God.

Another aspect of the history of the South is found in Three Paths to the Modern South by Clark (1965). Although it is also a good source of historical detail, it adds the element of being arranged around a theoretical framework. Clark lays emphasis on three areas which he says are instrumental factors in the progress which has been made: Education, Agriculture, and Conservation. Basically this author seems to be optimistic concerning the future of the South, implying that economic problems related to non-diversified crop production, along with lack of education were the major problems. He feels that these problems are being conquered, and, given time, the remaining problems should be worked out.
It is probably safe to say, however, that most of the material that has been published about the South does not fit into the molds of being strictly historic, nonpartisan, or optimistic in scope as to a peaceful and integrated outcome.

Most of those who have published works on the history of the South have had misgivings as to the outcome of integration, and many have emphasized the legal and political factors as important variables in shaping the future. Hero (1985) focuses on Southerners' political attitudes concerning foreign affairs as an indicator of their position in more domestic matters. He chronicles trends in thinking in such areas as immigration, defense, intercultural relations, trade, colonialism, and foreign aid, showing the changes which have taken place since the mid-thirties. He portrays southern hesitancy about several areas of international cooperative efforts and the favoring of unilateralist action seen mainly in terms of military power. Several issues mentioned in the early 1960's were that Southerners were more hostile to newly independent states and to neutralism in underdeveloped countries, and that they were for a tougher stance toward Communist China and more in favor of unilateral military action in defense of U.S. interests than were other Americans at the time. They also tended to be more influenced by tradition and were more pessimistic about the prospects of changing social institutions. Hero, however, seems to feel that changes happening in the south are indicative of future shifts in thinking bringing them more into line
with the rest of the country.

Lipset and Raab (1970) look at the phenomenon of Southern repressivists groups such as the Ku Klux Klan along with other extremist organizations as the John Birch Society and the Anti Masons as examples of right wing fervor which involved most of America during the fifties. This book tends to give one a slightly different perspective in looking at the South, since its major contention is that the whole country was going through some major upheavals in several areas (not just those of the racial and/or political) during that time. Thus, it is possible to see the problems of the Southern U.S. as part of something larger, and not as an isolated phenomenon. Here again, however, the emphasis is placed on the political aspects of the problem, although the causes of these tendencies of the time, or hysteries (as these terms were applied especially to McCarthyism) are not dealt with adequately. Bartley (1970) looks at the effects of status of political behavior in a statistical analysis of voting tendencies in Georgia since 1948, alleging that increased black voter registration was primarily beneficial to the Democrats, whereas rural white Southerners are Republican by tradition, something highly regarded as a guideline for political voting behavior.

An historical analysis of a smaller area is Roger's 1970 study: The History of Georgetown County, South Carolina. Here agriculture and economic factors are given as causal impetus for unrest in this area with the collapse of that county's staple crops of indigo and
rice. Another tie between agricultural elements and racial struggles is Cantor’s study of the "Missouri Sharecropper's Roadside Demonstration." This demonstration came about because black (for the most part) sharecroppers were dispossessed of their land as a result of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. This piece of legislation encouraged cotton planters to get rid of their tenants and sharecroppers so that they could receive all of the cash benefit payments. As a consequence, in 1939 more than a thousand destitute sharecroppers camped along highways 60 and 61 in southeast Missouri, led by a black farmer-minister named Owen H. Whitfield. Although they were gotten rid of by authorities within four days, the incident nevertheless received nationwide publicity. This mass campout is said to have demonstrated that peaceful protest was at least possible, and, although (or perhaps because) no positive government action was forthcoming, it was the beginning of the protest movement.

When laws finally were passed which began to benefit the black population of the South, the major thrust was towards equality and integration. Pettigrew (1971), in the preface to his work on the racial issue, urges integration as the principal means of fighting white racism. He emphasizes the relationship between individual prejudice and institutional restrictions and argues that for real integration to exist, blacks and whites must have equal status as well as equal access to resources. That this is not now the case is seen in his conclusion that more extensive integration, along with sweeping
programs of ghetto improvement, is necessary. Wirt (1970), somewhat
like Pattigrew, analyzes the relationship between law and social
change in the South. Wirt sees law as a major engine of change with
varying degrees of success in three areas: voting, school
desegregation, and economic rights. Although he states that at this
time whites' perception of blacks has changed little, behavioral
patterns have changed. He sees this as a result of forced compliance
to law and states hopefully that the "law will have played a signal
role in reshaping perceptions after it has reshaped behavior"
(1970:290). Wirt says that the weight of past evidence shows that
white southerners would move very slowly, if at all, in the area of
civil rights without the direct intervention of federal laws rigidly
enforced.

Most of the authors' writing on this general topic seem to agree
to a certain extent that although some advances have been made on the
surface of the South due to the imposition of federal laws on civil
rights, the attitudes of white Southerners have changed little, if at
all. Silver (1963) argues that this is possible because
Mississippians (as emblematic of the South in general) have, to the
present, effectively sealed themselves off from the rest of American
society in cultural ways so that they can continue to live in the
past.

Bestley (1969) takes somewhat the same position as he discusses
the resistance on the part of whites to civil rights legislation.
Though it is not the purpose here to explore the means by which resistance was given, (through Neobourbonism, the Dixiecrat Movement, the White Citizens Councils, etc.), it is interesting that his conclusion points to the same general notion cited by others, namely that the moderates who took over from those mounting overt resistance were themselves thwarting federal law through a passive acceptance of tokenism, which in itself is only another form of resistance. John Reed (1972) substantially agrees with this general position in postulating the continuing existence of a "regional subculture which has retained much of its integrity" (preface). Using secondary data analysis and comparing on a North-South basis, Reed stated that Southerners "are more likely than non-Southerners to be conventionally religious, to accept the private use of force (or the potential for it), and to be anchored in their home place" (38).

Howard and Brent (1966) feel that Southern history has "culminated in the social type, totalitarian" (5) in which, as one of four possible alternative outcomes, "consciousness of class must continue to compete with the determination to maintain white supremacy, the basis for the power monopoly of the status quo" (10). As Lerome Bennett has positively and vehemently stated, the black man in America has not overcome (Namoroto, 1979:191), especially in the South, nor will he in the immediate and possibly the foreseeable future.
This rather pessimistic overall appraisal of southern cultural norms relating to racial integration is much more likely to contain the causal influences in the conflicts discussed within the Methodist Church than are religious norms.

Religion and Racial Prejudice

As was mentioned at the outset of chapter one, a great many people tend to equate religion, and especially Christianity, with human rights and equality. Even a cursory examination of the history of Christianity, however, should convince the most idealistic individual that not all groups taking upon themselves the mantle of this designation have had exemplary records in this context. On the contrary, one is not at all hard pressed to find numerous examples of racial prejudice and discrimination, not to mention outright racism, practiced within, and in the name of Christianity.

Perhaps the most widely known historical example would be that of the Crusades (roughly from C. 1096 to C. 1270) during which time many categories of Christians deemed it their duty to God to slaughter as many Turks and other assorted infidels as possible. Warfare, indeed, became something of a sacrament in its own right as Pope Urban II declared:

Strong in our trust in the divine mercy, and by virtue of the authority of Sts. Peter and Paul, of whose fullness we are the depositary, we hereby grant full remission of any canonical penalties whatever to all the faithful of Christ
who from motives of devotion alone and not for the procurement of honor or gain shall have gone forth to the aid of God's church at Jerusalem. But whosoever shall have died there in true repentance shall undoubtedly have the remission (indulgentiam) of sins and the fruit of eternal reward. (Quelben 1969:171).

Although the Crusades serve as a popular example of discrimination, others come readily to mind. Johnstone (1975:217) states that numerous examples of prejudice and discrimination appear throughout the history of Western Christianity. One thinks of the Inquisition in medieval Europe, the execution of various Protestant reformers by Roman Catholic state and ecclesiastical powers, the Thirty Years War in seventeenth century Europe between Protestant and Roman Catholic forces, the present Protestant-Catholic civil conflict in Northern Ireland, and, along a somewhat different line, the prejudice and discrimination in the name of religion that has been directed against blacks throughout American history.

A couple of notable examples not mentioned by Johnstone are those of persecution of Jews by Christians at various times and places throughout history, and the fierce anti-Irish-Catholic sentiment expressed by the American Protestant Majority occasioned by the Irish Potato Famine Immigration of the 1800's (Luhman & Gilman, 1980:15).

These examples by no means exhaust the list which could be produced, but are sufficient to make the point that Christianity has not always displayed the love, brotherhood, and equality that it lays claim to on an ideal basis. This, however, should not be taken as a negation of the ideals which it has generally held since its inception with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. As any human organization will do, it has many times fallen short of its stated
goals and positions; but it is also interesting that it has always tried to police itself. Most of the foregoing examples were corrected in time, generally through internal reforms of one kind or another.

In the case under consideration in this study, it was Methodism's general conference which decreed that integration of black and white conferences should take place, although outside influences no doubt provided the initial motivation. In this connection, it has already been mentioned that no organization, religious or otherwise, can exist untouched by the influences of its cultural milieu. This is as true of the northern element of Methodism as it is of the South. Johnstone (1975:222) observes that "in the "1950's and 1960's nearly every major religious group issued official statements and passed resolutions at their national conventions favoring equality for blacks and calling for an end to discrimination and segregation, although not always issuing clear calls for integration as such."

During this period of time, a major ideological split developed between church hierarchy and laity, since a very large percentage of the latter did not seem to be in agreement with official denominational stands. Within the "white Christian denominations...as recently as 1967, nearly half (44 percent) of the white respondents registered basic disapproval of the black civil rights movement in this country" (Johnstone 1975:222). There is, however, some indication of change in this opinion, as Sheatsley (1966) expresses the opinion that various polls since the 1940's show a small but
steady increase in positive sentiments toward civil rights issues. There seems to be some doubt, however, as to whether or not this increase represents a practical desire to get involved, or merely an intellectual assent.

Summary

This chapter has sought to bring to the reader's attention some aspects of the character of prejudice, discrimination, ethnocentrism, and racism. Several theories of discrimination as the outgrowth of prejudice were mentioned, as well as the problems of its resolution. Since religious organizations are influenced by their regional cultural environments, some facets of southern cultural prejudice were noted from the points of view of such authors as Brewley (1970), Clark (1965), Lipsitz and Raab (1970), and others.

These authors approach the subject from diverse positions ranging from primarily historical analysis to empirical field studies; some are optimistic of progress, while others see none.

The question of racial prejudice was looked at in the context of religion, specifically Christianity. It was observed that discrimination has not been an uncommon element in church history, although this reality is not sanctioned by Christian doctrine or ideals. Discrimination against blacks in America was seen as part of the overall pattern and notice was taken of disagreement between
official church organizational stands and rank and file lay sentiment.
CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

General Theoretical Perspective

The basic theoretic position in this study flows from the contention that cultural influences have a marked effect on attitudes of what is right and wrong, proper and improper, etc. Thus, in theorizing an expected relationship between the attitudes of religious professionals and their cultural milieu, attention must be paid not only to the expressed attitudes, but also to their interconnections with other variables expressing such cultural connections.

One of the earliest theorists to posit this connection was Emile Durkheim, to whom the relationship was especially important, since culture not only shaped individuals in their belief structures through the process of socialization (1956:87), but also provided the very essence of religion itself in the form of the deity to be worshiped. Spencer (1979) feels that for Durkheim, "the group is made into a personalized living entity. Religion sacralizes the traditions on which society is based" (386). Thus, not only does society socialize its members into expected beliefs and behaviors, but also becomes their god and in return is supported by them. "The purpose of religion, therefore, is to preserve society...In collective acts of
worship society reaffirms and strengthens itself" (Spencer, 1979:386).

According to Martindale, this applies not only to religious ideals and beliefs, but also to moral norms, since he separates these concepts while positing only a single source. "Thus, religion and the moral life have the same origin" (1960:89).

White (1972) takes a similar position by pointing out that what he refers to as "constituting norms" (by which he means the basic American cultural ideal of democracy) have an important impact upon religious organizational behavior, particularly in periods of stress. This may be applied to regional or Southern norms as well as national.

Peter Berger (1969) may be seen as adding to this basic framework by his assertion that the "fundamental dialectic process of society consists of three moments, or steps. These are: externalization, objectivation, and internalization" (4). In this assertion, he recognizes the interrelation and interdependence of society and its component parts. Societal and cultural elements must be shaped by man in the process of externalization, but as these constructed realities become objectivated, and take on a separate reality of themselves, they require a reappropriation into subjectivity through the ongoing process of socialization. This process takes place on many levels, from the societal in the broadest sense (as in White's Constituting norms), through organizational bodies (such as religious groups), down to dyadic relationships ("spouses, friends, and other associates") (Berger: 1969:17).
So although society is thus instrumental in shaping the moral realities of member groups and individuals, such groups and individuals will also have a reciprocal (though certainly smaller comparatively) input upon the maintenance and/or reshaping of these realities. Berger asserts that the "world is built up in the consciousness of the individual by conversation with significant others (such as parents, teachers, peers)" (1969:16). While it is not entirely clear just how these others come to be designated by the individual as "significant" (as opposed, presumably, to non-significant others), the roles or expected behaviors learned will vary in subjective import, depending on the group with which they are associated. The role activity performed in a given setting may conflict with that in another, and may even be disapproved of by the individual. When this conflict becomes too apparent and a choice of action must be made, Ullman (1965) suggests that the choice will be made in light of subjective differential value accorded to the reference groups/roles in conflict. Thus, we could assert that an individual's expressed opinions and behaviors will vary according to the values he attaches to various reference groups, whether these be national or regional within a religious organization.

Applying these notions to the subject under consideration, it may be posited that Mississippi Methodist Clergy have been caught in a role conflict situation between the moral and social norms of the southern culture in which they live, and the moral and religious norms
and values of their national culture, aligned with and exemplified in
the organizational policy demands of their denomination headquarters.

**General Theoretical Model**

Paul D. Reynolds (1971) suggests that theories may take one of
three forms: the set-of-laws form, the axiomatic form, and the causal
process form. Reynolds himself favors the last form, stating that the
"author takes the position that a sense of understanding is only
provided by statements arranged in such a way that they describe a
causal process" (106).

Since Reynolds has suggested that this particular approach to the
presentation of sociological theory is a good explication of the
concepts as well as the interrelational connection, it will be
employed here with regard to three elements of this study. These
diagrammatic representations of the theory, with their accompanying
explanations, should be helpful in fitting the theoretical model
together.

First, the general theoretic framework is offered in diagrammatic
form (Figure 1) showing the contextual or situational variables which
underlie the more specific model which will then follow. The assumed
theoretic relationships are numbered for more convenient consequent
consideration.
FIGURE 1: GENERAL MODEL OF THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.  

- **National Cultural Norms of Democracy and Equality**
- **Southern Cultural Norms Relating to Racial Prejudice**
- **Southern Religious Norms Relating to Racial Prejudice**
- **Federal Laws Relating to Integration**
- **National Methodism's Norms and Policies Relating to Racial Prejudice & Practices**
- **Non-Southern Christian Religion Norms Relating to Equality of Christians**

Arrows indicate the flow of influence:
- 1. National Cultural Norms to Southern Cultural Norms
- 2. Southern Cultural Norms to Southern Religious Norms
- 4. Federal Laws to National Methodism's Norms
- 5. National Methodism's Norms to Non-Southern Christian Religion

Factors:
- (a) Age
- (b) Education
- (c) Rel. Fund.
- (d) URB-RUR.
- (e) Clergy Perc.
1. The American standards of democracy and equality of all persons must, by its nature, allow for a certain limited freedom of thought and action. Thus, the democratic ideal made possible the inception and growth of the south's regional stance on slavery and (even after that was abolished) on racial prejudice.

2. Because these norms relating to racial prejudice infused the southern culture, and because the religious organizations of the South existed within that culture, they were strongly motivated to come up with some doctrinal justifications for the areas where conflict existed between cultural norms and Christian teachings.

3. These southern cultural and religious norms have an effect on the independent variables through the vehicle of socialization.

   (a) The older the clergyman, the more impact these southern norms will have upon his own level of racial prejudice.

   (b) The less educated the clergyman, the less he will be exposed to opposing ideologies and challenged to critical evaluation of his own belief systems.

   (c) The more traditionally oriented, the more prejudiced he is likely to be if his fundamentalism is of the southern norms justificational system.
(d) The more he perceives his congregation and community to be prejudiced, the more likely he will be to be prejudiced as well, partly as a conflict reduction mechanism.

4. American democracy, although allowing for regional differences of ideology, must eventually take action when human rights of the minority are violated for too long a time. Thus, the federal government came out with the laws relating to integration.

5. These laws became part of the motivating force behind the national Methodist Church's position on integration, both with regard to doctrinal stance and behavior.

6. Added to the formal element of federal law was also the contextual element of the national cultural norms. Combined with the foregoing two causal connections, the element of the equality of Christians under God is also assumed to have had an impact upon the Methodist policy on integration.

7. These policies, resulting in the organizational merger of previously separate black and white conferences in Mississippi, are assumed to have an impact upon clergy levels of racial discrimination and prejudice using the same patterns of reasoning employed in number 3 above.

8. The two way arrows on numbers 8 and 9 indicate somewhat similar conflict situations on a cultural and religious
level. Since it was the cultural situation in the South which caused the inception of the federal laws on integration, we have a rather direct connection. Various authors have argued that these laws have had a corresponding impact on southern cultural norms through the vehicle of enforced behavior modification.

9. This connection represents the same sort of situation as in number 8 with regard to the more specific case of Methodism on the national and regional levels.

Second, the diagram of the assumed relationships between independent and dependent variables in this study is shown (Figure 2). Partial explication of these variable relations has already been indicated above as part of the third relationship in Figure 1, but such additional brief comments as are necessary in this section have been added.

The clergy level of prejudice will be represented by a score on a prejudice scale derived from the population of ministers polled. This will be compared with the independent variables as listed. It is expected that age will have a causal impact not only because of the degree and direction of socialized prejudicial attitudes as mentioned previously, but also because there should be a positive correlation with education. The ministry is currently viewed as an occupation requiring more professional training than has been the case in years
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past, and thus younger ministers will probably be better educated than their older colleagues. Education tends to challenge a person to critically examine his own beliefs and cultural norms in order to obtain a measure of objectivity and more adequately assess other standards with which he is presented. In addition, the educational institutions of today are attended by students [and teachers] of diversified and varied backgrounds, geographical, cultural, and ideological. This means association with such people and a probable development of at least understanding of and lenience toward the views of others, if not the actual modification of one’s own views. Thus, higher education in particular is likely to act as a modifying influence on racial prejudice.

Religious fundamentalism is expected to be positively linked to racial prejudice levels only if it represents the southern fundamentalist view. It is possible to be religiously fundamental from a non-southern Christian tradition and not be prejudiced. This factor will be related to southern socialization and probably more directly to age as well.

Rural-urban location of ministry is related to perception of community attitudes. Since rural areas typically have less transient populations, there is more of a cultural holdover effect in action than in cities where the dictates of big business and industry transcend regionalism, or transplanting Northerners to the South and vice versa.
The Minister's perception of the prejudicial attitudes of his church people and community should affect his own views and/or subsequent behavior in much the same way that prevailing cultural norms will affect one's attitudes/actions. Since the clergyman is to a fairly large extent dependent upon his congregation (who are part of and, thereby, influenced by their community) in areas of moral and financial support, he will not willingly desire to alienate himself from them. Measurement of this variable is discussed later on, and it will be compared with the dependent variable as well.

Third, a simple diagrammatic representation of the comparative aspect of the study is presented as Figure 3.

In this case, through the assumed relationships already discussed, it is expected that there will be a certain amount of change in the clergy's overall level of racial prejudice, and that this should be from a more prejudiced former position to a less prejudiced latter position. It is possible that such alteration of attitude could be fairly significant, given the pressure exerted on the South to that end. However, it is not expected to be great in this case because the time period involved is not in any sense long enough to be termed a generational one; and some theorists have suggested that attitudinal change is a slow process, taking place only over generational time periods.
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Specific Hypotheses

Since it will be a major purpose of this study to explore pastors' attitudes toward integration and to link this with four major independent variables, these are given as related to the general theory presented.

Dependent Variable:

Change of attitudes of Mississippi Methodist clergymen of racial prejudice. Given the upward trend in the economic indicators mentioned earlier, it is hypothesized that these attitudes have changed over the last decade and a half from a more to a less racially prejudiced position. We need to know what kinds of variables are influential in the formation and change of such attitudes. Since the data for the Cunningham study was gathered in 1969, this aspect of the comparison will span an eleven year period and should allow some contrasts to be made. Thus, we can discover what kinds of changes, if any, have taken place.

Independent Variable #1:

Age. This variable was found by Cunningham (1969) to have only a "slight positive relationship" (27) with prejudicial attitudes. It is
expected in the current study, however, to have a stronger relationship, since the younger ministers of today are probably more liberal than their 1969 colleagues. This is consistent with Hadden and Rymph's (1967) finding that the younger ministers in their study tended to be more integrationist as well as more committed to their ideological stances. Therefore, it is expected that younger ministers will be less racially prejudiced than their older colleagues, and that the ministers of today will be less racially prejudiced than those of 1969.

Independent Variable #2:

Education. On this variable Cunningham's study showed a strong negative relationship between seminary education and prejudice (gammas = -.77). It is assumed that education is one efficient method of dispelling myths upon which prejudicial thinking is often based. Whatever the reasons, it does seem that education reduces racial prejudice. According to Jones' (1969:76) findings, "When a white Southerner goes to college the reduction in anti-Black attitudes is sizeable." Although it is also related to age, Birdston and Culver (1965) found that future ministers in seminary schools were more committed to social involvement than were older ministers. The expectation is that the more highly educated clergy will be less prejudiced than their less well educated colleagues.
Independent Variable #3:

Traditionalist/Social Actionist Role. This variable has been linked with prejudice in several studies. Nelson, Yokley and Madron (1973) discovered that in their study the pastors' protest orientation was linked not only to theological liberalism, but also to what they referred to as the problem solving role (385). Glock and Ringer (1956) also allude to a relationship between religious liberalism and prejudice, as do Stark and Glock (1969), Davis (1936), Pinder (1970), Marx (1967), and Feagin (1965). Cunningham's (1969) study discovered a positive relationship between fundamentalism and prejudice of .57, which was statistically significant at the .01 level. It is expected that ministers scoring high in traditionalism will also be highly prejudiced.

Independent Variable #4:

Rural-Urban Ministry. Although the earlier study revealed a relationship between prejudice and rural residence which was not significant (gamma = .30), it is not expected to have the same results in this study. In 1969, when the data were gathered, prejudice was probably a good deal higher everywhere. Currently, it is probable that prejudicial attitudes have moderated somewhat, and that rural
areas may have more of a hold out effect operating on them than will the urban areas. Hadden and Rymph (1966) indicate that a major factor in clergy prejudice is the demographic area in which the minister's church is located. More specifically, they report that non-metropolitan churches are considerably more conservative on racial issues than are metropolitan churches. Urban clergymen are expected to be less prejudiced than their rural colleagues.

Independent Variable #5:

Clergy Perception of Attitudinal Conflict with (a) Parishioners (b) Community and (c) Denomination. In general, it is expected that the pastor's attitude on integration will be linked to his idea of what his church people and the community think about it. This is also linked to his perception of the national Methodist position on integration and how important this is to his career. The relation between church and community is noted by Troeltsch, Yinger, and Johnson, among others, as one in which the church tends to become "broadly inclusive and representative, inevitably taking on the character of the community as a whole" (Johnson, 1975:127). Thus, the importance of church and community attitude should be a factor in the clergyman's attitude, this being somewhat balanced by denominational policy statement. This sort of role conflict is attested to by Glock and Ringer (1956), Stark and Glock (1969) and others. It is,
therefore, expected that clergymen who perceive their congregations and communities to be less prejudiced will themselves be less prejudiced.

Model Variables Research Background

In relation to the model as it has been given, a good amount of research and theoretical material has been published. That which is presented here is representative of the field dealing with the subject of this study. It is categorized with reference to its relationship with the model variables previously listed.

A. Dependent Variable

The major dependent variable under consideration in this study is the change of attitudes relating to racial prejudice among Mississippi Methodist Clergymen, indicated over a period of time. A study researching several aspects of the Methodist Church conflict over racial concerns appeared in the 1966 issue of Social Forces, and was authored by Wood and Zald. This study explores the sources of resistance on the part of the southern conference to the national Methodist organizational position concerning integration within the church. Thus, it is relevant as an assessment of Southern Methodist clergy prejudices.
In this study, the authors employ as the major theoretic principle "Selznick's concept of unanticipated consequences" (1966:255) as evidence of the breakdown of organizational control. This is modified to the context of the religious organization in question. Within the field of the sociology of religion, very few such theories have been forwarded which deal with religious organizations.

The way in which Selznick treats the relationship as a breakdown of control seems to have its roots in the work of Weber. This may be argued, especially since the relationship between laity and clergy or leadership is explored as basically a question of power vested in official sanctions able to be brought to bear by leadership as balanced by other types of power being wielded by the laity or rank and file of the organization. In this regard, Selznick's concept of unanticipated consequences is basically conceptualized by Wood and Zald as a failure of leadership to foresee not only the extent of resistance to official policy on the part of the southern branch of the denomination, but also to foresee its mode or form and its intensity or degree. Thus, it is pointed out that although the normal sanctions at the disposal of policy makers were used, they were somewhat less than effective in the particular case in question. This is argued since these sanctions, although producing what appeared to be a form of moderate success (both immediate and long term) in overcoming the resistance, in an organizational sense were less than
satisfactory.

Wood and Zald speak of the struggle within Methodism and the consequence of tangential forces within the organization resulting in at least a partial adaptation on the part of leadership. The "effect of this is what is termed as character defining commitments, which affect the organization's capacity to control its own future behavior" (255). In general, the extent to which leadership must accommodate organizational subgroups depends on the balance of sanctions which are controlled by the organization with respect to its subgroups. This is a balance which normally favors the administrative forces. To the extent that this situation actually exists, the less likely will be the occurrence of unanticipated consequences which will seriously threaten organizational policy.

With this background, Wood and Zald attempt to present three major points relative to the theoretic base presented: (1) Evidence of "observable unanticipated consequences of the Methodist Church's integration policy" (256), (2) Delineation of the "accomodation Made by Conference Leaders to the forces which lie behind these consequences," (3) Analysis of the "character defining commitments of the national Church leading to the persistence and increase of its efforts at integration" (258).

Although this work centers on an organizational focus, it still clearly shows the differences in values and norms between Methodism as a whole and its southern conferences. An unpublished work authored
and issued by a past Bishop of the United Methodist Church in Mississippi (Pendergrass, 1964) is an excellent historical fund of corroborative material. It gives the viewpoint of an integrally related source as to causes, motivations, and attempts to remedy the conflict which occurred. The Reverend Pendergrass' view is that integration can be achieved only from within the local church organization unit, and that there is a definite need for dedicated leadership — men who are willing to stay on a permanent basis with the purpose of helping, as opposed to those who want to come just for a summer. These latter are characterized as not only not helpful, but (at least by implication) as actually being a part of the problem, instead of the solution. This amounts to a declaration of discontent with the official policies of the parent organization, revealing dispute and discontent with the established bureaucracy, which correlates with Wood and Zald's assessment of the basis for southern resistance to National policy.

Hinnings' and Foster's (1973) model of church organization based on Harrison's (1959) and Fichter's (1961) comparisons of religious organizations with secular organizations suggests that both types of organizations are forced to develop bureaucratic structures as they become older and larger. Roll expectations and, therefore, individuals within these organizations are not only affected by societal norms, as White suggests, but by bureaucratic norms as well.
Hoge and Faue (1973) compare what they see as the five basic conceptual positions in religious organizational theory in an analysis of possible issues which might be expected to generate intradenominational conflict. Although their sphere of issues did not cover contentious policy statements intended to be implemented on a denomination-wide scale, they did deal with the general subject of theological or ideological issues. "The present church conflict is not so much a generational conflict, a clergy-laity conflict, or a class conflict, as a theological conflict resulting from competing theological orientations within the denomination" (193). The church group used in this study was the Presbyterian denomination, which while somewhat similar to Methodism, also has some differences, making it difficult to know how far parallels can be made to apply. Also, it is not clear that the modes of expression related to their topic of study were utilized as symbology directly related to core theological and/or doctrinal issues, as compared with overlying justificatory mechanisms related to other areas of concern such as cultural influences. In the case of the Methodist Church, those factors bearing upon the racial attitudes of the Mississippi clergy are explored with the intention of discovering what cultural and perceptive factors are evidenced in seemingly doctrinally oriented controversy.

Benson and Dorsett (1971) want to get away from the commonly used church-sect theory, which is seen as a theoretic position of limited
value, and develop a more powerful conceptual scheme composed of what is referred to as "four dimensions of religious groups as organizations: bureaucratization, professionalization (of the clerical role), secularization and integration" (139). Some of the major conclusions of the authors are that organizational direction will be determined, among other factors, by the direction and degree of extra-organizational pressure. In this regard the community is seen as the most important source of pressure toward "integration" ("rejection of a segmented or exclusive position relative to other churches or organizations") (140).

Thus, the unanticipated consequences observed (adverse regional reaction to national Methodist rulings on intradenominational integration) can be seen in light of the fact of the denominational split between North and South. Although this was later resolved, its existence would have fostered the perception on the part of the South of themselves as a separate entity with resulting development of separate bureaucratic structure. This feature, combined with the ideological differences as exemplified by Pendergrass (the importance of which is stressed by Hoge and Faue 1973), forms a base for the initial resistance to what was essentially a policy of integration initiated by the North. When we add to this Benson and Dorsett's (1971) theory that the religious organization is influenced to a significant degree by pressure from surrounding cultural context toward integration, the resulting organizational disruption becomes
clearer. With the passing of time, however, these separatist organizational perceptions should diminish, especially as there is increased national organizational firmness with respect to the policy in question, and especially if there are any changes in regional cultural or community attitudes. Thus, change of clergy attitudes within a given religious organization may be posited under certain conditions, which are discussed more fully as the independent variables.

B. Independent Variables

As has been indicated, one of the important underlying roots of the independent variables felt to have an impact on the conflict under discussion is related to regional cultural norms. Silver (1963), along with others, takes the position that the racial distinction between black and white in the South has a political-economic base rather than a religious one. In order to understand the religious involvement within the larger issue, it is necessary to see that the religious group in question is an inextricable segment of the larger society of which it is a part.

White (1972) argues that one cannot fail to take American culture into account in understanding American religious organizations (as compared with their European counterparts). Thus, an integral point here is the impact upon Mississippi Methodism of the combination of
American culture as a whole combined with that of southern cultural values and norms. Therefore, those publications dealt with in the theory section which explored secular cultural conditions in the South are interpreted as an aid in understanding the religious element also. Silver (1963) claims that the closed value system of the South with its segregationist and racist tenets remained undiluted to the extent that it could be used as a moral justificatory mechanism for actions taken within religious contexts which could otherwise have been perceived by their instigators as being of negative moral worth. This was particularly true within the larger framework of Christianity, which theoretically stresses the worth of the individual, the equality of men before God, and the basic brotherhood, if not of all mankind, at least of all Christians.²

Since these beliefs or values are not in accordance with actions taken by self designated Christian churches in the South, the resulting contradiction of value systems and role conflict would seem to have demanded some attempt at resolution. Such attempted resolution in most cases took the form of doctrinal systems, which endeavored to justify in a theological sense the segregation and related phenomena characterizing these religious organizations. As an example of this Stark and Glock (1968) explore the relationship between theological beliefs and attitudes concerning prejudice. Relative to this relationship they make the point that certain theological positions have a definite relation to racial prejudice.
One such position is the doctrine of the free will of man. "The significance of this for prejudice is that radical and traditional Christian images of man prompt those who hold them to put the blame for disadvantage upon the individuals who are disadvantaged" (81), resulting in the specific application that blacks are responsible for their own lowly position in society because they could better themselves if they wanted to. Therefore, the result of this thinking is that black people are further disadvantaged, either through the withholding of opportunities because of their supposed laziness or undependability, or through a paternalistic attitude which prompts the white, as a self-perceived superior, to care for them, thus again effectively closing many avenues of opportunity.

As previously mentioned, the portrayal of southern thought systems is necessary to the understanding of religious attitudes. Integral to this is Silver's assertion that southerners actually believe in the biological superiority of the white race and the inferiority of the black. This is true to the extent that blacks are perceived as little better than animals or lower life forms at worst, and as feeble minded or deficient humans at best. This attitude led to the outright exploitation of the black race by the unscrupulous and to a protective stance such as one might adopt toward a retarded child on the part of those who considered themselves morally upright, responsible citizens. But in both cases the inferiority of the black person was assumed with the result that blacks "were deprived of their
constitutional rights by intimidation, violence and fraud" (Silver, 1963:16). Silver lays a good deal of stress upon the process of socialization by which Mississippians were almost literally brainwashed into believing in the notion of biological inferiority of blacks by virtue of the fact that no other opinions on the matter were allowed to be voiced (hence his designation of Mississippi as a closed society). Of the role of organized religion he states that "the church played a principle role in the formulation of the orthodox (segregationist) view in the 1950's" (53), and although in the fifties many clergy are admitted to have taken integrationist stands, "the church as a whole placed its banner with the status quo," (53) torturing "the Scriptures into sacred sanction for inequality and inhumanity" (54).

Berger (1961) also speaks of religion as having an integrative function whereby it affirms the legitimacy of other aspects of the culture. In this connection religious ideology as a situational definition is actually a "set of ideas serving the vested interests of a particular social group. In this sense ideology may be described as the sociological parallel to the psychological concept of rationalization" (1961:53). For our purposes this explanation refers to a particular ethnic as well as social group, which does not in any way do violence to Berger's assertion. In fact this association is pointed out in his remark that "eleven o'clock on Sunday morning marks the beginning of the most segregated hour in America," a fact which
"troubles the conscience of many American Christians, and not only in the South" (1961:73).

Berger further argues that there is a strong connection between racial and class segregation, which is all made tolerable by constructing religious realities which serve to justify this kind of conduct from both class and racial perspectives. Furthermore, it is stated that both sides in the conflict are expected to have their religious justification.

Religion functions in similar fashion, sociologically speaking, when it gives sacred sanction to the integrationist goal as when it identifies the segregationist status quo with the divine will. In both cases it is operating as a social religion in the service of a particular group. It just happens that the interests of one group demand radical change while those of the other call for conservative defensiveness. (1961:87).

The social construction of reality perspective would assert that the average Mississippi Parishioner within the Methodist Church firmly believed in the moral rightness of his position. White's theory would suggest that these same people, having also been reared to the greater American cultural heritage of the right of every person to his own religious beliefs, were acting in what they considered to be a right and moral fashion in rejecting an integrationist policy from their denominational headquarters.

The major point that White makes is that religious organizations are affected fundamentally by the norms of the culture in which they
exist. Thus, American church organizations are infused with the concept of democracy and so White contends that centralized authority systems are effective only in normal or non-crisis situations. However, when any form of deep controversy enters the scene, "trends toward decentralization will occur" (1972:107). This concept is argued to have a direct bearing on the intra-organizational conflict within the Methodist Church as the controversial policy on integration was issued.

The idea of cultural factors acting as independent variables in relation to religious organizations is not unusual in sociological literature, and although White's approach to the subject is rather novel with its emphasis on constituting norms, there are other sources which offer corroborative material. Almost any text in the history of religion will furnish ample evidence of White's assertion that religious centralized authority systems break down in crisis situations, especially those in which there are belief or behavior oriented challenges to these systems. Numerous religious sects and denominations which have broken away from larger organizations bear testimony to the general working out of this principle.

Feagin and Hahn's (1970) article provides additional background material concerning the political climate in the South during and after the years of integration and primarily with the rise of the black man from the interrelated perspectives of politics and demography. This may be viewed as an agitation factor within the
religious topic of study to southern whites since their perception is that their entire way of life is being threatened by the prospect of integration.

Sommerfield's (1968) contribution is more theoretic in nature, using McKinney's (1968) notion of constructed types to come up with what he sees as "three major conceptual types: Famileal, Democratic, and dominical" (181). Although Sommerfield does not posit the all-pervasive effect of the cultural impact of American democracy upon religious institutions as does White, yet his democratic type suggests similar effects upon the behavioral patterns of organizational bodies so designated. As a further point of interest, Sommerfield includes American Methodism as being in this particular classification or type.

Nelsen and Yokley's (1973) study of Presbyterians and Church pronouncements is also an effort to explore the effects of denominational policy statements or attitudes of members with regard to compliance behavior.

Finally in connection with the notion of the relationship between culture and religious prejudicial attitudes and behavior, Pinder (1970) provides a good summary historical analysis of Wesleyan Methodism in American, especially with reference to its philosophical and doctrinal evolution. Pinder discusses Methodism in the context of its cultural milieu and includes his own analytic judgements concerning its social aspects rather than treating it solely as a religiously oriented movement. The basic theoretic subject material
concerns the nature of secularization as related to Methodism, giving it relevance not only in the fact of its treatment of the Methodist denomination, but also because of its conceptual approach to the area, which may be compared with both Durkheim and Berger's theoretic systems as well as that of role theory.

As Berger (1968) has suggested, the causal impact of culture upon religion is actually in the nature of a reciprocal relationship. Since the concept of the holy is formed within the context of the cultural framework, and in turn, the designation of religious reality has a direct bearing upon acceptance or rejection in the formulation of various cultural norms, the relationship between religion and culture is posited as one which will have a good deal of explanatory power in religious organizational behavior and attitude.

In looking at the role relationships of the clergy, the subject of the changing role of the minister vis-a-vis his congregation and also his superiors within the denomination may also be seen as relating to the area of social change. The thesis of Berger in this regard is interesting since his postulated process of reciprocation seems to be in evidence in Wood and Zald's (1960) observation that cultural factors represented by the policy of integration have a definite impact among the younger clergymen, especially while the prevailing religious mores expressed by the southern group represented a countervailing force from within the local congregations which was expressed through the vehicle of religious justifications.
To this point it has been stated that the major point of interest in this study is attitudes concerning racial prejudice on the part of Mississippi Methodist clergymen. A combination of organizational theory with Berger's ideas of the social construction of reality has been utilized so that the importance of the next theoretical addition may be seen as a unifying element. It is generally conceded that role theory is capable of utilization both within organizational theory and the framework of Berger's theoretical construction. It is argued that it may serve as a unifying element in this case between the two. We have discussed cultural impact upon the organization. What impact does the organization have in conjunction with cultural influences on the clergy as a group and as individuals? The answer to this lies largely within the area of role theory, since actions and attitudes are both part of role expectations and, therefore, of individual or group perception of what is seen as proper behavior in any given set of circumstances. "The institution is there, external and coercive, imposing its predefined patterns upon the individual in this particular area of his life. The same objectivity belongs to the roles that the individual is expected to play in the institutional context in question" (Berger, 1969:13). Therefore, both the attitudes and behaviors of clergy must be seen in the context of their organizational roles as clergy.

With relation to clergy-organization-congregation roles, it might be said that integral to the performance of duties, including not only
what is done, but also how it is done, is the perception of position and of responsibilities to be performed. One of the most important elements in the religious role positioning is a definition of the situation in which there is consensus concerning why we are here, what is to be done, and how it is to be accomplished. The individual's perception of what is to be done, or appropriate behavior within a given social context, is usually designated as role cognition (Banton, 1965:28).

Role is defined by Michael Banton as "clusters of rights and obligations" in relation to an individual's membership in a "social unit" (1965:2), while Goffman sees a social role as the "enactment of rights and duties attached to a given status" (1959:16). Broom and Selznick define role as "a pattern of behavior associated with a status or social position" (1973:36), and Gross et. al. see it as a "set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a particular position" (1958:59). From these sources we can see that the general idea of role is of that which gives order to social existence -- that which one may expect from a recurring social situation, as well as that which is expected (Banton, 1965:28). In very simple terms the way in which an individual acts or behaves according to expectations in a given circumstance constitutes his role.

Roles change and vary with the social setting: one would not be expected to act the same way in his role as father in relationship with his children as he would in his role as teacher in relationship
with his students. Changes in behavior or role performance can also be expected from one time to the next even within the same role. As Broom and Selznick point out: "actual role behavior is always subject to the pressures and opportunities of a specific social setting at a specific time," and is "also conditioned by the individual's personality and past experience" (1973:37).

According to role theory each individual has many roles corresponding to his many statuses (Broom and Selznick, 1973:35), and each status as well demands a bundle of interrelated roles termed a role set (Banton, 1965:28). The status of teacher, for example, will carry with it expectations of students concerning proper behavior, as well as those of colleagues, superiors, union officials, and the public. These expectations, and the resultant pattern of conformant behavior constitutes "an array of associated roles" (Merton, 1968:423).

The application or playing out of a role in a given social setting is a dynamic, on-going experience and may require instant changeovers or taking up of an intermediate position as, for example, a teacher interrupted during the teaching of his class by his principal who carries on a conversation in front of the pupils thus requiring a change of roles from teacher to employee, and, when the principal leaves, back again to teacher. The change of roles may not be complete, however, as the teacher may not feel that he can be as subservient and humble in front of his class, to which he is an
authority figure, as he might well be were it not for their presence.

The dominant role in a role set at any given point of time will depend not only on the "pressures and opportunities of the specific social setting at a specific time" (Broom & Selznick, 1973:37), but also on the individual's interpretation of those pressures and opportunities according to his own value structure or system of priorities.

Stebbins says that "a role (more likely, part of it) both helps guide the defining of the situation and serves as part of the resulting definition itself" (1971:384). This defining of the situation affects the way in which the role is played out and precludes the usefulness of a simple stimulus — response model such as that postulated by B. F. Skinner (1953) because individuals will not always respond to role expectations in the same way.

The general role expectations invariably are filtered through the person's interpretative apparatus, which results in their modification as they are accommodated by (the individual) to his situated needs (Stebbins, 1971:385).

When role expectations do not coincide, the individual will then be forced to make choices in a conflict situation as to what action to take, or what role to favor. Burchard (1954:535) says that the role which provides him with his principle identification will be most likely to be enacted, while Ullman (1965:344) hypothesizes that the role chosen will probably be that one associated with the reference group having the highest priority. In this latter case, however, role
priority, as indicated by choice in conflicting situation, is attributed to reference group priority and, in the former case, to what amounts to a personal value system based on a type of ego fulfillment. Both of these views effectively avoid the issue by boiling the choice down to one based on a personal value structure without saying much about the motivations leading to the priority systems alluded to.

Parson's interpretation of values is that they exist as the result of internalization of primary socialization forces (Parsons & Shills, 1956). Blau, on the other hand, appears to think that all values and motivations, even seemingly selfless ones, stem from an "underlying egoism" (Blau, 1964) which is seen as a kind of inbuilt trait of all humanity.

Thus, the question as it applies to this study is: what role choices available to the clergyman will be chosen in conflicting situations where cultural and organizational role expectations may demand behavior contrary to more general religious values? Clearly some priority must be established so that if conflict occurs it may be adequately resolved. One possible direction in this problem may be found in the salience of roles themselves.

One could view role priorities in a composit light wherein attitudes and actions stem from a basic posture of self interest shaped by socialization and interpreted through past experience in any given situation. This postulated system whereby values are built up
and may to some degree be the "interpretative apparatus" (1971:385) of which Stabbins speaks and which results in role expectation modification to individual situational needs.

Using this as an assumption of value establishing procedure, it is not difficult to deduce that especially for clergy their profession will rank fairly high in their system of role priorities, since economic considerations are high in the value structure of our North American culture. This will probably be true to a greater degree if a good deal of investment has gone into the profession, such as education or training which must be financed.

Broom & Selznick point out this difference by observing that "for many people an occupation or profession is a salient status", whereas that which is designated as a job "is less salient and consequently tells little about the individual who fills it except how he earns his living" (1975:35). A salient status will tend to "fix the identity of the person who occupies it if a large part of the individual's life is organized around it, or if the status has a special symbolic significance" (Broom & Selznick, 1975:35). Obviously, then for most ministers, their profession will require a major portion of their life to be organized around it, both from the point of view of time and of economic considerations, thus affecting and acting back upon their social identity and self perception. In connection with this David (1936) discusses ways in which Protestant clergy assess their own roles with respect to integration, and explores the impact of social
milieu upon these perceptions.

Nelsen, Yokley and Madron (1973) discuss clergy roles in relation to integration, again with an approach which deals with self concepts of the individuals. Not too surprisingly they report that traditionalist ministers are not prone to be protest oriented and that this orientation is rather linked to theological liberalism and to the problem solving or social action role. This former assertion is linked to one of the hypothetical contentions of this study.

Hadden and Rymph (1967) in a case study of Protestant clergymen discuss the problem of role conflict experienced by southern ministers. One interesting contention is that leadership in integrative action must come from the North because southern ministers were viewed as being too dependent on their membership reference system. These studies link secular organizational role theory with the area of religious organizations and provide a link with the analysis in the case of the Methodist Church.

In addition, Glock and Ringer's (1956) study brings out the assertion that in the whole area of social issues in general, the religious professionals or leadership are more liberal than the laity, who tend to retain a more conservative point of view. This contention seems to correspond well with the situation of Mississippi Methodism during the 1960's, in which the Methodist Laymen's Organization played a large part for the conservative element.

Feagins (1965) study of southern fundamentalists uses Allport's
(1958) theoretic concept concerning the importance of an hypothesized intrinsic-extrinsic spectrum indicating the degree of interiorization of religious socialization processes. Feagin reports that for Southern Baptists, the more extrinsic, the more prejudiced they are likely to be. In other words, one's theological position is not as important as its integration into everyday life.

The aspect of role theory is again indicated by Campbell and Pettigrew's (1959) study concerning the role conflict experienced by Little Rock Protestant Ministers. Not only was this conflict experienced as a result of external contradictory expectations, but also as a result of self expectations at variance with external role pressures. With regard to the clergymen under consideration, the authors "distinguish three systems as relevant to his behavior: the self reference system (SRS), the professional reference system (PRS), and the membership reference system (MRS)" (513). This model can be seen as complementary in considering the kinds of role conflicting pressures to which Mississippi Methodist Clergymen were also subject, since it includes the relevant independent factors of congregation, organization and self perception.

**Summary**

Emile Durkheim was one of the first sociologists to posit a connection between society and religion. He felt that one's cultural
surroundings shaped individuals, giving them all that they needed to become members of society. Therefore, their response to this situation came in the mystical form of personifying society and then deifying it so that man himself builds his god from his society. Thus, culture, moral life, and religion have a common origin. Peter Berger adds a dialectic element by asserting that not only does society form the individual, but the process is also reversed in that the individual contributes to the creation of society as a process of group designation of reality.

O. K. White sharpens the focus by designating certain societal norms as causal inputs into religious organizational behavior. This is taken still further by the assertion that subcultural influences within a society will also affect both attitudes and behavior of individuals and groups within that society. This is applied to Methodist clergymen in Mississippi with relation to prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behavior concerning the national body’s ruling on integration of the denomination. The principle is seen as working through the specific vehicles of age, educational level, religious fundamentalism, rural-urban parish or ministry, and the clergy’s perception of the extent of prejudicial attitudes of congregation and community.

Because of the intervention of federal law in southern society, forcing integration on the culture as a whole, certain changes in regional prejudicial attitudes were posited as having an effect for
change on prejudicial attitudes of clergy. Various theoretical works and studies were reported on from the literature as they appeared relevant to the general theoretical position and model, and role theory was introduced as a possible unifying factor between the areas of organizational theory and social construction of reality theory. Basically the clergyman's assessment of salient role status, operating through the independent variable, is suggested as having an impact on both attitudes and behavior.

Some objection might be made to the combination of such traditionally diverse paradigms as represented by Durkheim and Berger. Ritzer (1981) argues, however, that not only may such cross paradigmatic alliances take place, they should even be seen as complementary parts of an overall system of sociological theory. Thus, although Durkheim is traditionally cast in the social factalist camp, Ritzer maintains that many of his concepts, such as "anomie, egoism, and altruism, clearly do not have a material existence, although they may have a material effect by causing differences in suicide rates" (p. 18). It could be similarly argued that his notion of the nature and social origin of God fits much more consistently within the framework of the social construction of reality school of thought.

Thus, this study proposes to pursue a rather eclectic theoretical base in accordance with Ritzer's admonitions toward an integrated sociological paradigm, which, if it needs labelling, might be seen as
a generally social psychological approach to the problem.
Footnotes

1 It is to be noted that the term integration, as Benson and Dorsett (1971) use it, does not refer to racial integration, but rather to a kind of ideological integration with other parallel organizations and ultimately with the community itself. Thus, in the case of Southern Methodism, pressure is exerted against racial integration.

2 For a thorough presentation of this ideological, or theological position, see Hilrie Shelton Smith's In His Image, But—.

3 For Figures 2 and 3 the arrows used in the diagramatic construction do not necessarily indicate causal relationships.
CHAPTER IV

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the methodological procedures employed in the collection of data, sampling, measurement of the variables, and statistical techniques used in organizing the data and assessing the variable relationships.

Given the objectives of the study, three data sources are utilized. A brief description of these sources provides the necessary background to understand the complexity of the research design. The data sources for this study consist of the following:

1. 1969 survey of the clergy
2. 1980 survey of the clergy
3. Official records of the Mississippi Conference

The 1969 Survey

The first data source is a 1969 survey of Mississippi Methodist clergy. The focus of the study was an examination of clergy attitudes regarding racial prejudice.

The data were collected from a sample of 118 white male ministers
in attendance at the Mississippi Annual Conference in the summer of 1969. The questionnaire was administered to 242 clergy on the opening day of the Annual Conference in Jackson, Mississippi. the clergy were asked to respond to the questionnaire and return it to the researcher by the end of the conference. The 118 returned questionnaires represent approximately 48 percent of the clergy in the Mississippi Conference.

The 1980 Survey

The 1980 survey of Mississippi Methodist Clergy represents an eleven year follow-up of the 1969 survey. Items measuring the dependent variable and several of the independent variables are identical in both surveys. However, several additional independent variables were measured in the 1980 survey of the clergy.

Since it was indicated by one of the district superintendents that past efforts at mailed questionnaires to the clergy in the Mississippi Conference had limited success (in some cases, a return of only 19%), it was suggested that questionnaires be taken to the summer clergy conferences held at the district level. After securing the Bishop's permission to conduct the survey, members of the research team were present at all of these district conferences. Clergy present were encouraged by their district superintendents to complete the questionnaires given to them. In many cases the questionnaires
were immediately completed, but in other cases, the ministers were provided with stamped, self-addressed envelopes and requested to return the questionnaires by mail shortly.

All of the ministers were not present at the district meetings, necessitating an alternative data collection strategy. Thus, a complete list of the clergy for each district was obtained from the district superintendents, and those clergy not present at their district meetings were mailed a questionnaire accompanied by a letter from their district superintendent requesting that they participate in the study. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was provided the clergy to enhance response.

Using the two approaches above, a total of 244 ministers received the questionnaires. Of the 244 questionnaires administered to the clergy, 164 (67.2 percent) returned them within a short period of time. No effort was made to send follow-up letters to those failing to return questionnaires.

The Official Records

The third source of data is obtained from the Records of the Mississippi Annual Conference published in the Official Journal of the Mississippi Conference, 1968-1979. Along with the various reports on the proceedings of the conference for the past year, the Journal presents a complete record of each church in the Annual Conference.
Information relevant to this study was compiled from the financial data concerning contributions to Race Relations, World Services, and the Interdenominational Cooperative Fund. In addition, data relative to the number of churches giving to these funds were also recorded as part of the data set for this study.

Since the official records are used as a data source, a brief description of each of the funds is necessary to provide insight as to their utility in the research.

1. Race Relations Fund. This fund is a special offering that is collected on Race Relations Sunday. The funds are forwarded to the General Board of the United Methodist Church to be used in establishing better relations among the world's races, and to eliminate injustice and discrimination from society. It is one of those "special" offerings recommended by the General Conference. As such it is an institutionalized part of the Methodist Church. However, it is left to the discretion of the local pastor to observe Race Relations Sunday (usually, it is observed on the third Sunday in October).

2. World Service Fund. This fund is an apportioned aspect of the local church's budget. That is, it is required of each church, and the amount apportioned is determined by a committee of ministers and laymen at the district level. The
Local church has no input into the amount apportioned. It does determine, however, how much of the apportioned amount will be paid by the local church during the fiscal year.

3. Interdenominational Cooperative Fund. This fund, like World Service, is an apportioned amount and the only control that the local church has over it is the amount given. Some of the proceeds to this fund support the program of the World Council of Churches.

Data for this study were obtained by systematically going through each yearly journal, noting total contributions to each of three separate funds, and then counting the number of churches which had contributed during that year. It should be noted that the name of the Race Relations Fund was changed to Human Relations Day Fund in 1974, but its purpose in regard to the policy of the United Methodist Church remained virtually unchanged in subsequent years.

Data relative to such contributions as support of the Interdenominational Cooperative Fund, World Service Fund, and Race Relations Sunday are utilized as indicators of the extent to which the Mississippi Annual Conference supported the racial policies of the United Methodist Church. They serve also as an indicator to the degree to which the clergy in Mississippi supported the policy of an inclusive church. As such the data provide additional support or information concerning the conflicts and changes in Mississippi Methodism as well as the time frame in which they were registered.
**Problems Inherent in the Official Records**

Systematic codification of data from the Official Records was not without problems. The coding scheme worked well from 1969 to 1973. During this period of time records were kept separately for the white and black Annual Conferences. However, in 1973, the process of merging the two conferences (black and white) was initiated, and the records for the two annual conferences were handled separately in the Official Journal. In 1974, the merger was completed and black and white statistics on contributions of the churches were combined.

For comparative purposes it was necessary to obtain data on white churches only. The Official Records in the Journal, beginning in 1974, presented a problem in that the black churches were not differentiated from the white churches. Fortunately, a separate list of the black churches appeared in the 1973 edition of the Journal. This list enabled us to delete the black churches from the study. This procedure allowed valid comparative statistics to be gathered through 1979.

**Measurement of the Variables**

Measurement is a crucial aspect of empirical research. Accordingly, the techniques of measurement for the questionnaire data
and official records are presented in the following sections.

The Dependent Variable: Racial Prejudice

The dependent variable in this study, racial prejudice, is measured from clergy responses to five questions administered via questionnaire. The same questions were used in the 1969 and 1980 surveys to insure comparability. Responses to the questions were fixed-choice Likert type, i.e., strongly agree, agree, etc., (for some items the responses strongly approve, approve, etc., were used instead of strongly agree, agree, etc., but do not present difficulty for the study in that the same numerical values were assigned to the corresponding responses).

The five items measuring racial prejudice are as follows:

1. What do you think about integrated public school classrooms?
2. Apart from skin color, there are no differences between Blacks and Whites.
3. Blacks should be granted greater political power.
4. Blacks are pushing too hard for equal rights.
5. Blacks should be satisfied with separate but equal treatment in education, housing, and jobs.

Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients for these items were calculated, and are shown, along with their respective means and standard deviations, in Table 1. Pearson r's for the 1969 data are
presented in the upper half of the Table, and the means and standard deviations are shown in the right hand margins. The correlation coefficients, means and standard deviations for the 1980 data are presented in the lower half of Table 1.

The mean inter-item correlation coefficients are .441 for the 1969 data, and .442 for the 1980 data. Mean r's of this magnitude indicate that the items correlate significantly with one another.

In order to determine the scalability of the five items, principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was used. To further refine the scale the final solution was based on an oblique rotation of the factors. The five items forming the scale and their factor loadings for the 1969 and 1980 studies are presented in Table 2.

As may be seen from the factor loadings in Table 2, all of the items forming the prejudice scale are well above the .40 level. It should be noted that the magnitude of the factor loadings for each of the items varies slightly from the 1969 study to the 1980 study. The differences in the magnitude of the factor loadings do not adversely affect the scalability of the items.

Scores on the prejudice scale were obtained by weighting the items as follows: strongly agree was given a score of 1, agree was assigned a score of 2, undecided was given a score of 3, disagree was assigned a score of 4, and strongly disagree was given a value of 5; and then summing across the items. Weightings were reversed for items
TABLE 1: Inter-item Correlation Coefficients, Means and Standard Deviations for Items Indicating Racial Prejudice of Clergy: 1969 and 1980. (Items one through three are scored directly and items four and five are scored inversly, so that in all cases 1= low prejudice and 5= high prejudice scores)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>X's</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>2.747</td>
<td>1.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>2.981</td>
<td>1.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>2.327</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>3.327</td>
<td>1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.710</td>
<td>1.318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1980

| X's  | 1.894 | 2.742 | 2.450 | 2.728 | 2.007 |
| S    | .910  | 1.293 | 1.081 | 1.019 | .934  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>FACTOR LOADING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What do you think about integrated public school classroom?</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apart from skin color, there are no differences between Negroes and Whites.</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negroes should be granted greater political power.</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Negroes are pushing too hard for equal rights.</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Negroes should be satisfied with separate but equal treatment in education, housing and jobs.</td>
<td>.867 .820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
four and five on the scale since, for these items, the strongly agree category represents the highest degree of prejudice rather than lowest. The range of the scores for the prejudice scale is 5-25, with 5 representing least prejudicial attitude and 25 most prejudicial. The mean respondent score on the prejudice scale is 13.82 for 1969 and 11.82 for 1980. Scores from the scale were used as a quantitative indicator of the extent to which clergy express prejudicial attitudes.

The Independent Variables

The independent variables in this study are Age, Education, Traditionalist/Social Actionist Role, Rural-urban Ministry, and Clergy Perception of Attitudinal Conflict with Parishioners, Community, and Denomination.

The processes of measuring these variables are discussed below under separate headings.

1. Age of Clergy.

Age of clergy in the 1980 study was measured by asking the clergy the following question:

What was your age at your last birthday?

Responses to the question represent age measured on a continuous scale. Age in the 1969 study was determined by asking the minister to select the age category appropriate
for his age. The categories reflecting age are as follow:

1. Under 24
2. 24-29
3. 30-34
4. 35-39
5. 40-49
6. 50-59
7. 60-69
8. 70-79
9. 80 plus

2. Education of Clergy.

Educational level of the clergy in the 1980 survey was determined by asking the ministers to indicate the highest seminary degree that they held. Choices for this item were:

1. Bachelors of Divinity
2. Masters of Divinity
3. Doctorate of Ministry
4. Other, please specify ____________________.

For the 1989 study, this variable was measured by the question:

What is the highest level of special education for the ministry that you have attained?

Choices for this item were:
1. Conference course of study (correspondence)
2. Bible School or Institute
3. Some Seminary
4. Seminary graduate
5. Graduate work beyond Seminary
6. Other

For purposes of this study educational level of clergy was determined by dichotomizing responses to the educational question (for both studies) into two discrete categories: (1) those without a seminary degree, and (2) those with a seminary degree. Thus, for the 1980 survey, any answer to this item indicated those with a degree while those without a degree were represented by non-respondents. For 1969, the cutting point was between the categories of: "some seminary", and "seminary graduate".

3. Role Orientation of Clergy.

Although social actionism and traditionalism have often been treated in the literature as opposite sides of the same coin, it is not clear theoretically that the absence of one necessitates the presence of the other. It is at least conceivable that ministers may be both traditionalist and social actionist at once, as well as liberal and non-social action oriented. For this reason these two role aspects were
treated separately, rather than as antithetical ends of a single scale.

3. (a) Traditionalism.

In order to ascertain presence or absence of tendencies toward the traditionalist role in the 1980 survey, the ministers were asked to indicate how much they usually enjoyed each of the pastoral role activities listed as:

1. Pastoral counseling with individuals who have problems
2. Preaching (including sermon preparation)
3. Calling on church members
4. Teaching and training adults or youth
5. Visiting the sick and bereaved

Each of these statements were scored on a scale from one to six, with one represented as "Enjoy Very Much", while six was represented as "Dislike Very Much". Correlation Coefficients for the five items were calculated and are presented in Table 3.

The mean inter-item correlation is .494, indicating that the items in this scale correlate significantly with one another. In order to ascertain the common structure of these items, a principle components factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to determine the scalability of the items. The factor loadings for the five items are shown in Table 4.
TABLE 3: Inter-item Correlation Coefficients, Means and Standard Deviations for Items Indicating Tendency Toward Traditional Role Orientation: 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X's 2.283 1.750 2.241 2.355 2.125
S 1.051 1.147 1.182 1.198 1.129
TABLE 4: Items and Factor Loadings for Items Indicating Clergy Tendency Toward Traditional Role Orientation: 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>FACTOR LOADING 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate how much you usually enjoy each of the pastoral activities listed below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pastoral counseling with individuals who have problems.</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Preaching (including sermon preparation).</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Calling on church members.</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching and training adults or youth.</td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Visiting the sick and bereaved.</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the 1969 survey the questions intended to indicate the presence/absence of the traditionalist role were answered by rank ordering the items. Because this procedure necessitated a full range of choices from one to six, whereas the 1980 item allowed repeated scores, it resulted in low and negative correlations, and in the formation of two factors with some negative loadings. Thus, traditionalism is not reported on for the 1969 study.

3. (b) Actionist Role.

The social actionist role of the clergy was measured by a two item scale which asks questions about the extent to which the ministers feel that they should become involved in social issues. The questions measuring social action stance of the clergy are as follow:

1. As a minister of a local church do you think that you should be concerned with racial discrimination?
2. Do you think that a minister should be a leader for social change?

Item one employed the response categories: (1) Should not be concerned with this, (2) Should only express opinion on this, (3) Should actively engage in this, and (4) No opinion. For this item, four was deleted, and number one scored as five, number two as three, and number three as one. For item two,
a five choice response pattern from strongly agree to strongly disagree was scored from 1 to 5, with the low score representing strong agreement. The range of scores is from 3 to 10. Correlational coefficients for these items are shown in Table 5.

The inter-item correlation coefficients as reported are .560 for the 1969 data set and .345 for the 1980. Although the correlation among the 1980 items is not as strong as that for those of the 1969 study, the measure is still useful as a means of comparison.

Principal components factor analysis is employed to assess the consistency of the scale items. The factor loadings for these items are .883 for 1969 and .820 for 1980.5

3. (c) Religious Beliefs.

In order to ascertain clergy belief systems as pertaining to religious liberalism/fundamentalism, the ministers were asked, via questionnaire to indicate how they felt about the following statements:

1. Jesus was born of a Virgin
2. The devil actually exists
3. There is life beyond death

A correlational matrix showing inter-item correlation coefficients for the 1969 and 1980 studies are presented in Table 6.
TABLE 5: Inter-item Correlation Coefficients, Mean and Standard Deviations for Items Indicating Tendency Toward Clergy Identification with the Social Actionist Role: 1969 and 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X's</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X's</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1980

| X's  | 4.418| 4.026| 4.830|
| S    | .936 | 1.385| .548 |
The mean inter-item correlation coefficients for the 1969 data in Table 9 is .577, and for the 1980 data is .427. As in Table 1, the upper half of the table give the Pearson r's for the 1969 data, with the means and standard deviations to the right. The bottom half of the table presents the same statistics for the 1980 data.

In order to ascertain the scalability of the items comprising this scale, principle component factor analysis with oblique rotation was employed. The factor loadings for the three items for the 1969 and 1980 data are presented in Table 7.

Scores for this scale were obtained by assigning the numerical weightings to the response categories as previously indicated. These statement scores were then summed across all items, giving a range for the scale of from 3 to 15.

4. Size of Community in which Clergyman's Church is located.

The size of the community in which the clergy reside is determined by the following question:

What is the population of the community, town or city which your church is located?

Choices for this question were:

1. Open country
2. Less than 350
3. 350-999
4. 1,000-2,499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jesus was born of a Virgin.</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The devil actually exists.</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is life beyond death.</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. (a) Clergy Perception of Community Attitude Toward Prejudice. The perception of the clergymen concerning their parishioner's attitude toward racial prejudice was ascertained in the 1980 survey through the use of two questions:

1. How do you think your congregation feels about your concern on racial discrimination?

2. How does your congregation feel about integrated public school classrooms?

These items were factor analyzed, and the factor loading was found to be .883.5
For this variable, no comparable data are available from the 1969 study. Some questions were included in the 1980 questionnaire which did not appear in the earlier study. Thus only some of the variables are comparable across both studies. These are indicated by the designation in the tables of both sets of data. The correlation coefficient for this variable is .492.

By scoring the response pattern as indicated, the variable was measured on a four point scoring scale. The minimum score is 2 and the maximum 8.

The correlational matrix for the inter-item correlation coefficients, with means and standard deviations, is presented in Table 8.

5. (b) Clergy Perception of Community Attitude Toward Racial Integration.

The perception of the ministers with regard to their communities' attitude toward racial integration was ascertained in the 1980 survey by asking:

1. How do you think your community feels about your concern on racial discrimination?

2. How does your community feel about integrated school classroom?

This variable was scored as a dichotomy. Responses for item
TABLE 8: Inter-item Correlation Coefficients, Means and Standard Deviations for Items Indicating Clergy Perception of Parishioners' Attitude Toward Racial Prejudice: 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X's</td>
<td>2.602</td>
<td>2.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9: Inter-item Correlation Coefficients, Means and Standard Deviations for Items Indicating Clergy Perception of Community Attitude Toward Racial Integration: 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X's</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>1.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
one were: (1) Should not be concerned with this, (2) Should only express opinion of this, (3) Should actively engage in this, and (4) No opinion. These responses were scored as: 1 = 2, 2 and 3 = 1, 4 = 0. Item two had the standard Likert type responses of from (1) Strongly Approve, to (5) Strongly Disapprove. these were scored as: 1 and 2 = 1, 4 and 5 = 2, 3 = 0. Thus for both items a score of one indicates a positive attitude perceived by the clergyman on the part of his community toward racial integration, while two indicates a negative attitude. Factor loadings for these items were found to be .809.\textsuperscript{5}

The correlation between the two items measuring clergy perception of community attitude is shown in Table 9.

5. (c) Clergy Perception of and Attitude Toward the Methodist Church's General Policy on Racial Integration.

The attitude of the clergy with regard to the policy on racial integration of the Methodist Church was examined by asking them to respond to the following statements:

1. Following the teachings of Christ about brotherhood, local Methodist churches should be inclusive churches; that is, they should receive into their membership all persons of faith regardless of race or ethnic background.

2. Even though I had learned that the Bishop has more
Liberal views on racial integration than I had thought, I would continue to give as large a contribution to the church as I had previously given.

The range of fixed-choiced responses for these items in the 1980 survey are: (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Undecided, (4) Disagree, and (5) Strongly disagree. In the 1969 survey item one had the same choices as above but the choices for item two were simply (1) Yes, and (2) No. To maintain unity of measurement choice two was scored as five so that the summated range of possible scores was from two to ten. Thus a score of two would represent sympathy with or positive attitude toward the Methodist churches' stand on racial integration, while a score of ten would represent a negative attitude.

Table 10 shows the inter-item correlation, means, and standard deviations for these items.

The factor loading for the items comprising this variable were found to be .804 for 1969 and .854 for 1980.

Statistical Techniques Used

Two major methods were utilized to determine the relationships between the indicated variables. (1) To determine the zero order correlations Pearson's r was utilized as a correlation coefficient and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>X's</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>1.613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X's</th>
<th>1.683</th>
<th>1.503</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
probability of \( \rho = 0 \) was used as a test of significance for these relationships. (2) The second major method used was that of regression analysis. Nie et. al. (1975) describe this statistical technique as a general one by means of which:

one can analyze the relationship between a dependent or criterion variable and a set of independent or predictor variables.... The most important uses of the technique as a descriptive tool are: (1) to find the best linear prediction equation and evaluate its prediction accuracy; (2) to control for other confounding factors in order to evaluate the contribution of a specific variable or set of variables; and (3) to find structural relations and to provide explanations for seemingly complex multivariate relationships, such as is done in path analysis (321).

Basically, regression analysis is the expression of a causal relationship between two variables as a linear construct, or the regression of \( Y \) on \( X \), often signified as \( Y = a + bx \) (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1981:349-50). Babbie (1979:496), speaking of a posited causal relationship between \( X \) and \( Y \), states that "regression analysis is a method of determining the specific function relating \( Y \) to \( X \) such that the squared distances between individual cases and the regression line are minimized."

Since this procedure allows relationships between variables to be explicated in terms of strength and probability, it was used to explore the relationships to determine their effects when other variation was held constant. The probability of \( F = 0 \) was used as a measure of significance for this procedure.
Summary

This chapter has set forth the procedures used in collection of data and the measurement of variables. The data sources were discussed with a brief description of statistical procedures utilized in the analysis of the data. These will be expanded in the next chapter. The use of different methods of collection and analysis to be employed are an attempt to utilize the concept of triangulation in a methodological setting (Denzin 1973).
Footnotes

1 Since the "other" category included both non seminary and seminary trained clergy, since it represented only a small proportion of the samples, and since in some cases it was answered in addition to other categories, it was deleted.

2 These scale items had the following fixed-choice response categories: (1) completely true, (2) probably true, (3) probably not true, (4) definitely not true, and were assigned numerical values of 5, 4, 2, and 1 respectively.

3 Responses for item one were: (1) Should not be concerned with this; (2) Should only express opinion on this; (3) Should actively engage in this; (4) No opinion. These responses were scored as 5, 3, 1, and 0 respectively.

4 Responses for item two were: (1) Strongly approve; (2) Approve; (3) No opinion; (4) Disapprove; (5) Strongly disapprove. These responses were scored as 1, 2, 0, 3, and 4.

5 Standardization for scale items when there are only two items in the scale. Procedure is to set the mean of each item equal to zero, and the standard deviation equal to one. This procedure allows for the
normalization of variables for comparative and interpretive purposes. In essence, this procedure allows the two items to share common variance. Such a procedure causes the factor loadings to be set equal to one another, and makes the scores obtained from this factoring technique to normalize (Harmon, 1967).
CHAPTER V

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The concerns of this chapter are directed to: (1) presentation of the data, (2) testing of the hypotheses, and (3) an assessment of the theoretical model guiding the research.

The general objective of this study was an examination of prejudicial attitudes held by Mississippi Methodist Clergymen in relation to a number of independent variables believed to have an influence on such attitudes. More specifically, the objective is to test a theoretical model delineating the nature of these relationships. Given the several data sources, we begin our analysis with an overview of the data.

Descriptive Overview of the Data

Survey Data

It should first be noted that the present study does not utilize the statistics and conclusions as they appeared in the 1969 report.
since the original raw data were available, all of the statistics here presented are of current computation. New methods of analysis have been utilized, and classification and composition of some of the variables have been changed. All variables compared across the two studies, however, are constructed from the same questionnaire items. In cases where certain questions were no longer relevant in the time frame of the later study, these were dropped from the scale composition for the earlier study as well to insure comparability.

For the dependent variable, clergy attitudes of racial prejudice, the mean score in the 1969 study was 13.82 with a standard deviation of 4.76 compared to the 1980 mean of 11.82 with standard deviation of 3.79. Given the range of scores for this variable (5 to 25), this represents a decline in prejudice of approximately 10% on the scale.

In the 1969 study the average age of the clergymen polled was 36.8 years of age. This is 11.05 years lower than the 1980 group whose mean age had risen to 47.85 years. A look at the distributions verifies the rise in average age, as in 1969 there were 49.1% of the ministers under and 50.9% over the age of 40, while in 1980 the ratio was 28.4% to 71.6%.

In the area of educational training it was discovered that, for the 1969 group, the average minister had a college education, the modal category being college graduates. In 1980 the average category indicated a higher proportion with a college education, and the modal category had gone to those with a master's degree. Of the 163 pastors
polled, 113 (68.3%) held a graduate degree of some sort.

As for the ministers' tendency toward a traditionalist/social actionist role stance, the mean social actionism score in 1969 was 4.25. Since these scores are interpreted inversely on an 8 point scale, this would be represented by a standardized direct score between 0 and 1 of .72. The 1980 mean of 3.72 portrays a rise in social actionist role orientation to a standardized score of .78 indicating an increase in this variable of approximately 6%. The traditionalist role orientation was also scored inversely on a scale of 5 to 30 for the 1980 data, and was represented by a mean score of 10.93. For this variable, the direct standardized score was .76, indicating a fairly high level of traditionalism as measured by the scale. The fact that the social actionism mean score was also high demonstrates the notion mentioned earlier that these two concepts are not necessarily antithetical. Since this measure was not used for the 1969 study, the 1980 statistic has no earlier correlate.

The clergy's orientation toward a fundamentalist belief stance increased slightly over the eleven year period from a mean of 12.90 to that of 13.27. This variable was scored directly on a 12 point scale of from 3 to 15 points. This rise in mean scores represents a difference of only .21. We can postulate little change in this scale variable.

The possible score range of population density of areas in which
churches were located remained the same in both study questionnaires. This range went from open country to cities of 100,000 and above population. In the 1980 survey, however, more churches on the average were located in larger population centers, as evidenced by the change in mean categories from 4.19 to 4.96. This is only a slight increase however, as evidenced by the fact that if these figures were translated into actual population figures for the average size of town in question the difference would be between an average population of 1284 in 1969, and 2439 in 1980.

The ministers' perception of the denominational policy regarding integration as positive or negative was rated on an 8 point scale; a score of 2 representing positive attitude, or agreement with denominational policy, while 10 represented the extreme negative perception. The mean score for the 1969 group was 3.18 and for the 1980 group was 3.19. Both of these mean scores indicate a positive attitude toward denominational policy according to the measure used in this study, but with a difference of only .1% no significant change can be noted.

With the exception of traditionalist role stance, the variables reported on thus far have been constructed from the same questions in both surveys. Because the area of ministerial perception of parishioners and community was added in the 1980 survey, the questions necessary to their construction do not appear in the 1969 questionnaire. Therefore, the report of data on these two variables
will be given for the 1980 survey only.

Clergy perception of parishioners' level of prejudice had a range of possible scores of from 2 to 8, with 2 representing perception of lowest prejudice and 8 the highest. The actual range of respondent scores for this scale was 2 to 8, with an average score of 4.96. Although the range included both extremes, the standard deviation was only 1.67 units, indicating a lesser degree of heterogeneity than might have been expected. The mean score was calculated to have a standardized score of .495, indicating an overall perception of a moderate level of parishioner prejudice as measured on the scale used for this study.

Perception of community prejudice had a range of possible scores from 2 to 4, such that a score of 2 indicated a ministerial perception of the lowest level of community prejudice while 4 represented the highest level. The mean of 2.85 (standardized score of .425), gives an indication of a perception of a reasonably low level of community prejudice as measured on the scale, and is fairly close (6.8% difference) to the average perception of congregational prejudice.

As a brief summary of the comparable data collected in the two surveys it could be said that there were slight increases in all areas except for prejudice, which registered a decline of about 10%. The new variables introduced in the 1980 study portrayed clergymen as being traditionalist oriented as well as social actionist, and that with regard to their perceptions of prejudice in their congregations
and communities, these were at a relatively low level as measured on the study scales. The most pronounced high points of the data sets were the decline in prejudice, the increase in mean age and the continuing strength of the social actionist role stance.

Official Records

Official records of contributions made by Mississippi Methodist Churches to several different denominational funds were examined. It was noted that, in general, levels of giving dropped off in the mid-sixties and began to recover again in the early seventies. Contributions to the Race Relations Fund in particular, portrayed a significant decline in the periods of 1964 to 1969, and again in 1973 to 1977. After that point there was a slow increase, but levels of giving have in most instances not achieved those which characterized the pre-integration period. In general, patterns of financial giving to the denomination portray a marked drop in support from approximately 1963 to 1969, and after a short recovery in the early seventies, another drop back down again by 1973.

Assessment of the Hypotheses

The diagram presented in the theory chapter illustrating the posited relationships between independent variables gave rise to the
following hypotheses:

1. Ministers of today will be less racially prejudiced than those of 1969.

2. Younger ministers will be less racially prejudiced than their older colleagues.

3. The more highly educated clergymen will be less prejudiced than their less well educated colleagues.

4. Ministers with high traditional role orientation will also be high in prejudice.

5. Urban clergymen will be less prejudiced than their rural colleagues.

6. Clergy who perceive their parishioners to be less prejudiced will themselves be less prejudiced.

7. Clergy who perceive their communities to be less prejudiced will themselves be less prejudiced.

It was expected that the social actionist role orientation, as well as religious fundamentalism would be linked to traditionalism. Also, the relationship between prejudice of clergy and their attitudes toward the Methodist Church's general policy on racial integration was expected to be a corollary to their perception of parishioners' and community prejudice levels. This would be of the nature that the more the individual minister agreed with the Church's official stance, the less prejudiced he would be.

In order to fully assess these relationships, and especially the
aspect comparing the results of the two studies, data from both must be presented and compared. Thus the 1969 data are presented together with the results of the 1980 study. In this way the hypotheses are assessed for both studies and some comparisons can be made without as many back references.

Survey Data

Prejudice Change

One of the first areas of interest in the hypothesized relationships is that between prejudice scores recorded from the 1969 group of clergymen in comparison to those recorded in 1980. The hypothesis in this case is supported as the mean prejudice score in 1980 has decreased. For 1969 the mean prejudice score was 13.82 with a standard deviation of 4.76. In 1980 the mean score had declined to 11.82 with standard deviation of 3.79.

Age of Clergy

In the original 1969 questionnaire, the variable of age was broken down into nine categories:

1. under 24 years of age
2. 24 to 29 years of age
In order to get a visual representation of the correlation of clergy prejudice and clergy age, Table 11 is presented.

Treating both age and prejudice as non-dichotomized variables produced a Pearson's $r$ correlation coefficient of $0.22^2$, showing a rather weak positive relationship. The standard regression coefficient ($Beta)^3$ for this variable was computed at $0.15$ indicating a predicted standard deviation score increase of $0.15$ units for each standard deviation unit increase in age when the other variables were statistically controlled. Standard error for this statistic was calculated at: std. error $B = 0.0891$, denoting that the prejudice score thus predicted will deviate from the actual score by $0.09$ units on the average. The $F$-ratio for age in the 1969 study was computed at $2.83$ with $5$ and $74$ degrees of freedom. Significance Level for this variable was computed at $0.096$, indicating a non-significant relationship. $R$ square for age was found to be $0.013$ showing that this variable within the overall model accounted for about one percent of the variation in prejudice. The zero order relationship was
TABLE 11: Clergy Attitudes of Racial Prejudice, by Age: 1969

(Categories for clergy prejudice and age were constructed by dichotomizing prejudice at the mean of its array, and age at the categorical mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prejudice</th>
<th>Clergy Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Prejudice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prejudice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant, however \( (p > 0.02) \), allowing acceptance of the hypothesis as stated. It must be noted that this relationship loses its significance when the other variables are statistically controlled.

Since one of the purposes of the 1980 study was to provide a follow-up to that of the earlier research, the same questions, measures, statistics, data, cutting points and etc. were utilized in order to make the end products as comparable as possible. To this end also the order of presentation of the data will be the same.

For the variable of age, therefore, the same categories were used as for the corresponding 1969 data, as represented in Table 16.

Treating age and prejudice as continuous variables in this particular case revealed a correlation coefficient of \(-0.08^4\). Beta\(^5\) for this variable was \(0.0037\) with a standard error of \(0.0973\). The F ratio for age was not calculable at two decimal places and the probability rating was found to be \(0.97\). \(R^2\) was found to be \(0.00001\), indicating that this variable had no discernable relationship to clergy prejudice in the 1980 survey. The probability level for the zero order relationship was also non significant at \(0.34\).

Thus, we can conclude that the zero order relationship in the 1969 study supports the hypothesis for that year. For 1980 the hypothesized relationship between age and prejudice must be rejected, since the relationship is not only non-significant, but also inverse in nature.
TABLE 12: Correlation Coefficients For All Model Variables: 1969
(The correlation coefficients utilized the Pearson r statistic. The significance statistic shown below each r value is the test of probability that rho= 0. The third figure is the N for each variable relationship.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clergy Prejudice</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.2186</td>
<td>-.4371</td>
<td>-.1814</td>
<td>.5154</td>
<td>.6098</td>
<td>.5205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0237</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0681</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age of Clergy</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-.1147</td>
<td>.2235</td>
<td>.1100</td>
<td>.0790</td>
<td>.1861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.2163</td>
<td>.0184</td>
<td>.2550</td>
<td>.4494</td>
<td>.0549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>109*</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Educational Level</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.2930</td>
<td>-.3136</td>
<td>-.3534</td>
<td>-.2431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0018</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Population of Parish Community</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-.0804</td>
<td>-.2859</td>
<td>-.0847</td>
<td>.4193</td>
<td>.0073</td>
<td>.3971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.4193</td>
<td>.0073</td>
<td>.3971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Religious Beliefs</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.3605</td>
<td>.2636</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.3605</td>
<td>.2636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Actionist Role Orientation (a)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.4416</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.4416</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perception of Denominational Position</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) This variable was scored inversly.
### TABLE 13: Regression of Clergy Prejudice on All Independent Variables: 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta Weights</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Value of F</th>
<th>Probability of F</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Actionist Role Orientation</td>
<td>.3487</td>
<td>.0979</td>
<td>5-74</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.3790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Denominational Posit.</td>
<td>.3264</td>
<td>.1015</td>
<td>5-74</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>.0019</td>
<td>.0990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Beliefs Fundamentalism</td>
<td>.2274</td>
<td>.0852</td>
<td>5-74</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>.0093</td>
<td>.0093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Clergy</td>
<td>.1501</td>
<td>.0891</td>
<td>5-74</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.0965</td>
<td>.0138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>-.0850</td>
<td>.0893</td>
<td>5-74</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.3444</td>
<td>.0053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of Parish Community</td>
<td>-.1035</td>
<td>.0947</td>
<td>5-74</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.2780</td>
<td>.0132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Model: \( R^2 = .561 \)
\( F = 15.76 \)
\( Pr. > F = .0001 \)
TABLE 14: Correlation Coefficients for all Model Variables: 1980
(Correlation Coefficients shown are the Pearson r statistic. Significance statistics shown below each r value is the test of probability that rho = 0.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clergy Prejudice</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.0791</td>
<td>-.0078</td>
<td>-.1551</td>
<td>.2655</td>
<td>-.0948</td>
<td>.6002</td>
<td>.4233</td>
<td>.3024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age of Clergy</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-.3233</td>
<td>.0341</td>
<td>.0055</td>
<td>-.0767</td>
<td>-.0635</td>
<td>-.2538</td>
<td>-.1925</td>
<td>.1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.1544</td>
<td>-.2111</td>
<td>.0899</td>
<td>.0532</td>
<td>.1269</td>
<td>.0014</td>
<td>-.1090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Population of Parish Community</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-.0934</td>
<td>.1156</td>
<td>-.1653</td>
<td>-.1324</td>
<td>-.1931</td>
<td>-.1298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Religious Beliefs Fundamentalism</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-.1354</td>
<td>.2152</td>
<td>.0117</td>
<td>-.0311</td>
<td>.0586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Traditionalist Role Orientation</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0094</td>
<td>-.0637</td>
<td>-.0503</td>
<td>-.0243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Social Actionist Role Orientation</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.2868</td>
<td>.2219</td>
<td>.4590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Perception of Parishioner Prejudice</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.7481</td>
<td>.1269</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.1709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Perception of Community Prejudice</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.1671</td>
<td>.0717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Perception of Denominational Position</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These variables were scored inversely
TABLE 15: Regression of Clergy Prejudice on All Independent Variables: 1980
(for the model: R square = .511, F = 8.01, and Pr. of F = .0001.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta Weights</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Degrees Freedom</th>
<th>Value of F</th>
<th>Prob. of F</th>
<th>R^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Actionist Role Orientation</td>
<td>.3659</td>
<td>.1083</td>
<td>8-69</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>.3288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Beliefs Fundamentalism</td>
<td>.2044</td>
<td>.0791</td>
<td>8-69</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>.0119</td>
<td>.0490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Parishioner Prejudice</td>
<td>.2913</td>
<td>.1332</td>
<td>8-69</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.0321</td>
<td>.0900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Denominational Position</td>
<td>.2065</td>
<td>.0966</td>
<td>8-69</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.0360</td>
<td>.0356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of Parish Community</td>
<td>-.0842</td>
<td>.0833</td>
<td>8-69</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.3157</td>
<td>.0074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>-.0152</td>
<td>.0994</td>
<td>8-69</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.8784</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalist Role Orientation</td>
<td>.0068</td>
<td>.0916</td>
<td>8-69</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.9408</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Clergy</td>
<td>.0037</td>
<td>.0973</td>
<td>8-69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.9699</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Community Prejudice</td>
<td>-.0034</td>
<td>.1196</td>
<td>8-69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.9773</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 16: Clergy Attitudes of Racial Prejudice, By Age: 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clergy Prejudice</th>
<th>Clergy Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Prejudice</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52.56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prejudice</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47.44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education of Clergy

In the 1969 study, the question measuring clergy educational levels had six response categories:

1. CONF. Course Study
2. Bible School or Institute
3. Some Seminary
4. Seminary Graduate
5. Graduate work beyond seminary
6. Other

Since the theoretically important division in this variable was the presence/absence of seminary training, Table 17 separates those with some seminary training from those without this minimum level.

The correlation coefficient for this particular relationship in 1969 was equal to -.437. The Beta value was -.085 with a standard error of .089, and R square was calculated at .005. F was found to be equal to .91 with a probability of .344, portraying a non-significant relationship. Again, however, the zero order relationship was significant with a probability of .0001, allowing acceptance of the hypothesis at that level.

In the 1980 questionnaire, education was investigated through the use of two separate questions, one of which explored the respondents secular training and the other his seminary experience. The
categories of seminary/non-seminary training were thus represented by their respective questions. In the tabular data presentation, the non-seminary category is given by those who did not answer the question for seminary education. The seminary category is represented as those who answered the latter question in any fashion, thus identifying themselves as having some kind of seminary degree.

The correlation coefficient for 1980 was calculated at -0.008 with a probability of .92. The F value was found to be .02 with a significance value of .878, indicating a non-significant relationship at both levels. Beta was computed at -0.015 with a corresponding standard error of .099, while the R square value was only .0003. Thus, for 1969, the hypothesis while the R square value was .0003. Thus, for 1969, the hypothesis is supported at the zero order level, while in the 1980 study the data indicate that having a seminary education proved to have no impact on clergy prejudice. Thus, the hypothesis for the 1980 relationship is rejected.

Role Orientation of Clergy

It was suggested in Chapter four that while the role orientations of traditionalism and social actionism were often linked together as opposite ends of the same scale, this could be more of an assumption than actual fact. In this study traditionalism and fundamentalism were not assumed to be directly linked together. Thus, while there is
TABLE 17: Clergy Attitudes of Racial Prejudice, By Educational Level: 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clergy Prejudice</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Seminary Degree</td>
<td>Seminary Degree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Prejudice</td>
<td>40.91</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78.85</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prejudice</td>
<td>59.09</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18: Clergy Attitudes of Racial Prejudice, By Educational Level: 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clergy Prejudice</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Seminary Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Prejudice</td>
<td>52.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prejudice</td>
<td>47.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
only one hypothesis dealing with the relationship between traditional role orientation and prejudice, traditionalist role orientation, social/actionist role orientation, and religious beliefs with respect to doctrinal fundamentalism were treated as separate variables and were tested independently for their effects on clergy prejudice.

The social actionist role orientation proved to be the most important explanatory variable in both studies. In 1969 the coefficient of correlation for this relationship was .616 (probability = .0001), with an individual R² within the regression model of .38, signifying that this individual variable was responsible for over a third of the total variation in clergy prejudice for that year. The strength and significance of the correlation are borne out by a Beta of .35, standard error of only .09, and F value of 12.68 with concomitant probability of .0008.

In 1980 social actionism was also responsible for a third of the model variation with a R² of .33. For this study the correlation coefficient was also very strong at .60, and the other statistics supported this strength as Beta was calculated at .37, standard error at .10, and F at 11.41 with a probability of .001.

Doctrinal fundamentalism within the structure of religious beliefs also showed a strong correlation with prejudice with a coefficient of .51 (probability = .0001) in 1969, and dropping to .26 probability = .001) in 1980. The respective R squares and Betas for the two years also reflect a mild drop in the importance of the
fundamentalist doctrinal position to clergy prejudice.7

The traditionalist role orientation, which was not measurable in the 1969 study, proved to have no discernable relationship to prejudice in the 1980 survey. The correlation coefficient was weak at -.09 (probability = .26), and with a R² of .00004, a Beta of .007, and a probability F calculated at .94, the conclusion of no correlation seems to be evident. Although traditionalism as a single factor had no relationship to clergy prejudice, the other two variables examined under the heading of clergy role orientation did have a strong effect. We may conclude that clergy prejudice is directly related to fundamentalism and strongly inversely related to social actionism.

Demographic Aspects of Church Location

Size of the town or community in which the ministers' churches were located was represented by the same question in both studies and required a choice among nine categories as presented in Chapter Four. Since the cutting point between urban and rural designations is generally set at 2,500, the item was broken down into communities less than 2,500 and those of population 2,500 or greater. Tables 19 and 20 illustrate the relationship between this variable and prejudice for the 1969 and 1980 data sets respectively.

In 1969 the correlation coefficient for the relationship in question was found to be -.18 (with a probability of .07). This
indicated a rather weak negative relationship which was not significant \((F = 1.19, Pr = .28)\) and explained only a very small degree of the variance in the dependent variable \((R^2 = .013)\), causing rejection of the fifth hypothesis for that year. In 1980 the correlation coefficient had a value of \(-.15\) (probability = .06), with a corresponding indication that this variable was responsible for almost none of the variation in clergy prejudice. \((R^2 = .007)\) With an \(F\) value of 1.02, a probability rating of .316, and a Beta of \(-.084\), the indications were that there was no relationship at all between the two variables. Thus, we conclude that although the zero order probability levels were close to being significant, we must reject the hypotheses for both years.

Clergy Perception of Parishioner Prejudice

The expectation of the next two hypotheses was that clergymen who perceived their parishioners and communities to be less prejudiced would themselves be less prejudiced. It should be noted that these hypotheses were formulated particularly with regard to the 1980 study, since the items were not included in the earlier questionnaire. The clergy's perception of their parishioner's prejudice correlated with their own levels of prejudice at \(.423\) which was the third strongest correlation coefficient within the 1980 study model. The relationship had an \(R\) square value of \(.09\) indicating that the perception of
TABLE 19: Clergy Attitude of Racial Prejudice, By Population of Parish Community: 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clergy Prejudice</th>
<th>Population of Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities less than 2500 Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Prejudice</td>
<td>54.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prejudice</td>
<td>45.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population of Parish Community: 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy Prejudice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities less than 2500 Population</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
parishioner's prejudice explained about nine percent of the clergyman's own level of prejudice. Beta for this variable was .29 with an F value of 4.79, indicating a relationship which, while not highly significant, was well below the .05 level, with a probability of F calculated at .03. It might be further noted that for the zero order probability of significance for the correlation coefficient, the relationship was found to be highly significant with a value of .0001. On the basis of the level of significance used a connection with the F test, we may conclude that the clergy's perception of parishioner prejudice does have a significant impact on their own level of prejudice, and a highly significant impact at the zero order level.

Clergy Perception of community Prejudice

Although clergy perception of community prejudice correlated highly with perception of parishioner prejudice \((r = .75)\), it did not have as strong an effect on clergy prejudice. The correlation coefficient for this variable was found to be .30, \((R^2 = .00001)\). Beta was low at -.003, with an F value of 0, and a probability of F equal to .977. The probability of \(r\) however, was highly significant at .001. For this relationship we conclude that the data support the hypothesis at the zero order level of correlation. The relationship loses its significance when the other variables' influences are controlled.
Clergy Perception of Denominational Policy

Because the variable of clergy perception of denominational position did not correlate strongly with the two foregoing variables, it was decided to assess its impact on clergy prejudice separately. It was thought to have been correlated with perception of parishioner and community prejudice and was intended to gauge the degree to which the ministers perceived themselves as professionals with primary loyalty due to their denomination as opposed to Southerners with major ties to regional cultural norms. Because the items of which this variable was composed were found in the 1969 questionnaire, it was possible to measure it for both studies and compare the results.

As indicated previously, ministerial perception of denominational policy was slightly less negative in 1980 than in 1969. However, the correlation of this variable with clergy prejudice was somewhat weaker in the 1980 survey. The correlation coefficients for 1969 and 1980 were .52 and .51 respectively, R square had declined from .09 to .04, and Beta from .326 to .206. The significances of the two relationships are given by F values of 10.34 with probability of .002 and 4.57 with a probability of .036. Thus, altogether this variable was not included in the model as a separate hypothesis, it proved to have a highly significant relationship to clergy prejudice in the 1969 survey, explaining almost ten percent of the variation; and a
significant relationship in 1980 explaining almost four percent of the variation in clergy prejudice for that year. The zero order correlation was found to have a highly significant relationship (probability = .0001).

Assessment of the Models

As the foregoing presentation of the data indicates, the specific model presented in Chapter Three (Figure 2) has been partly borne out by the empirical evidence. However, the longitudinal aspects remain to be considered along with the comprehensive model also presented in Chapter Three.

In order to properly understand the changes over the decade in question, this section will first present a brief recapitulation of the data in comparative fashion. It will then consider the financial giving data from the Mississippi Methodist Conference official records.

Comparative Survey Data

In order to be able to comparatively assess the data, strength and significance of the hypothetical relationships should be evaluated. Table 21 will show relative strengths of associations through presentation of five statistics for each variable: Pearson's
r, Probability of rho, Beta, $R^2$, and Probability of F. Although these statistics have been presented previously, this table allows easy comparison of the variables between the two studies.

From Table 21 it is clear that the major area of strength of association in both studies was in the area of the variables collectively referred to as clergy role orientation. The only other common area of strength was perception of denominational position, while perception of parishioner prejudice was a strong variable in 1980. The reason that none of the associations are stronger in 1980 may be because of the extra variables added for the later study.

The second general element to be considered in gauging variable associations is the significance of the relationships. Inspection of the probabilities of F given in Table 21 reveals that the associations with least probability of occurring by chance in the 1969 study were those involving prejudice and the social actionist role orientation, perception of denominational position, and religious fundamentalist beliefs. In the 1980 study we find the lowest probability rating for social actionism, followed by fundamentalism, perception of parishioner prejudice, and perception of denominational position. Clergy age was significant in the 1969 study only.

Finally, in order to assess relative strengths of variable associations comparing between the two studies, stepwise regression analysis was performed with corollary statistics of F and probability values, Beta values, and $R^2$ calculations. Stepwise regression adds
TABLE 21: Association strengths of Relationships Between
the Dependent Variable and the Independent Variables: 1969 & 1980
(Statistics utilized are: Pearson's r, Probability of rho, Beta,
R², and probability of F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Clergy</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. rho</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. F</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. rho</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. F</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalist Role</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Prob. rho</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. F</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Beliefs</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentalism</td>
<td>Prob. rho</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. F</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Actionist Role</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Prob. rho</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. F</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of Parish Community</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. rho</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. F</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Denominational Position</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. rho</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. F</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Community Prejudice</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. rho</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. F</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Parishioner Prejudice</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. rho</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. F</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
each variable into the model in order of descending importance as they help to explain variation in the dependent variable. For the 1969 study the first six variables were added in the following order:

1. Social Actionism
2. Perception of Denominational Position
3. Religious Fundamentalism
4. Age of Clergy
5. Population of Parish Community
6. Educational Level

For 1980, with the inclusion of the additional variables, the stepwise order had become:

1. Social Actionism
2. Perception of Parishioner Prejudice
3. Religious Fundamentalism
4. Perception of Denominational Position
5. Population of Community
6. Educational Level
7. Traditionalism
8. Age of Clergy
9. Perception of Community Prejudice

In the cases where Pearson's $r$ and its related probability were stronger than indications given by the ANOVA statistics, it may be assumed that other influences were at work in the zero order correlations, which disappeared when the influence of the other
variables were controlled.

The continuing importance of social actionism as a role orientation is shown in its position for both studies. The aspect of professional identification through perception of and attitude towards denominational position on integration had lost in correlational contact from second to fourth position while religious fundamentalism had remained unchanged. Since the variable occupying second place in the 1980 data is not present in the 1969 study, there is no way to assess its relative position.

In order to understand the changes registered as discussed, as well as to gain insight into the change in prejudice as it was recorded, the longitudinal aspect of the study must be more thoroughly investigated. Since the 1969 and 1980 questionnaires afford only data applicable to those two specific points in time, the other data sources are seen as useful indicators of attitudes before and between the surveys.

Financial Data

All three of the funds chosen for inspection in this Section go to the wider support of Methodism as a national movement. Thus the support of these funds, or lack thereof, should serve as an indicator of support or rejection of their ties with the parent organization.
Interdenominational Cooperative Fund

The Interdenominational Cooperative Fund is used as a source of support for such agencies as the World Council of Churches. Since the national Methodist policy on race relations was influenced by decisions made within the W.C.C. (Perceived by many as a major cause of that policy), contributions made to a fund in support of it would indicate local rejection/support of that national policy.

It was in 1964 that the General Conference instructed all regional conferences to move toward integration. Although Mississippi conference giving to the I.C.F. had declined somewhat since 1961, a marked drop was recorded in 1964 and 1965. Contributionary records to this fund are recorded in dollars per year in graph form in Figure I, which gives a good visual representation of this data.

Although the integration policy became official in 1964, actual merger of the black and white conferences of the Methodist Church in Mississippi did not take place until 1973. As the preceding graph indicates, 1973 was another downward trend in giving to this fund.

As previously indicated, the I.C.F. is an apportioned fund. That is, local churches are told the amount which they are expected to give. A comparison of amounts apportioned with amounts paid, however, reveals that the actual amount given never reaches that apportioned. It was felt that in addition to the portrayal of actual giving in dollar amounts, the ratio of monies given to apportioned would be
FIGURE I

CONTRIBUTIONS OF WHITE MISSISSIPPI METHODIST CHURCHES TO THE INTERDENOMINATIONAL COOPERATIVE FUND: BY YEAR
FIGURE II

Contributions of W.I.M.G.C.'s to the I.D.C. Fund, expressed in percentage rate of amt. given / amt. apportioned: by year.
enlightening as a form of local reaction of official expectations. Thus, Figure II shows this data expressed as a percentage of paid to apportioned funds over the years.

Inspection of the two foregoing graphs reveals a very similar pattern. If these data are in fact representative of local negative reaction to national policy, it is obvious that the most severe reactionary period was found at the time of the first announcement of that policy, followed by a similar trend around the year of actual integration. The severity of that reaction may be seen in the low points in 1965 and again in 1973, when giving levels dropped to $317.00 and $784.00 respectively. Apportioned/paid ratios for these two years were 5.85% and 10.98%.

Although these trends would tend to show a pattern of disillusionment and rebellion of Mississippians against an unpopular national pronouncement, with strong theoretical suspicion of accompanying inverse rise and fall of racial prejudice levels, the lack of the hypothesized change keeping pace with the noticeable increases from 1974 to 1978 is still unexplained.

World Service Fund

The World Service Fund is closely connected with Methodism's missionary outreach around the world. Since this involves the support of other racial groups through both foreign and home missions, giving
in this area was hypothesized to be an indicator of feelings of prejudice on the part of the Mississippi Conference. Figures III and IV show yearly amounts given to this fund and percentage of amounts paid to amounts apportioned, respectively.

Inspection of these graphs reveals little of a conclusive nature. Although actual levels of giving present more noticeable fluctuations around 1969 and 1970, the overall indication is one of continued progress. Figure IV, however, indicates that progress did not keep pace with organizational expectations, dropping off to a low point of 54.9% in 1972 and increasing rather sharply to an overall high of 98.5% in 1979.

These results may indicate either less of a reaction to integration than had been previously indicated, or perhaps that the subjects of missions and reactions to local racial problems are separated in Methodists' consideration.

Race Relations Fund

The title of the next fund, Race Relations Fund, is by itself a good reason for suspecting that it may well be the prime indicator of attitudes of racial prejudice. Money given into this fund is used in various ways, but with the common goal mainly of helping to improve relations between blacks and whites. Additionally it should be reiterated that this is not an apportioned fund. There are no
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official expectations attached to it since its collection depends entirely on the choice of local pastors and congregations. Thus, while it may not be as good an indicator of reaction to official policy as the others, it will surely be a better one on the part of white congregations of unsolicited desire towards better relations with their black counterparts. Figure V portrays donations to this fund by the year in which they were registered.

Another aspect of this data which is helpful as an indicator of the intensity of support or non-support of the conference is the rate expressed by figures of amount given per church. This data is expressed by year in Figure VI.

In the two foregoing representations of the contributory data, a somewhat different view of the situation emerges. In the years before 1964, the yearly fluctuations are within normally expected limits. The sharp subsequent decrease from well over the six thousand dollar mark in the early sixties, to a low only slightly over five hundred dollars clearly portrays the reaction which took place. It is to be seen, however, that the giving again increases until actual merger in 1973, with another sharp decrease which is only beginning to recover by 1979.

It would appear that a theoretical design that posited a high point of racial prejudice in 1964 concurrent with the pronouncement of proposed integration, and subsequent decline thereafter would be in error. The facts as indicated by the last graphs show that the
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reaction of 1964 was followed by another severe one in 1973-1974, with a decline between the two, and a smaller one subsequent to the last low point. Thus, we can see that the two surveys done in 1969 and 1980 do not represent points on a steady line of either increasing or decreasing prejudice, but instead two comparatively low points with rather extreme deviation between. We might then interpret the difference in mean prejudice scores noted earlier not as a slow, steady decline in prejudice, but rather as one of increase to, and subsequent decrease from a high point registered roughly at midpoint between the two studies.

Impressionistic Observations of Conference Structure

During the course of the data collection phase of the 1980 study, impressions of the researchers attending the district clergy conferences were informally polled. Although no attempt was made at quantitative measurement of black and white clergy interaction, some few commonalities or themes seemed to emerge. First was the observation that no overt disharmony or racial discrimination existed within the groups present at these conferences. No instances were observed wherein whites in interactive situations obviously shunned blacks, relegated them to inferior positions or tasks, or displayed discrimination in any verbal or behavioral fashion. It was observed in the majority of cases, however, that after initial greetings were
made, there was little actual interactional integration between black and white clergy and their families. In one instance, for example, the evening meal was eaten picnic style in the open, with black clergy and their families generally together in one spot while whites scattered around in various other places. In another case, the evening meal was eaten in a pavilion with blacks in one corner and whites in other areas. In the latter case, however, one black minister was noted in earnest conversation with a white colleague for most of the supper hour, while their wives engaged in talk concerning the problems of raising children in a parsonage setting. In general, there did not appear to be nearly as much integrated interaction as that which might have been interpreted as being of a segregated nature.

Second was the general impression gleaned from a large number of informal conversations with various of the white clergymen, that great care was being taken not to say anything which would give the researchers any reason to surmise that they (the clergy) were in any way racially prejudiced. When the subject was approached directly in conversation, all indicated that: (a) they were not prejudiced against blacks, and (b) they felt that the south had been badly misrepresented by the media and unfairly stereotyped. One minister, however, told the researcher that in the majority of cases, blacks had to be "looked after" because they could not "manage on their own." He cited the example of one of his ancestors who had been a slave holder.
and who had always treated "his people" with love and compassion. He made the point that these people had been savages when they came to America, had been unable to live without constant help and supervision, and that they owed most of what was good in their lives (civilization, life style, Christianity) to the tutelage of their white masters.

Another man indicated that the lack of organization being discussed in his district was largely due to the black clergymen, most of whom were not well educated and some of whom could not even read and write. When the researcher asked how it would be possible to preach from the Bible without being able to read it, he replied that he supposed that they must get others to read it to them. Still another spoke of the highly emotional style of preaching which the majority of black preachers adopted, because in most cases "they respond better to emotionalism than to reason."

One other item which was noticed on many occasions was the careful and suspicious reaction to the questionnaire. Several men indicated, in quasi-humorous fashion, that they hoped that they had filled out the questionnaire in such a way as to make them look good when the results were tabulated. Several others refused to finish the questionnaire after having begun to fill it out. Still others refused to participate at all, some stating this to the researcher and the rest simply not coming to pick one up.

Although the foregoing includes largely only impressions gained
in the course of collecting the quantitative data, several themes seem noticeable: (1) a general concern about the study and the researcher's motives in doing it, (2) a tendency to stereotype and look down on most black clergymen, (3) a feeling of having been unfairly cast into a negative role by the media in particular and northerners in general, and (4) the determination not to appear prejudiced in their participation in the study, especially on the part of the older clergymen.

Black Clergy Data

As mentioned earlier, a small number (24) of black clergymen consented to answer our questionnaires and, although not germane to focal concerns of this study, a brief note is here included on the results obtained from these. Although the instrument was not designed specifically for black clergy, they were instructed to reverse such questions as made reference to blacks, and perhaps not surprisingly, came up with a mean prejudice score of 8.55, only 3.27 points below that of their white counterparts. Because the number of black participants was so small, one could not expect that statistical manipulations would yield any generalizable results. Significant zero order relationships were, however, found between prejudice and: Population of Parish Community \( (r = -0.48, \text{ Probability } > r = 0.04) \), Social Actionist Stance \( (r = 0.65, \text{ Probability } > r = 0.001) \), Perception
of Parishioners' Prejudice \( r = .82, \text{ Probability } > r = .0001 \), Perception of community Prejudice \( r = .85, \text{ Probability } > r = .0001 \), and the Perception of Denominational Position \( r = .50, \text{ Probability } > r = .02 \).

Conversations with black clergymen and comments on their questionnaires indicated two general attitudes: (1) gratitude for the changes within the church organization, and (2) a sense that real racial equality had not been achieved.

**Summary**

This chapter has presented both an overview of the data gathered from the 1969 and 1980 surveys as well as that obtained from both official conference financial records and impressionistic observations of the researchers. The assessment of the hypotheses section sought to evaluate the hypothetical assertions made in the theoretical causal model through the strength and significance of the variable associations. Five of these associations in the 1969 study and five in 1980 were found to have been significant at the zero order level of comparison. Controlling for variation within the models produced three significant relationships in 1969 and four in 1980. The two surveys were compared in order to test the longitudinal effects of the study. With the exception of the importance of the social actionist variable in both studies, this comparison did not reveal any clear
pattern of results.

It was discovered that the clergys' mean racial prejudice score had dropped as predicted. Inspection of the conference contributionary records revealed that this decline in prejudice was, however, probably not a constant change. Financial support of the race relations fund over the time period in question indicated that between the two studies there may well have been a period of high prejudice, brought about by the conference integration in 1973, followed by a subsequent reduction.

Impressionistic observations indicated some possible problems in the filling out of the questionnaires, and inclusion of a brief note on the feelings of black clergy showed a prejudicial attitude somewhat less than that of their white counterparts.
Footnotes

1 A score of 2 is the lowest score, but indicates highest degree of social actionist role orientation. A score of 10 indicates the lowest social actionist score.

2 All 1969 correlation coefficients and r probabilities in this section will refer to Table 12.

3 All Beta weights, F Values, F probabilities and R squares will refer to Table 13.

4 All 1980 correlation coefficients and r probabilities in this section will refer to Table 14.

5 All 1980 Beta weights, F values, F probabilities and R squares will refer to Table 15.

6 Because this variable was scored inversely, and because the nature of the hypothesis is also inverse the positive Pearson r's support the hypothesis that the greater the social actionist identification, the lower the prejudice level should be.
1969: \( R^2 = .05, \) Beta = .23, \( F = 7.13, \) Probability \( F = .009 \)

1980: \( R^2 = .049, \) Beta = .20, \( F = 6.68, \) Probability \( F = .01 \)

For this stepwise regression procedure, all variables were forced into the model, so that their inclusion in it does not signify significance.
Introduction

This chapter proposes to focus upon two major concerns: first, the assessment of the data in relation to the models presented, and second, to discuss some of the implications of the findings of this study in relation to Mississippi Methodism.

Data Relations to Models

Data Collection Problems

Reference has already been made to the fact that there was a general feeling among the ministers that they were tired of being studied, of being the focus of unwelcome attention, and of being, in their view, unfairly made to appear worse than they perceived themselves to be. From various remarks made about the questionnaire as it was being distributed and filled in, it became obvious that many were doing it in a light manner, leading to the suspicion of inaccuracy of the answers given. This factor may have had something to do with the rejection of several of the hypotheses.
Another factor which may well contribute to lack of definite relationships is the small number of subjects dealt with. This problem tends to amplify the first, because where some individuals give answers either without due consideration — even with intent to falsify information — the effect will be much greater with a small number of subjects than with a large number.

Data Directional Trends

The hypotheses were derived from the specific causal model presented in Chapter Three. The relationship of the data to this model has been presented in the preceding chapter. Briefly recapitulated, it was discovered that in the 1969 study five of the hypothesized relationships were significant at the zero order level of comparison: Age of Clergy, Educational Level, Social Actionist Role Orientation, Perception of Denominational Position, and Religious Fundamentalism. For the 1980 data set five significant relationships were also discovered: Social Actionist Role Orientation, Religious Fundamentalism, Perception of Community Prejudice, Perception of Parishioner's Prejudice, and Perception of Denominational Position. Although this particular model was not explaining as much of the variance in racial prejudice as was hoped (about 56% in the 1969 study and 51% in 1980), the relationships became more interesting considered as relevant within the longitudinal mode. Over the period of time
covered by the combined study the clergy's role orientations (Social Actionism and Fundamentalism) were responsible for registering the largest proportion of variance explained within the dependent variable, although they had lost slightly both in significance and in proportion of variance explained. Clergy perception of denominational position, although it also had dropped both in significance and proportion of variance explained, was still a significant and relatively important variable. In general, losses were registered for all of the model variables contained in both studies. This fact may reflect the respondents' negative feelings on being studied in the 1980 survey. It should be noted, however, that the difference between the 1969 and 1980 prejudice means was highly significant. This is particularly interesting in view of the intervening rise in prejudice suggested by the Race Relations Fund data, which showed a sharp drop in giving in 1973 after substantial gain from 1969 to that point. The actual integration of the black and white conferences in Mississippi at that time is speculated to have had an impact on this variable, making the drop in prejudice even more remarkable. As suggested earlier, the difference between the prejudice mean scores is interpreted not as a gradual decline in white clergy attitudes of racial prejudice over the study period, but rather as two fairly large declines with a sudden precipitous rise in the early 1970's.
Outcome of Hypotheses

Although the associations of the independent variables with clergy prejudice have been discussed in the preceding chapter, they will now be considered more particularly in connection with the theory presented in earlier chapters.

Socialization and Education in a Closed Society

Although the variable of age had a zero order significant relationship with prejudice in the 1969 study, it was lost when other variation was controlled and had no significance in the 1980 study. This fact calls into consideration Silver's (1963) contention that Mississippi functions as a closed society. Since any society passes along its values and norms through the process of socialization and will not easily capitulate to outside influences interfering in this mechanism, it would appear that Southern culture is having some success in holding its own against the rest of the country in inculcating prejudice into its younger sons.

Education, like age, lost its significance when controls were introduced in the 1989 data analysis and showed no significance in the 1980 study. A possible reason for this indecisive effect of education on clergy prejudice could have something to do with where the education was taken. Perhaps, if Silver is correct, institutions of
higher learning in the South will not have the same liberalizing effect as those in other geographic areas. It is unfortunate that the questionnaire did not ask where clergy education had been taken. This factor may have had some correlation to prejudicial attitudes. The only data collected relevant to this possible relationship showed that 79.3% of the respondents in 1969 had been born in Mississippi, with a corresponding figure of 79.01% for 1980. Given the fact that they were ministering in their state of birth, it is arguable that they would probably have opted for a Southern educational institution as well. If this is the case, and if Silver's arguments concerning the all pervasive nature of socialization in a closed society reaches to the seminary level, then this factor may have confounded the normal liberalizing effect that education has on prejudice.

The loss of all significance of the relationship of education to prejudice in the 1980 study may point either to an increase of prejudicial content in southern educational institutions, or it may simply be part of the attitudinal backlash indicated by the financial data as having taken place in the early 1970's.

Traditionalist Prejudice

Although the combined variable of role orientations did have a large effect on clergy prejudice in both studies, the aspect of traditionalism in the 1980 study was found not to have had a
significant association with it.

In order to understand this relationship, or lack of it, between prejudice and traditionalist role orientation, it is necessary to look once again at the connection between religion and culture. In earlier chapters this connection was shown as posited by such theorists as Durkheim and Berger with regard to the fact that there is a strong reciprocal relationship which operates in the shaping of both elements. Religion serves as a legitimizing agent for the beliefs of the culture such that one would expect cultural norms and religious justifications to work together. However, it was also pointed out that traditionalism is a bifurcated variable, depending for its result on its foundation: whether that of southern culture or that of the broader and more historic aspects of Christianity as perceived by the northern majority in Methodism. It is possible that in this situation traditionalism produced no effect on the variation in prejudice because of the dual base on which it rests. It would seem likely that the changeable nature of, and tension between religious and cultural influences as determinants of an overall base for the traditionalist role of orientation would account for the nonsignificance of this particular relationship.

As an example of the tension inherent in these conflicting influences, it might be pointed out that one of the Christian virtues is caring for the weak, the ill, the impoverished, or, in general, anyone worse off than one's self. Certainly the providing for of one
who is mentally or otherwise incompetent to provide for himself would be considered an act of charity. But who decides such categories as incompetence, weakness, and inability to provide for one's self and family? In addition, is the act of Christian charity enhanced or lessened either by an outright gift toward the fulfilling of a need, or by provision of the means whereby the needy may supply the fulfillment of his own needs?

The belief of many Mississippi clergy that blacks are for the most part inferior is not seen by them as prejudice since it may conveniently be held by culturally based traditionalists.

Southern Fundamentalism

As indicated in Chapter Five, social actionism and fundamentalism displayed strong and significant relationships with clergy prejudice in both studies, and the nature of these associations was in keeping with the expectations of the theoretical model.

These variables (social actionism and fundamentalism), although tapping beliefs and behaviors within clergy roles of religious orientation, rest partly on cultural bases. As discussed in Chapter Three, fundamentalism, as it is related to prejudice, may be either of a southern variety or of the larger aspect of Christianity represented by national Methodism. Especially in the case of fundamentalism, this variable may be closely allied to either the southern cultural norms
or to the more biblically conservative norms of Christianity as perceived by northern standards. Thus again prejudice is possible for both positions. That is, one may be either fundamentalist or nonfundamentalist and still believe in the inferiority of blacks. Although the end products or patterns of behavior attendant to prejudice differ with degree of fundamentalism, the factor itself need not influence one's culturally defined "knowledge" about a group of people. Thus, the fact of the substantial significance in both the 1969 and the 1980 study probably reflects a more pure southern cultural base for fundamentalism.

Social Actionism

As previously noted, the social actionist role orientation was the most powerful and significant of all the variables in the model for both years. Correlations were positive as expected, since both the scoring procedure for the scale and the direction of the hypothesis were inverse, indicating that a high score on the social actionism scale (denoting low orientation towards the social actionist role) was correlating with a high score on the prejudice scale. The strength of the relationship indicates that, for Mississippi Methodist Clergymen, there is little tendency to be social actionist in the direction of a return to greater prejudice and segregation. Given the relatively nondirectional nature of the questionnaire items, this
interpretation of the scale was within the framework of theoretical possibility. That is, being a leader for social change (referring to one of the items in the social actionism scale) could conceivably apply to a change to increased prejudice and discrimination as well as away from these. The data would tend to show, however, that the majority at least of those who were high in social actionism interpreted this as action in favor of rather than opposed to civil rights.

Marginal Population Influence

Although the rural-urban variable was clearly significant in neither study, it was close to being significant at the zero order level in both cases, missing the .05 mark by .02 in 1989, and by .01 in 1980. Although the R squares are not at all high, in 1989 this variable explains slightly more than one percent of the variation, and in 1980 slightly less than one percent.

Additionally, the associations in both cases are inverse in nature, showing that ministers located in areas of less density of population do tend toward higher prejudice scores. This finding agrees with the arguments forwarded in connection with the theoretical substantiations for the hypothetical relationships given previously. The failure of this variable to significantly relate to prejudice in both cases may be a correlate to the variable of age. In the 1980
survey, age was related negatively, though weakly, to prejudice. This substantively means that younger men were, if anything, actually more prejudiced than were their older colleagues. It was suggested that this fact may be due to an increased degree of prejudice inculcated into the southern socialization system, perhaps as a result of the ongoing process of integration. In any case an obvious fact of life in almost any religious organization or denomination is that the younger ministers start with the smaller, rural churches and work up to larger, more prestigious urban churches as they grow older and more experienced. Thus, if there is at least a weak tendency for the younger clergymen to be more prejudiced, this should normally strengthen the results which we would expect to find for the church location variable. The fact that the relationship between age and prejudice loses significance when other variables are partialled out suggests the presence of another stronger variable in a colinear relationship with both age and population of community. The data, however, do not indicate any strong relationship of this nature which makes it likely that such a posited variable may exist outside the limits of this study.

Roles in Conflict

The underlying element behind the perception variables was posited in Chapter Three as that of role cognition. How did the
clergy see themselves in relation to their congregations, communities, and denomination? It is unfortunate, as has been previously pointed out, that the first two parts of this trio are not really longitudinally comparable because of the absence of the relevant scale items in the 1969 questionnaire. These, therefore, will be discussed only in the 1980 study.

Perception of Parishioners' Prejudice

It will be remembered that Campbell and Pettigrew (1959) were cited as having posited what they referred to as three reference systems which were relevant to the behavioral relations of clergy to their professional duties. These were: "the self reference system (SRS), the professional reference system (PRS), and the membership reference system (MRS)" (513). Although not posed in the terminology of role theory, per se, their study points out the impacts of the three systems upon what is easily interpretable as role behavior. The first of these systems had to do with the "actor's demands, expectation, and images regarding himself" (1959: 513), and is not particularly applicable to our study, since no provision was made in the questionnaire for measuring self image. However, the MRS consists "simply of the minister's congregation" (513) and is basically the element with which we are dealing in relation to the clergy's perception of his parishioners' degree of prejudice.
The major indicator by means of which the pastor may judge his success as a professional is his success with his congregation. Campbell and Pettigrew point out that the major criterion of professional accomplishment provided for the clergyman by the church institutional structure is the management of his local church. "This encourages, even compels, the minister to base his self image, hence his sense of worth or unworth, on his success in managing his church. Thus, if church members do not share his goals" (1959: 515), he is restrained in various ways from expression of his differences with them. Because of this interactional incentive to conformism, the pastor is likely to be in substantial agreement with his congregation, at least in most of the important areas. Therefore, the significance of the relationship between clergy prejudice and perception of parishioners' prejudice (.0001 at zero level and .03 when other variables are controlled) is surprising only in that it is not stronger, especially in view of the fact that this variable is explaining only slightly over nine percent of clergy prejudice.

Perception of Community Prejudice

The prediction of a relationship between prejudice of the clergy and perception of community prejudice was not as well borne out by the data. The explanation as to why the zero order correlation was highly significant (.001), while the probability of F was .98 may be found in
the fact of a correlation of .75 between the clergy's perception of congregational and community levels of prejudice. This collinear relationship may have been an influence which made a difference when its effects were partialled out.

Theoretically it could also be said that even though one of the normal expectations of a pastor is that he be well thought of in the community, there are occasions when all of those outside of the church can be designated "the world" (in contradistinction to "the church"). On these occasions it is to be expected that certain values will be held by the community which will be at variance with Christian standards. When this occurs, the community must be guided and taught rather than agreed with. Presumably such an occasion may be in evidence in the area of racial relations. Thus, the community's level of prejudice has little or no relationship with the clergy prejudice, because there is no input into the ministerial role image. This would suggest that it is only as the clergy's perception of community prejudice varies with perception of parishioners' prejudice that the community has a direct influence.

Another variable which may add explanatory weight to this non-significant relationship is that of social actionism. The minister who sees himself as a leader of men in social situations may well be less affected by opinions of both congregation and community.
Perception of Denominational Position

The variable of the clergy's perception of the denominational position on the issue of integration turned out to be the second strongest predictor in the 1969 survey and fourth strongest in 1980. According to Campbell and Pettigrew (1959) the national organization is not "organized to confer effective rewards or punishments on individual ministers" to the same degree as the local conference which "has the responsibility of recommending or assigning parishes, and of assisting the pastor in expanding the program of his church". (513) In the case of southern Methodism, its history of having split with the main body in the past should have made this contention even stronger.

Since the questions concerning this variable were intended only to tap the ministers' perceptions of the denomination rather than the local conference, there is no way of knowing whether ministerial opinions of the conference may have affected their "professional reference system" (Campbell & Pettigrew: 1959) with relation to their feelings of prejudice. It would seem likely, however, that their perceptions of the denominational position and its effect on them had a pronounced effect on their own prejudicial attitudes. Thus it may be conjectured that had the survey included an instrument for the measurement of the perception of the position of the local conference, it probably would have been strongly related to the professional
reference system. Perhaps the decline in strength from 1969 to 1980 may be associated with a change in perception of solidarity between conference and denominational levels of organizational leadership.

Another interesting correlate of this variable was its association with the social actionist role orientation, shown by a correlation coefficient of .46 to be fairly substantial. Obviously the clergyman’s perception of himself as a religious professional in connection with the denomination as a whole coincided with his idea of role orientation toward a social actionist stance. This may have been due to a connection of Methodism as a leader and trend setter in a social action sense with the manner in which clergy subsequently perceived themselves.

**Specific Model**

To briefly summarize data correlation with the model, in the 1969 study the variable relationships of significance were, in order: (1) Social Actionism, (2) Perception of Denominational Position, (3) Religious Fundamentalism, (4) Age, (5) Population, and (6) Educational Level. The model as a unit accounted for some 56% of the variation in clergy prejudice. It was suggested that part of the directional pattern of the model may have been accounted for by the impact of the totality of the socialization process within a closed society, countered by a positive perception of social actionist role orientation, in connection with a strong identification with the
denomination as a whole with relation both to fundamentalism and the professional reference system described by Campbell and Pettigrew.

In the 1980 study it was discovered that the relationships of importance were: (1) Social Actionist Role Orientation, (2) Perception of Parishioners' Prejudice, (3) Religious Fundamentalism, (4) Perception of Denominational Position, and (5) Population of Parish Community. In this study the model accounted for slightly over 51% of the variation in clergy prejudice. It was suggested that the first four of these variables fit together to form a unified self image for clergy of themselves as dedicated fundamentalist religious professionals, whose stance as social actionists was in accord with denominational policies. It was pointed out that the decrease in prejudice could not be interpreted as a steady linear progression, but that actual integration of conferences in the early 1970's had caused a major attitudinal change, which was being mitigated again by 1980.

The fact that fundamentalism's correlation with prejudice had declined somewhat may have been due to the character of the role orientation variable as displaying a dual base of cultural and religiously fundamental composition.

**Longitudinal Model**

The prediction of a significant decrease in clergy prejudice was borne out by the data. Inspection of the financial data indicated
that a good deal of decline may have taken place before the postulated rise in prejudice in 1973 occasioned by the actual integration of the conference. The reduction in prejudice since that event may well have been even more dramatic in its decline. It is speculated that federal law and national Methodist policy have had an effect. Given the fact that the reaction to integration of the conference in 1973 was so strongly negative, however, it is not clear that these factors are responsible for the improvement, or whether other forces are at work. The possibility was noted that perhaps national, cultural and religious norms were slowly making inroads into Southern thinking with the rise in significance of the relationship of social actionism, fundamentalism and especially perception of denominational policy (as interpreted through Campbell and Pettigrew's professional reference system). This implication is supported by the fact that, although the denomination as a reference base may have declined somewhat, it is linked more solidly with social actionism and fundamentalism.

General Theoretic Model

Referring back to the general mode of the theoretical framework presented as Figure One in Chapter Three, nine general relationships were asserted. Several of these are documented in the literature section as historical fact while the others have had some light shed on them from the results of this study. For easy comparison they will
be discussed here in the order in which they were presented in the model.

First according to White (1972), it was primarily the American constituting norm of democracy which made possible the inception and growth of the South's stance on slavery and prejudice. This proposition seems well taken and is supported by the historical facts of slavery in the South, largely unchecked (until the advent of the civil war) by federal authority. The fact of slavery as a regional phenomenon gave rise to justifications for its existence. These were constructed in the form of attitudes of prejudice which were institutionalized into cultural norms through socialization, along with attendant behavioral patterns of discrimination.

Second, the conflict between these regional cultural norms of prejudice and Christian norms of equality necessitated the manufacture of religious justifications which would allow southerners to be prejudiced and Christian without undue dissonance. Christianity was not the only source of such justifications, as Chapter Two points out, but it provided a partial element in cultural acceptance of prejudice.

Third, the relation of these southern norms by means of socialization to clergy levels of prejudice through the independent variables comprises the specific model. This has already been discussed.

Fourth, the confrontary element of the model emanating from the constituting norms concerns the effect of these norms (notably
democracy) on the formation of federal laws relating to integration. This was also discussed in the form of the comparatively recent (early 1900's) enactment and enforcement of laws designed to integrate the south and elevate the status of blacks.

Numbers five and six represent the impact of national norms on Methodist policies concerning integration formally announced in 1969. Although this was not formally discussed as a separate item, it seems not unreasonable to assert that these influences acted as motivating forces (brought to bear in part by the World Council of Churches) in the adoption of Methodism's formal policy of integration for all of their conferences. This would be but another example of the interaction of religion with its surrounding cultural norms and expectations.

The additional influence, Six (a), portrays the effect of biblical Christian norms as generally alluded to in earlier chapters upon the formulation of Methodism's integrational position. No doubt these were more effective since their relationship to the question of discrimination had already been interpreted by other major religious bodies, both denominational and interdenominational at that time.

Seven depicts the possible consequences of this policy for the specific model. As it was presented, this was, along with national laws and norms, presumed to be a mechanism in the decrease of prejudice through the vehicle of enforced behavioral modification. In the case of the conference merger in Mississippi, this should have
been a major factor in reducing prejudice in the sense posited by Gordon (1964) through interracial contact. If the financial data's contribution to the study is correctly interpreted as a strong wave of resentment and prejudice following conference integration in 1873, with subsequent slow lessening of these attitudes, this part of the model would seem not to have been contradicted. Although it may still be argued that the time period of seven years is too short to properly assess the results of integration on clergy prejudice, its reduction over the study period might be seen as supportive of the theory.

Number eight symbolizes the reciprocal effects of southern cultural norms and federal laws. Obviously the conditions of discrimination based on the south's norms of prejudice were the basis for the enactment of the federal laws in question. It cannot be concluded from this study, however, that these laws have positively affected the prejudicial attitudes of southern people, since the direct impact of federal law was not investigated.

The ninth relationship is similar to number seven, being only more general in effect than the specific ways in which Methodist policy was hypothesized to have affected clergy prejudice.

Summary

As a brief summary to this section, we generally conclude that the specific and longitudinal models as presented, while not as
effective as had been hoped in explaining the prejudicial attitudes and change of prejudicial attitudes that were discovered among Mississippi Methodist clergymen by this study, nevertheless did evidence some utility in these areas. The preceding discussion has sought to interpret the results of the data in light of the theory. It is clear that more research would be necessary to answer the questions which have been suggested.

Study Limitations and Recommendations

To this point the data have indicated that clergy prejudice has become most strongly related to social actionist role orientation, and that fundamentalism, perception of denominational policy, and perception of parishioner prejudice are also related. On the average, clergy were more prejudiced in 1969 than in 1980. Apparently age and seminary education had ceased in the 1980 study to have an impact on prejudice, and ministering in an urban area, although close, failed to produce any variation significantly different from that in rural areas. This may have been due to the cancellation effect mentioned of having younger ministers typically assigned to smaller rural churches. Perception of community prejudice produced a difference only at the zero order level, and the Traditionalist Role Orientation had no effect on prejudice in the 1980 study.
Concepts of Measurement

In reflecting back on the study, it would appear that there were several aspects of it that functioned as limiting factors. The first of these was the aspect of measurement, particularly in the area of validity. Those issues which have already been discussed will not be raised again in this section (such as the dual bases of traditionalism and fundamentalism), but the validity of the measurement of the dependent variable should be mentioned. Because of the fact that racial prejudice covers a broad area, it encompasses many attitudes. One's prejudicial stereotypic judgments of another may include attitudes on physical, mental, spiritual, moral and even political preferences as well as more specific areas within these categories. Given the items which were used in the construction of the prejudice scale, it might be argued that what was being measured more specifically were attitudes on civil rights. One recommendation for future research would be to clarify and refine the concept of racial prejudice in such a way that it becomes more amenable to measurement. Further conceptual clarification also is needed for the definitional areas of integration as compared with and distinguished from racial desegregation.
Generalization

Another limitation of the study is the lack of its generalizability. Although from the standpoint of the access granted the author into the Mississippi Conference, this problem was inherent in the research design, it remains that the results cannot be applied to any larger population. This is not to say that the results are not in accord with other studies, since they seem for the most part to fit the overall pattern rather well. However, a future study using a random sample from a larger population, might reveal whether or not these specific findings did agree with the overall pattern of the south.

District Prejudice

Another limitation of the problem which was conceptualized centered around the fact that the study treated the Southern Mississippi Conference as a unit, rather than as districts. Informal conversation with an ex-clergyman from the conference revealed that the several districts within the conference tend to centralize around the person of the district superintendent, as well as other variables. This leads to the speculation that there may be significant differences in prejudice, as well as in other study variables, between the districts. It is suggested that future research endeavor to separate the
Clergy Recruitment

It has been mentioned that the younger clergymen tend to be better educated than their older colleagues. From impressions received in the course of the research, it seemed that the younger men also had a more overall sense of professionalism in their approach to the ministry than did the older men. Given the fact that there are generally more ministerial positions than clergy to fill them, it might be suggested that future studies investigate denominational recruitment policies as well as placing a greater emphasis on the minister's self image as a professional.

Data Implications

The major implication of this study is felt to be connected with the anomaly presented earlier on in the study. On the one hand, the data indicate a significant decrease in racial prejudice, even with the evidence of the financial data of a rise in resentment between measurements. On the other hand, although black and white clergy interaction appeared to be friendly, there was little evidence of any real interactional integration at that level. Nor was there any indication that integration was being achieved at the congregational
level (with the exception of only two known churches where there is at least some integration of the congregation). These facts point back to the misgivings mentioned earlier concerning the measurement of prejudice. While it is clear that prejudice and integration are separately defined concepts, one would perhaps expect some empirical relationship between them.

It is possible that the relationship mentioned may be interpreted simply through the passing of time. It seems clear that prejudice is decreasing, and it may also be posited that the fact that black clergy are less prejudiced than white is an indication of some of this positive attitude being reciprocated. Since attitudes and behavior do seem to be related, if the change in attitude is real, then perhaps time will reveal behavioral modifications as well.

Despite Silver's assertions that Mississippi is a closed society, some change is occurring. Although this change has been largely in the area of attitudes, the relations between black and white clergy are at least friendly and not unduly strained and marked by tension. These observations would perhaps imply that behavioral modification may follow, if no further motivations to resentment and conflict occur, and if the trend of decreasing prejudice continues.

Summary

In this chapter the meaning and application of the data to the
models has been discussed. There was also an attempt to assess the relevant theoretical concepts with respect to the findings of both studies. Some seeming anomalies have been pointed out between the quantitative data and the informal conversations and impressions recorded by the author. These have generated questions concerning the validity of the measurement methodology employed.

**Conclusion**

With the exception of limited resentment on the part of some clergy to being subjected to yet another academic study, the overall attitude of this group toward the author was generally warm, helpful, and receptive. In fairness it should be stated that such resentment as existed was probably not without cause. Few denied that a racial problem existed in Mississippi; but many pointed out that it was not the sole racial problem existing in America and were of the opinion that they had been the recipients of an undue amount of observations, suspicion, criticism and outright hatred. Many also stated that while they recognized the problem they felt that the solution should be sought from within, and that it should not be expected overnight.

This position is well stated in a paper by the former Bishop of the Southern Mississippi Conference, E. J. Pendergrass. The Reverend Pendergrass points out the inadequacies of the summer projects staffed by northern young people who came to Mississippi with attitudes of
"moral superiority and self-righteousness" (p.2). He suggests that temporary leadership of this nature is more harmful than helpful. "If they really and truly want to help our situation, they ought to ask for a transfer into this conference and work with our people permanently. If they would be willing to love our people, to visit the sick, to bury the dead and train our young people, our members would ultimately listen to them. But not otherwise." (p.5) He contends that while radical change of the nature desired by integrationists cannot be expected overnight, it can be accomplished. It should be obvious that no solidly entrenched cultural norm will change with rapidity, but changes have been, and are being made in the outlooks of most Mississippians. In the words of the reverend E. J. Pendergrass: "I am firmly convinced that the vast majority of Methodists in Mississippi can be ultimately persuaded to accept our church's policies, even though they disagree with them now. But their acceptance will have to be gained by persuasion. It cannot be accomplished by pressure." (p. 5)

On the basis of this study, it seems that Dr. Pendergrass's perception of the way things were in 1964 have been confirmed. Moreover, there is evidence to suggest that Mississippi Methodists are adjusting to church policy, but as of the present time the adjustment is still in process.
Footnotes

1 The value of T for the difference of prejudice means was found to be equal to 7.506 which was significant at the .001 level.

2 Significance order was taken from the entrance of the variables into the stepwise regression model.

3 Significance order was taken from the entrance of the variables into the stepwise regression model. The last four were deleted because of low significance values.

4 After extended conversations with many of the clergymen and several of the district superintendents, and after reading the comments on the questionnaires, the author's personal feeling is that there is a need for clarification of the concept of prejudice as well as of its operationalization. It was earlier stated that prejudice is "a negative attitude toward a group of people" (Luhman & Gilman; 1980:61), generally based on stereotypes. This definition does not lend itself readily to measurement, as a number of problems arise. Although the term is most often used in relation to racial or ethnic groups, it is clear that other kinds of groups may also be victims of prejudice.
Religious groups, for instance, may be discriminated against on the basis of prejudice, even though they are comprised of people of varied racial stock. Mormons, as an example, were discriminated against historically because of their belief in the practice of polygamy. But in this case the discrimination could hardly be said to be based on stereotypic prejudice. Certainly non-Mormons held negative feelings towards them, but there was no need for use of a stereotype. Mormons at that time did in fact believe in the rightness of polygamy. The assumption basic to prejudice is that the negative feelings held toward the disadvantaged group are not true, at least not for all members of the group. If negative feelings or beliefs held toward a group are based on accurate assumptions or factual information, it is questionable whether the resultant attitude may still be labeled as prejudice, or whether it can more accurately be seen simply as a reaction to a value disagreement. It would seem reasonable to argue that, if a judgment of incompetence is made against a man only because he is black, and with the absence of any other indications of actual incompetence, prejudice is indeed the basis for that judgment. But if the man is judged to be incompetent on the same criteria that would be used for any other, then prejudice could not be said to be a determining factor.
It has been argued that American blacks deserve preferential treatment because of all of the disadvantage they have suffered in the past as a result of prejudice and discrimination. It is not the purpose of this study to comment on the rightness or wrongness of this value position, but it should be noted that it is in fact a value position. Unfortunately, there have been instances when proponents of this opinion have claimed that prejudice and discrimination were at work when blacks failed to receive preferential treatment. No matter what one's value stance is on this issue, if all individuals in any category are judged on the same criteria as to their competence, we cannot claim that prejudice is being employed in resulting judgments. This is still categorically true even if the standards or criteria are unfair to any one group.

This contention sidesteps the subject of institutionalized discrimination. However, it could be argued that in order to utilize the argument that a whole group is being discriminated against for stereotyped characteristics, it is necessary to show that all are not different or subnormal in some way associated with a given characteristic such as race, which is in itself the same kind of generalization utilized in stereotyping. The pivotal issue would appear to be the use to which such generalizations are put, which leads back to the problem of value positions.
The application of the foregoing argument to this study is that it is possible that white Mississippi Methodist clergy may be being seen as prejudicial when the real issue may be that of a difference in value judgments. As mentioned earlier, many of the clergy held certain of their black colleagues in high esteem. One of the open-ended items on the 1980 study questionnaire asked the respondent to name five clergymen in his conference who were providing good leadership to the church. Of 78 who fully answered this question, 41 included the name of one particular black clergymen, indicating their respect for his leadership. It is possible that what is assumed to be the measurement of prejudice may include some proportion of an honest attempt to state levels of competency of southern blacks. Was the district superintendent who reported that many of his black clergymen were inadequate in their ability to read and write prejudiced, or only reporting a fact?

The attitude of many of the white clergy appears to be that they perceive the majority of southern blacks as poor, uneducated and unsuited to responsibilities requiring education and/or professional training. Many, however, do not appear to feel that these differences are an integral or inherent racial genetic phenomenon. Most of the white clergy seem to want to extend to blacks all available opportunities to better themselves educationally, economically, and politically. Only 11 in the 1980 study (6.8%) were against integrated educational facilities, and only 34 (21.1%)
were against blacks being accorded more political power. Perhaps more consideration needs to be given to the concept of prejudice. The complete scope of the study suggests an overall positive attitude on the part of whites which is not well supported by the quantitative data. It is at least possible that we are not measuring what we think we are measuring.
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APPENDIX I

1969 Questionnaire
Mississippi Methodist Church Survey
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Ky. 42101

Department of Sociology
Orville Cunningham

Ministerial Questionnaire

1. Sex

   (1) Male
   (2) Female

2. Age:

   (1) under 24
   (2) 24-29
   (3) 30-34
   (4) 35-39
   (5) 40-49
   (6) 50-59
   (7) 60-69
   (8) 70-79
   (9) 80+

3. Are you married?

   (1) Yes
   (2) No

4. How many dependent children do you have?

   (1) 1
   (2) 2
   (3) 3
   (4) 4
   (5) 5
   (6) 6
   (7) 7
   (8) 8
   (9) 9+
5. What is your present relationship to the conference?

(1) Elder in full connection
(2) Deacon
(3) Probationary member
(4) Lay Pastor
(5) Full-time Lay Pastor
(6) Part-time Lay Pastor
(7) Other

6. What is the highest level of general education that you have achieved?

(1) Some grade school
(2) Grade school
(3) Some high school
(4) High school graduate
(5) Some college
(6) College graduate
(7) Master's degree

7. What is the highest level of special education for the ministry that you have attained?

(1) Conference course of study (correspondence)
(2) Bible school, or institute
(3) Some Seminary
(4) Seminary graduate
(5) Graduate work beyond Seminary
(6) Other

8. At what age did you definitely decide to enter the ministry?

(1) under 10
(2) 10-19
(3) 20-29
(4) 30-39
(5) 40-49
(6) 50-59
(7) 60-69
(8) 70+
9. At what age did you receive a license to preach?

   (1) under 10
   (2) 10-19
   (3) 20-29
   (4) 30-39
   (5) 40-49
   (6) 50-59
   (7) 60-69
   (8) 70+

10. How long have you been in the ministry?

    (1) 1-5 years
    (2) 6-10 years
    (3) 11-15 years
    (4) 16-20 years
    (5) 21-25 years
    (6) 26-30 years
    (7) 31-35 years
    (8) 36-40 years
    (9) 41+

11. How many churches do you now serve?

    (1) 1
    (2) 2
    (3) 3
    (4) 4
    (5) 5
    (6) 6
    (7) 7+
    (8) Not serving

12. How many church members are there on your charge?

    (1) 1-49
    (2) 50-99
    (3) 100-149
    (4) 150-199
    (5) 200-249
    (6) 250-499
    (7) 500-999
    (8) 1000-1499
    (9) 1500+
13. What do you consider to be the normal number of parishioners that one minister can adequately serve?

(1) 1-49
(2) 50-99
(3) 100-149
(4) 150-199
(5) 200-249
(6) 250-499
(7) 500-999
(8) 1000-1499
(9) 1500+

14. How long have you served at your present appointment?

(1) 1
(2) 2
(3) 3
(4) 4
(5) 5
(6) 6
(7) 7
(8) 8
(9) More than 9 years

15. How many charges have you served since entering the ministry?

(1) 1
(2) 2
(3) 3
(4) 4
(5) 5
(6) 6
(7) 7
(8) 8
(9) More than 9

16A Do you engage in any other occupation than that of a minister?

(1) Yes
(2) No

16B If so, what? Please specify:


17. Is your wife employed?

(1) Yes
(2) No

18. Is your wife's salary necessary in order to maintain a stable financial position?

(1) Yes
(2) No

19. What is your present salary range (including travel allowances and utilities if paid)?

(1) under $2000
(2) $2000-2999
(3) $3000-3999
(4) $4000-4999
(5) $5000-5999
(6) $6000-6999
(7) $7000-8999
(8) $9000-10,999
(9) $11,000 or more

20. Do you think that your salary is:

(1) More than adequate
(2) Adequate
(3) Less than adequate

21. In comparison to the average family income of your parishioners do you think that your salary is:

(1) Below average
(2) Average
(3) Above average

22. What is/was your father's highest level of educational achievement?

(1) Some grade school
(2) Completed grade school
(3) Some high school
(4) Completed high school
(5) Completed high school, and also had other training; e.g. technical school, but no college
(6) Some college
(7) College graduate
(8) Some graduate work
(9) Graduate degree--M.D., M.A., Ph.D., etc.
23. What is/was your father's occupation?

(0) Minister
(1) Professional (M.D., lawyer, teacher, etc.)
(2) Business owner or government official
(3) Farmer (over 300 acres)
(4) Clerical worker or salesman
(5) Skilled worker or foreman
(6) Machine operator (operator in a factory; truck driver)
(7) Farmer (under 300 acres)
(8) Unskilled worker, Laborer
(9) Do not know

24. What is the population of the community, town or city in which your church is located?

(1) Open country
(2) less than 350
(3) 350-999
(4) 1000-2499
(5) 2500-4999
(6) 5000-9,999
(7) 10,000-49,999
(8) 50,000-99,999
(9) 100,000 and over

25. How many hours per week do you spend in denomination or conference business?

(1) None
(2) 1-3 hours
(3) 4-6 hours
(4) 7-9 hours
(5) 10-15 hours
(6) More than 15 hours

26. Is your appointment that of:

(1) A pastor of local church
(2) District Superintendent
(3) Special appointment within the conference or jurisdiction
(4) Theological student, etc.
(5) Other
27. How many hours do you spend per week in conducting services and attending meetings in the local church?

   (1) None
   (2) 1-5 hours
   (3) 6-10 hours
   (4) 11-15 hours
   (5) 16-20 hours
   (6) More than 20 hours

28. How many hours do you spend per week in general study (not related to sermon preparation)?

   (1) None
   (2) 30 minutes -1 hour
   (3) 2-4 hours
   (4) 5-7 hours
   (5) 8-9 hours
   (6) 10-15 hours
   (7) More than 15 hours

29. How many hours per week do you spend handling the business administering of the church?

   (1) None
   (2) 1-3 hours
   (3) 4-6 hours
   (4) 7-9 hours
   (5) 10-15 hours
   (6) 16-20 hours
   (7) 21-25 hours
   (8) 26-30 hours
   (9) More than 30 hours

30. How many hours per week do you spend in pastoral visitation?

   (1) None
   (2) 1-3 hours
   (3) 4-6 hours
   (4) 7-9 hours
   (5) 10-15 hours
   (6) 16-20 hours
   (7) 21-25 hours
   (8) 26-30 hours
   (9) More than 30 hours
31. How many hours do you spend per week visiting in the hospital?

(1) None  
(2) 1-2 hours  
(3) 3-5 hours  
(4) 6-8 hours  
(5) 9-10 hours  
(6) More than 10 hours

32. How many hours per week do you spend in preparing sermons?

(1) None  
(2) 1-5 hours  
(3) 6-10 hours  
(4) 11-15 hours  
(5) 16-20 hours  
(6) 21-25 hours  
(7) 26-35 hours  
(8) 36-40 hours  
(9) More than 40 hours

33. How many hours per week do you spend with your family for relaxation and family life in general?

(1) None  
(2) 1-3 hours  
(3) 4-6 hours  
(4) 7-9 hours  
(5) More than 10 hours

34. How many hours per week do you spend in community activities (e.g. P.T.A.; Lions Club; Rotary; Civitan Club; etc.)?

(1) None  
(2) 1-3 hours  
(3) 4-6 hours  
(4) 7-9 hours  
(5) 10-15 hours  
(6) 15+ hours

35. Do you consider your entrance into the ministry to be the result of:

(1) A Divine Call  
(2) An occupational choice  
(3) Desire to serve others  
(4) Influence of another person  
(5) Not certain
36. How many hours per week do you spend in counseling with individuals (other than visiting in the homes)?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-7 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8-10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11-15 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16-20 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21-25 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26-30 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>More than 30 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37A Have you ever considered leaving the ministry?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37B If so, why did you consider leaving the ministry?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with your parishioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Church too &quot;liberal&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Church too conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Too much pressure on you to become successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The church is not what it use to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other, please specify: ________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. List the following categories in the order in which you consider them to be your most important function (e.g., Teaching 1; Counseling 2; Working with the youth 3; etc)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administering the sacraments of the church (e.g. Marriage ceremony, Holy Communion, Baptism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visiting the sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visiting parishioners in their home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaching ministry (e.g., training schools, church schools, minister's training class for new members, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preaching the gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Counseling with individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The business administration of the church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community work (e.g. P.T.A., Lions Club, community projects, Rotary Club, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Worker with youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. What do you think your laymen consider to be your most important function? (Rank by numerical order)

   (1) Administering the sacraments of the church
   (2) Visiting the sick
   (3) Visiting your parishioners in their homes
   (4) A teaching ministry
   (5) Preaching the gospel
   (6) Counseling with individuals
   (7) The business administration of the church
   (8) Community worker
   (9) Youth worker

40. It has been said that for one to be a success in the ministry one must increase one's budget each year, have a net gain in membership etc. Do you:

   (1) slightly agree
   (2) agree
   (3) disagree

41. If a minister is known as a "builder of churches" is he considered to be:

   (1) less successful than other ministers
   (2) equally as successful as other ministers
   (3) More successful than other ministers

42. Does your greatest challenge lie in preaching the gospel or solving such social problems as alcoholism, crime, delinquency, war, etc.?

   (1) Preaching the gospel
   (2) Solving social problems.

43. What do you consider to be the best approach in leading your parishioners to be better Christians?

   (1) Evangelism: Preach the word that all should be saved.
   (2) Precept and example: Living a saintly life before your parishioners.
   (3) Teaching: Teach a child in the way that he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it.
44. Has there been a time in your ministry when "the powers that be" in the conference have put pressure upon you to support the denominational goals?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) No opinion

45. If the "powers that be" apply pressure to you, is this:

(1) Not very often
(2) Often
(3) No opinion

46. As a minister of a local church do you think that you should be concerned with racial discrimination?

(1) Should not be concerned with this
(2) Should only express opinion on this
(3) Should actively engage in this
(4) No opinion

47. As a minister of a local church do you think that you should speak out on the morality of war?

(1) Should not speak out
(2) Should express opinions in private discussion
(3) Should speak out
(4) No opinion

48. How would you describe yourself in terms of national politics?

(1) Democratic
(2) Republican
(3) American Independent Party
(4) Other

49. Do you think that a minister should be a leader for social change?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) No opinion

50. What do you think about the National Council of Churches?

(1) Strongly approve
(2) Approve
(3) Disapprove
(4) Strongly disapprove
(5) No opinion
51. What do you think about integrated public school classrooms?
   _____ (1) Strongly approve
   _____ (2) Approve
   _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disapprove
   _____ (5) Strongly Disapprove

52. Apart from skin color, there are no differences between Negroes and whites.
   _____ (1) Agree
   _____ (2) Disagree
   _____ (3) No opinion

53. Are you familiar with the Methodist Church's ruling on race relations? Do you:
   _____ (1) Agree
   _____ (2) Slightly agree
   _____ (3) Slightly disagree
   _____ (4) Disagree
   _____ (5) No opinion
   _____ (6) Not familiar with.

54. Does the Methodist Church's position on race relations cause any conflict between you and your parishioners?
   _____ (1) None at all
   _____ (2) Only slight conflict
   _____ (3) Tremendous conflict
   _____ (4) No opinion

55. Are there times that your work as a minister causes problems with your own family life?
   _____ (1) Never
   _____ (2) Yes, but not often
   _____ (3) Yes, very often
   _____ (4) Yes, too much
   _____ (5) No opinion

56. Has your education (e.g. college, Seminary) helped you in preparing for the ministry?
   _____ (1) Yes, very much
   _____ (2) Yes, only slightly
   _____ (3) Not at all
   _____ (4) No opinion
57. Would you officiate at the wedding of a Negro and a white?

(1) Yes
(2) No

58. How large was the town in which you grew up?

(1) Open country
(2) less than 350
(3) 350-999
(4) 1000-2499
(5) 2500-4999
(6) 5000-9,999
(7) 10,000-49,999
(8) 50,000-99,999
(9) 100,000 and over

59. Some people believe that people basically are good; other people believe that people basically are bad. When there is a choice between good and evil, how many people would choose to do evil?

(1) Most choose to do evil
(2) Many
(3) Some
(4) Few
(5) None
(6) No response

60. We have all been taught the Ten Commandments and we know of other scriptural statements of what we should do. Which of the following statements comes closest to your feeling about the Commandments?

(1) The Commandments are to be followed because they are rules God has given us in order to lead Christian lives
(2) The Commandments give us a general idea how to live, but we must interpret them ourselves to fit the situation.
(3) No response

61. What do you think about drinking? Is it:

(1) Always wrong
(2) Sometimes wrong
(3) Never wrong
(4) No response
62. Here are four statements which have been made about the Bible. Indicate which is closest to your own view:

(1) The Bible is God's Word and all it says is true
(2) The Bible was written by men who were inspired by God, and its basic moral and religious teachings are true but because the writers were men, it contains some human errors
(3) The Bible is a valuable book because it was written by wise and good men, but God had nothing to do with it
(4) The Bible was written by men who lives so long ago, that it is of little value today;
(5) No response

63. Testifying about one's religious experience should be a part of regular church services.

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Agree
(3) Undecided
(4) Disagree
(5) Strongly disagree
(6) No response

64. I think that it is more important to go to church than to be active in politics.

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Agree
(3) Undecided
(4) Disagree
(5) Strongly disagree
(6) No response

65. Several ideas are mentioned below, indicate the answer closest to your opinion: Negroes should be granted greater political power.

(1) Strongly approve
(2) Approve
(3) No opinion
(4) Disapprove
(5) Strongly disapprove

66. Black militants are justified in seeking reparations from the churches.

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Agree
(3) Undecided
(4) Disagree
(5) Strongly disagree
67. Negroes are pushing too hard for equal rights.
   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) No opinion or not sure
   (4) Disagree
   (5) Strongly disagree

68. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.
   (1) Agree
   (2) Disagree

69. People can be divided into two distinct classes--the weak and the strong.
   (1) Agree
   (2) Disagree

70. Much of our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.
   (1) Agree
   (2) Disagree

71. White Citizens' Councils are needed to combat black power.
   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Approve
   (3) No opinion
   (4) Disapprove
   (5) Strongly disapprove

72. Negroes should be satisfied with separate but equal treatment in education, housing, and jobs.
   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) No opinion or not sure
   (4) Disagree
   (5) Strongly disagree

73. How did you feel about Martin Luther King?
   (1) Strongly approve
   (2) Approve
   (3) No opinion
   (4) Disapprove
   (5) Strongly disapprove
74. Federal civil rights legislation.

____ (1) Strongly approve
____ (2) Approve
____ (3) No opinion
____ (4) Disapprove
____ (5) Strongly disapprove

75. Jesus was born of a virgin.

____ (1) Completely true
____ (2) Probably true
____ (3) Probably not true
____ (4) Definitely not true.

76. The devil actually exists.

____ (1) Completely true
____ (2) Probably true
____ (3) Probably not true
____ (4) Definitely not true.

77. There is life beyond death.

____ (1) Completely true
____ (2) Probably true
____ (3) Probably not true
____ (4) Definitely not true.

78. Following the teachings of Christ about brotherhood, local Methodist churches should be inclusive churches; that is, they should receive into their membership all persons of faith regardless of race or ethnic background.

____ (1) Strongly agree
____ (2) Agree
____ (3) Undecided
____ (4) Disagree
____ (5) Strongly disagree

79. Even though I had learned that the Bishop had more liberal views on racial integration that I had thought, I would continue to give as large a contribution to the church as I had previously given.

____ (1) Yes
____ (2) No
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1980 Questionnaire

A STUDY OF COMPARITIVE FACTORS BEARING ON
CLERGY ATTITUDES ON RACIAL INTEGRATION

Dept. of Sociology and Rural Sociology
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

The following statement is to be read to/by each respondent:

My signature, on this sheet, by which I volunteer to participate in the Mississippi Methodist Clergy racial attitude study indicates that all subjects in the project are volunteers, that I can withdraw at any time from the interview, that I have been informed as to the nature of the research and interview, that the data I provide will be anonymous and my identity will not be revealed without my permission, and that my responses in this interview may be used for additional approved projects. Finally, I shall be given an opportunity to ask questions prior to the start of the interview and after my participation is complete.
Mississippi Methodist Church Survey
Louisiana State University
Department of Sociology
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Ministerial Questionnaire

1. What was your age at your last birthday? ______

2. What is your sex? _____Male
   _____Female

3. What is your race? _____Black
   _____White
   _____Other

4. Please circle the highest grade that you completed in school

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 1 2 3 4 MA PhD
   Grade School High School College

5. Please indicate the highest seminary degree that you hold.

   _____Bachelors of Divinity
   _____Masters of Divinity
   _____Doctorate of Ministry
   _____Other, please specify _____________________

6. What is your present relationship to the conference?


7. How long have you been in the ministry? Please state this time as number of years. ______

8. How many churches do you now serve? ______

9. How many church members are there on your charge?

   _____(1) 1-49
   _____(2) 50-99
   _____(3) 100-149
   _____(4) 150-199
   _____(5) 200-249
10. How long have you served at your present appointment? (number of years) _________

11. What is the population of the community, town or city in which your church is located?

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Open country</td>
<td>(2) less than 350</td>
<td>(3) 350-999</td>
<td>(4) 1000-2499</td>
<td>(5) 2500-4999</td>
<td>(6) 5000-9999</td>
<td>(7) 10,000-49,000</td>
<td>(8) 50,000-99,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How many hours per week do you spend in denomination or conference business?

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) None</td>
<td>(2) 1-3 hours</td>
<td>(3) 4-6 hours</td>
<td>(4) 7-9 hours</td>
<td>(5) 10-15 hours</td>
<td>(6) More than 15 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How many hours per week do you spend handling the business administration of your church?

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) None</td>
<td>(2) 1-3 hours</td>
<td>(3) 4-6 hours</td>
<td>(4) 7-9 hours</td>
<td>(5) 10-15 hours</td>
<td>(6) More than 15 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How many hours per week do you spend in preparing sermons?

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) None</td>
<td>(2) 1-3 hours</td>
<td>(3) 4-6 hours</td>
<td>(4) 7-9 hours</td>
<td>(5) 10-15 hours</td>
<td>(6) More than 15 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Do you consider your entrance into the ministry to be the result of:

- (1) A Divine Call
- (2) An occupational choice
- (3) Desire to serve others
- (4) Influence of another person
- (5) Not certain

16. Please indicate how much you usually enjoy each of the pastoral role activities listed below. Circle one number for each activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyed Very Much</th>
<th>Dislike Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>A. Church admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>B. Pastoral c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>C. Serious s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>D. Helping i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>E. Preaching (i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>F. Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>G. Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>H. Calling on c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>I. Calling on n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>J. Preaching in e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>K. Teaching and t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>L. Raising m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>M. Giving c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>N. Visiting the s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. What do you think your laymen consider to be your most important function? (Rank by numerical order)

- (a) Church administration
- (b) Pastoral counseling with individuals who have problems
- (c) Serious study and writing
- (d) Helping individuals toward Christian decision & commitment
- (e) Preaching (including sermon preparation)
- (f) Participating in denominational activities
- (g) Participating in ecumenical activities
(h) Calling on church members
(i) Calling on non-members
(j) Preaching in evangelistic meetings
(k) Teaching and training adults or youth
(l) Raising money
(m) Giving community leadership on crucial social issues
(n) Visiting the sick and bereaved

18. Does your greatest challenge lie in preaching the gospel or solving such social problems, as alcoholism, crime, delinquency, war, etc.?

(1) Preaching the gospel
(2) Solving social problems

19. What do you consider to be the best approach in leading your parishioners to be better Christians?

(1) Evangelism: Preach the word that all should be saved.
(2) Precept and example: Living a saintly life before your parishioners.
(3) Teaching: Teach a child in the way that he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it.

20. Has there been a time in your ministry when "the powers that be" in the conference have put pressure upon you to support the denominational goals?

(1) Yes
(2) No
(3) No opinion

21. If the "powers that be" apply pressure to you, is this:

(1) Not very often
(2) Often
(3) No opinion

22. As a minister of a local church do you think that you should be concerned with racial discrimination?

(1) Should not be concerned with this
(2) Should only express opinion on this
(3) Should actively engage in this
(4) No opinion
23. How do you think that your congregation feels about your concern on racial discrimination?

(1) Should not be concerned with this
(2) Should only express opinion on this
(3) Should actively engage in this
(4) No opinion

24. How do you think that your community feels about your concern on racial discrimination?

(1) Should not be concerned with this
(2) Should only express opinion on this
(3) Should actively engage in this
(4) No opinion

25. Do you think that a minister should be a leader for social change?

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Agree
(3) Undecided
(4) Disagree
(5) Strongly disagree

26. What do you think about integrated public school classrooms?

(1) Strongly approve
(2) Approve
(3) No opinion
(4) Disapprove
(5) Strongly disapprove

27. How does your congregation feel about integrated public school classroom?

(1) Strongly approve
(2) Approve
(3) No opinion
(4) Disapprove
(5) Strongly disapprove

28. How does your community feel about integrated public school classrooms?

(1) Strongly approve
(2) Approve
(3) No opinion
(4) Disapprove
(5) Strongly disapprove
29. Apart from skin color, there are no differences between Negroes and Whites.

   _____ (1) Strongly agree
   _____ (2) Agree
   _____ (3) Undecided
   _____ (4) Disagree
   _____ (5) Strongly disagree

30. Are you familiar with the Methodist Church's ruling on race relations? Do you?

   _____ (1) Strongly agree
   _____ (2) Agree
   _____ (3) Undecided
   _____ (4) Strongly disagree
   _____ (5) Not familiar with

31. Does the Methodist Church's position on race relations cause any conflict between you and your parishioners?

   (1) None at all
   (2) Only slight conflict
   (3) Tremendous conflict
   (4) No opinion

32. Would you officiate at the wedding of a Negro and a white?

   (1) Yes
   (2) No

33. Have you ever officiated at the wedding of a Negro and a White?

   (1) Yes
   (2) No

34. How large was the town in which you grew up?

   (1) Open country
   (2) less than 350
   (3) 350-999
   (4) 1000-2499
   (5) 2500-4999
   (6) 5000-9999
   (7) 10,000-49,999
   (8) 50,000-99,999
   (9) 100,000 and over
35. Some people believe that people basically are good; other people believe that people basically are bad. When there is a choice between good and evil, how many people would choose to do evil?

(1) Most choose to do evil
(2) Many
(3) Some
(4) Few
(5) None
(6) No response

36. We have all been taught the Ten Commandments and we know of other scriptural statements of what we should do. Which of the following statements come closest to your feeling about the Commandments?

(1) The Commandments are to be followed because they are rules God has given us in order to lead Christian lives.
(2) The Commandments give us a general idea how to live, but we must interpret them ourselves to fit the situation.
(3) No response

37. What do you think about drinking? Is it:

(1) Always wrong
(2) Sometimes wrong
(3) Never wrong
(4) No response

38. Here are four statements which have been made about the Bible. Indicate which is closest to your own view:

(1) The Bible is God's word and all it says is true
(2) The Bible was written by men who were inspired by God, and its basic moral and religious teachings are true but because the writers were men, it contains some human errors.
(3) The Bible is a valuable book because it was written by wise and good men, but God had nothing to do with it.
(4) The Bible was written by men who lived so long ago, that it is of little value today.
(5) No response

39. Several ideas are mentioned below, indicate the answer closest to your opinion: Negroes should be granted greater political power.

   (1) Strongly approve
   (2) Approve
   (3) No opinion
   (4) Disapprove
   (5) Strongly disapprove

40. Black militants are justified in seeking reparations from the churches.

   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) Undecided
   (4) Disagree
   (5) Strongly disagree

41. Negroes are pushing too hard for equal rights.

   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) No opinion or not sure
   (4) Disagree
   (5) Strongly disagree

42. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.

   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) No opinion or not sure
   (4) Disagree
   (5) Strongly disagree

43. White Citizens' Councils are needed to combat black power.

   (1) Strongly approve
   (2) Approve
   (3) No opinion
   (4) Disapprove
   (5) Strongly disapprove
44. Negroes should be satisfied with separate but equal treatment in education, housing, and jobs.

   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) No opinion or not sure
   (4) Disagree
   (5) Strongly disagree

45. The Civil Rights Movement of the 1960's has had a positive effect on Black-White relations in the South.

   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) No opinion
   (4) Disagree
   (5) Strongly disagree

46. Federal Civil Rights legislation has not provided the necessary changes in the South.

   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) No opinion
   (4) Disagree
   (5) Strongly disagree

47. Jesus was born of a virgin.

   (1) Completely true
   (2) Probably true
   (3) Probably not true
   (4) Definitely not true

48. The devil actually exists.

   (1) Completely true
   (2) Probably true
   (3) Probably not true
   (4) Definitely not true

49. There is life beyond death.

   (1) Completely true
   (2) Probably true
   (3) Probably not true
   (4) Definitely not true
50. Following the teachings of Christ about brotherhood, local Methodist churches should be inclusive churches; that is, they should receive into their membership all persons of faith regardless of race or ethnic background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Strongly agree</th>
<th>(2) Agree</th>
<th>(3) Undecided</th>
<th>(4) Disagree</th>
<th>(5) Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

51. Even though I had learned that the Bishop had more liberal views on racial integration than I had thought, I would continue to give as large a contribution to the church as I had previously given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Strongly agree</th>
<th>(2) Agree</th>
<th>(3) Undecided</th>
<th>(4) Disagree</th>
<th>(5) Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

52. Would Negroes be admitted to services of worship at the church which you minister?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Yes</th>
<th>(2) No</th>
<th>(3) Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

53. Is your church (s) in fact integrated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Yes</th>
<th>(2) No</th>
<th>(3) On occasion because of visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

54. Churches should encourage their members to support efforts to reduce racial discrimination in their communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Strongly agree</th>
<th>(2) Agree</th>
<th>(3) Undecided</th>
<th>(4) Disagree</th>
<th>(5) Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
55. How many hours per week do you spend in such work as locating jobs for individuals, taking people to doctors' offices, etc.?

   (0) None
   (1) 1-2 hours
   (2) 3-5 hours
   (3) 6-8 hours
   (4) 9-10 hours
   (5) More than 10 hours

56. Clergy should support race relations by taking an offering on Race Relations Sunday.

   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) Undecided
   (4) Disagree
   (5) Strongly disagree

57. Do you receive a Race Relations offering from your congregation on Race Relations Sunday?

   (1) Yes
   (2) No

58. If answer to the question above is no, why do you not take an offering for Race Relations?

59. The primary task of the church is to live the Christian life among its own membership and activities rather than try and reform the world.

   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) Undecided
   (4) Disagree
   (5) Strongly disagree
60. For the most part, the churches have been woefully inadequate in facing up to the civil rights cause.

____ (1) Strongly Agree
____ (2) Agree
____ (3) Undecided
____ (4) Disagree
____ (5) Strongly disagree

61. The larger church organization should cut off financial support from church institutions (hospitals, missions, etc.) that discriminate against Negroes.

____ (1) Strongly agree
____ (2) Agree
____ (3) Undecided
____ (4) Disagree
____ (5) Strongly disagree

62. Were you born in Mississippi?

____ (1) Yes
____ (2) No

If no, in what state were you born? _____________
63. **INSTRUCTIONS:**
Please answer all questions in this questionnaire. Missing answers tremendously complicate the type of data analysis I will be doing. Many of the questions can be answered by placing a check on a line to the left of one of the answers under each question, or by circling a number on a scale indicating the answer that most nearly represents your own view. Instructions are included with each question as to the way in which it should be answered. In some cases, you may not feel that any of the alternatives really expresses your position. Nevertheless, please check or circle the one answer nearest to your position; then note any comments which you may have at the end of the questionnaire or on separate sheets of paper.

**I. PURPOSES AND GOALS OF THE CHURCH**

What do you think the church ought to be doing? What do you think should be the goals and priorities of the church? After each of the following statements please CIRCLE ONE NUMBER indicating how important you think it is. Read through the list before beginning. Not all of the statements can be highest priority. Therefore, rate 3 most important goals "1", next 3 goals "2", next 3 "3", next 3 "4", and the last 3 and least important goals "5".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE CHURCH OUGHT TO:</th>
<th>RATING OF IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Encourage individual members to carry out acts of charity to needy persons.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintain Christian moral standards among members in the areas of alcoholism, gambling, sexual conduct, and related matters.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourage individual members to support social reform.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assist all members in reflecting on questions of personal morality.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support evangelism programs to convert people to Christ in America.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Study social issues in the light of Biblical teachings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Support evangelical missions overseas to convert the world to Christ.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Support and organise local and denominational programs for aiding needy persons.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Make the church a strong fellowship in which members of all classes and races feel unity and mutual support.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Engage in personal evangelism locally.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provide religious education for children and youth.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provide for guidance and growth of the spiritual life of individual members.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Support groups working for social change to overcome injustice and oppression.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Make competent pastoral counseling available to all persons.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Work for the unity of all Christian believers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other goals (write in):**

**HOW LOOK OVER THE STATEMENTS AND PICK THE ONE WHICH YOU CONSIDER THE MOST IMPORTANT OF ALL. IT IS STATEMENT NUMBER**
64. Since the early 1960's the Mississippi Annual Conference has undergone change. What do you feel are the major changes that have occurred?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

65. What changes would you like to see occur in the Mississippi Annual Conference?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

66. Every conference has those dedicated clergy and laity who provide good strong leadership to the church. Would you list below the names of those individuals who you believe has, and is, providing that leadership to the conference.

Clergy

1. ____________________________

2. ____________________________

3. ____________________________

4. ____________________________

5. ____________________________

Laity

1. ____________________________

2. ____________________________

3. ____________________________

4. ____________________________

5. ____________________________

67. In your opinion, do you think that what has been called a racial problem in Mississippi might more properly be seen as a social class problem? Why do you think it is a social class problem rather than a racial problem?
### APPENDIX III

#### Sample Financial Page

**THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH—MISSISSIPPI CONFERENCE**

**STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1976**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>Balance January 1, 1976</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Disbursements</th>
<th>Balance December 31, 1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Superintendent</td>
<td>$34,409.46</td>
<td>$144,938.62</td>
<td>$172,311.05</td>
<td><strong>$1,067.01</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>2,826.36</td>
<td>32,199.90</td>
<td>36,024.50</td>
<td><strong>18.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Fund</td>
<td>1,077.51</td>
<td>978,876.81</td>
<td>110,635.00</td>
<td><strong>1,284,348.72</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Salary (Exh. D)</td>
<td>14,878.37</td>
<td>134,761.56</td>
<td>123,745.87</td>
<td>10,831.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Group Insurance (Exh. H)</td>
<td>2,777.27</td>
<td>10,297.48</td>
<td>8,756.81</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>2,905.31</td>
<td>10,670.23</td>
<td>13,200.02</td>
<td><strong>2,318.43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional</td>
<td>273.45</td>
<td>1,335.97</td>
<td>3,953.78</td>
<td><strong>827.14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Denominational Aid</td>
<td>19,085.81</td>
<td>11,174.89</td>
<td>24,173.81</td>
<td><strong>6,007.45</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Gifts to Conf. Endow (Exh. C)</td>
<td>520.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Endowment (Exh. C)</td>
<td>42,095.60</td>
<td>142,765.36</td>
<td>182,182.30</td>
<td><strong>2,703.51</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millsaps College</td>
<td>12,072.97</td>
<td>503,277.22</td>
<td>581,164.33</td>
<td>41,204.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Home</td>
<td>48,195.60</td>
<td>142,765.36</td>
<td>182,182.30</td>
<td>2,703.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabourn Home</td>
<td>2,905.31</td>
<td>10,670.23</td>
<td>13,200.02</td>
<td><strong>2,318.43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabourn Dental Retirement</td>
<td>6,725.84</td>
<td>23,342.18</td>
<td>29,146.91</td>
<td><strong>811.91</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabourn Manor</td>
<td>2,905.31</td>
<td>10,670.23</td>
<td>13,200.02</td>
<td><strong>2,318.43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial Education</td>
<td>20,095.29</td>
<td>62,725.09</td>
<td>77,200.04</td>
<td>3,336.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Wesley Pine</td>
<td>8,421.18</td>
<td>23,342.18</td>
<td>29,146.91</td>
<td><strong>811.91</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Foundation Support</td>
<td>28,318.10</td>
<td>19,023.36</td>
<td>24,014.01</td>
<td><strong>4,700.06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired College</td>
<td>19,755.10</td>
<td>24,023.36</td>
<td>24,023.36</td>
<td><strong>19,755.10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black College</td>
<td>7,354.31</td>
<td>19,723.35</td>
<td>27,044.53</td>
<td><strong>3,023.23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Gifts to World Service</td>
<td>979.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Great Hour of Sharing</td>
<td>218.00</td>
<td>29,727.67</td>
<td>29,727.67</td>
<td><strong>176.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Convention Offering</td>
<td>3,646.40</td>
<td>12,755.90</td>
<td>15,794.35</td>
<td><strong>909.45</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations Day</td>
<td>211.40</td>
<td>985.10</td>
<td>1044.10</td>
<td><strong>66.55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Service</td>
<td>3,000.75</td>
<td>1,001.78</td>
<td>8,196.84</td>
<td><strong>105.75</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Student Day</td>
<td>713.70</td>
<td>1,001.78</td>
<td>8,196.84</td>
<td><strong>105.75</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Cross</td>
<td>2,384.44</td>
<td>946.92</td>
<td>227.89</td>
<td><strong>3,102.58</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education Sunday</td>
<td>320.68</td>
<td>335.16</td>
<td>881.81</td>
<td><strong>251.83</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Funds</td>
<td>4,708.18</td>
<td>84,747.67</td>
<td>87,772.54</td>
<td><strong>2,724.31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Junaluska</td>
<td>3,646.72</td>
<td>19,368.71</td>
<td>20,103.84</td>
<td><strong>2,612.53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Disaster Relief</td>
<td>28,318.10</td>
<td>20,649.42</td>
<td>20,649.42</td>
<td><strong>28,318.10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters Building</td>
<td>644.18</td>
<td>644.18</td>
<td><strong>644.18</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legent Memorial</td>
<td>532.00</td>
<td>3,241.97</td>
<td>3,013.83</td>
<td><strong>561.19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Methodist Fund</td>
<td>5,218.65</td>
<td>6,346.90</td>
<td>8,040.38</td>
<td><strong>1,548.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Specials (Exhibit E)</td>
<td>31,371.60</td>
<td>90,597.67</td>
<td>94,995.42</td>
<td><strong>21,379.34</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Endow. (Exhibit C)</td>
<td>1,023.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving Fund</td>
<td>166,230.19</td>
<td>12,804.12</td>
<td>50,007.20</td>
<td><strong>124,029.38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Assembly</td>
<td>1,044.98</td>
<td>3,656.62</td>
<td>4,066.62</td>
<td><strong>654.98</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Memorial</td>
<td>668.43</td>
<td>4,825.00</td>
<td>9,442.68</td>
<td><strong>353.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Life Retreat</td>
<td>36.49</td>
<td>8,850.39</td>
<td>9,051.42</td>
<td><strong>(117.33)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Chapel</td>
<td>1,811.66</td>
<td>10,152.32</td>
<td>9,765.64</td>
<td><strong>1,870.33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Indian Mission</td>
<td>761.34</td>
<td>7,761.33</td>
<td>3,008.00</td>
<td><strong>2,435.13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplains, University Hospital</td>
<td>1,776.79</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>1,784.76</td>
<td><strong>10.26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>131,737,192.46</td>
<td>511,147,617,47</td>
<td>11,124,174,14</td>
<td><strong>23,636,864.22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Notes: A minus sign represents a deficit.

1. Includes prior year receipts of $1,054,31.
2. Balance of $2,573,91 transferred to Conference Reserve to cover a portion of the deficit in this fund.
3. Balances in the Fund of $2,358,75 transferred to cover the deficit in the Conference Endowment Fund, the Wesley Foundation Support and the Chaplains, University Fund.
The author, John J. Nelson, was born on December 31, 1937, in Clyde, Alberta, Canada. He attended Public and High Schools in Edmonton, Alberta. After leaving high school he worked for several years in a variety of jobs before entering Canadian Bible College in September of 1959. After marriage in 1963, he transferred to Bethel College in Indiana, where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1966 majoring in music performance. After acquiring a Bachelor of Science degree in theology from Simpson College at San Francisco in 1981, he entered the ministry. Subsequent to serving as a pastor and teaching at Mountain View College in Canada, he was accepted into the graduate program at University of Calgary where he earned the Master of Arts degree in Sociology in November of 1977. The author is currently a candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology, to be conferred at the summer commencement, August, 1982.
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