

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations, Spring  
1920 to Summer 2023

Graduate Studies

---

12-2008

## Inter-Religious Marriage and Migration

Maggie Y. Bohm  
*Utah State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Bohm, Maggie Y., "Inter-Religious Marriage and Migration" (2008). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations, Spring 1920 to Summer 2023*. 140.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/140>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations, Spring 1920 to Summer 2023 by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



INTER-RELIGIOUS MARRIAGE AND MIGRATION

by

Maggie Y. Böhm

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Sociology

Approved:

---

Michael B. Toney  
Major Professor

---

E. Helen Berry  
Committee Member

---

Kelly Hardwick  
Committee Member

---

Byron R. Burnham  
Dean of Graduate Studies

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY  
Logan, Utah

2008

Copyright © Maggie Y. Böhm 2008

All Rights Reserved

## ABSTRACT

## Inter-Religious Marriage and Migration

by

Maggie Y. Böhm, Master of Science

Utah State University, 2008

Major Professor: Dr. Michael B. Toney  
Department: Sociology

This study analyzes the influence of 1) inter-religious marriage and 2) differing levels of church attendance within a married couple on migration behavior. The study draws from previous research on inter-racial marriage for a framework to examine whether there is reason to expect a relationship between migration and inter-religious marriage. We hypothesize that the propensity for migration is higher for inter-religious couples than for couples constituted by individuals of the same religion and for couples who attend church at different frequencies. To examine the hypotheses, this study uses age, education, and length of residence as controls in logistic models.

Theories that have been utilized in examining the effects of inter-group marriages, especially inter-racial marriages, on the behavior of couples provide theoretical guidance for the analysis. Largely, this research, as well as research on other differences between husbands and wives, indicates that inter-group married couples have higher migration rates than intra-groups couples. Data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth in

1979 are used to analyze the relationships between these aspects of religious identities and migration and between church attendance and migration. Results actually show slightly lower migration odds for inter-group couples than for intra-group couples. Thus, our hypothesis is rejected.

(62 pages)

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. Michael B. Toney, for his thorough editing and comments. Dr. Mike's and Dr. Eddy's endless support, encouragement, and faith have helped me to achieve the confidence to accomplish this thesis and my M.S. degree. I would also like to thank my other committee members, Dr. E. "Eddy" Helen Berry and Dr. Kelly Hardwick, for their support and assistance throughout this process.

I give special thanks to my colleagues for their tremendous encouragement and moral support, which has helped me mentally and physically throughout my two years here at USU: Chih-Yao Chang, Theresa Fedor, Yan Guo, Joyce Mumah, Sang Lim "Viva" Lee, Hyo Jun Park, Lisa Ralph, Rebecca Smith, Stephen VanGeem, and especially Jordan W. Smith for your patience, thank you.

Finally, I would like to thank my family: my dad, "Ma" Grant, YoYo, my beagles, Tommy and Tiffany, and Uncle Del. They have been with me every step of the way.

Thank you all for your endless support and encouragement. Without you, I would not be where I am today. You are my biggest fans, and I am so grateful to have you in my life.

Maggie Y. Böhm

## CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Why Study Religion? .....	3
Migration .....	4
II. LITERATURE REVIEW .....	7
Social Support .....	10
Religious Organization Attendance .....	11
Why People Migrate .....	13
Theoretical Framework .....	14
III. DATA AND METHODS .....	16
National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 .....	16
Dependent Variable .....	18
Independent Variables .....	18
Descriptive Data .....	24
Analysis .....	25
Limitations .....	27
IV. RESULTS.....	28
Inter-Religious Marriage and Migration .....	28
Church Attendance and Migration .....	30
V. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION.....	34
Discussion .....	35
Final Comments .....	38
REFERENCES .....	40

APPENDICES .....	48
Appendix A. Self Described Religious Identification of U.S. Adult Population, 1990-2001 .....	49
Appendix B. Logistic Regression of Catholic to Migration .....	51
Appendix C. Logistic Regression of Protestant <sup>a</sup> to Migration .....	52
Appendix D. Logistic Regression of Frequency of Catholic Attendance to Migration .....	53
Appendix E. Logistic Regression of Frequency of Protestant <sup>a</sup> Attendance to Migration .....	54

---

<sup>a</sup> Protestant includes Baptist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Methodist.



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2-1 Religious Identification in ARIS 2001 and NLSY, 1979.....	9
3-1 Present Religious Affiliation of Respondent and Spouse, 2000.....	19
3-2 Religious Affiliation of Respondent and Spouse, 2000 .....	21
3-3 Frequency of Religious Attendance of Respondent and Spouse, 2000 .....	22
3-4 Frequency of Religious Attendance Between Respondent and Spouse, 2000 .....	23
3-5 Summary of Dependent and Independent Variables .....	25
4-1 Logistic Regression of Religious Composition to Migration.....	31
4-2 Logistic Regression of Frequency of Religious Attendance to Migration .....	32

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between inter-group marriage and migration. Two forms of inter-group couples are examined in order to provide a broad assessment of the effects of religious differences between spouses on their migration: 1) spouses belonging to the same religious group and 2) spouses attending church at the same frequency. One of the analyses involves comparing the migration of those who marry within their religious group with couples formed by spouses belonging to different religions, referred to as spousal religious identities. The second analysis focuses on couples who attend religious services at different levels of frequency. A secondary objective of this research is to reexamine other individual-level characteristics known to affect migration.

Religious identity is one of the strongest identities among the many dimensions that individuals use to set themselves apart from one another. Although one can change religions, most individuals adhere to the religion into which he or she was born. That individual's self-identify with a religious group indicates a measure of its importance in his or her life. Similarly, religious identity is often an important consideration in the formation and nature of relationships between individuals.

While sociological research on the influences of religion held a critical position in early empirical sociology studies, it has declined as more emphasis has been given to gender, race, ethnicity, and other identities. Marriage outside of one's religion may impact identity and relationships in social networks. Similarly, differences in spouses' level of religious involvement (as reflected in frequency of church attendance) might

affect a couple's relationships within their social networks. A supposition of this study is that inter-religious marriages may create dissonance, which couples may attempt to escape by migrating.

There are many ways to observe and measure an individual's religious identity and religiosity. This study employs information gathered in a wave of the survey conducted in 2000 for the 1979 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth from questions that asked individuals to self-identify their religion and their spouse's religion. For religiosity, information from separate questions asking respondents about how frequently they and their spouse attend church is used. Information provided by NLSY79 on the date of the marriage is used to determine when the respondent and their current spouse were married. Migration and other characteristics are measured over the two years following the marriage. Other characteristics to be examined in relation to migration in the multivariate analyses are age, education, and length of residence.

Will inter-religious marriage influence a couple's migration pattern? With this question in mind, the study draws on the logic and findings from other related studies of inter-racial marriage as well as studies of inter-group couples for theoretical guidance. Research indicates less social support and higher divorce rates for inter-religious married couples than for intra-religious marriages (Bahr 1981). Researchers have shown that those having higher social support tend to have a lower likelihood of migration than those with lower levels of social support (Killian 2002; Myers 2000; Taylor and Chatters 1988). Past research has also shown that unusual disparities between husbands and wives

in education, occupation, and income are associated with higher rates of migration (Lee, Toney, and Berry 2003).

### **Why Study Religion?**

Sociologists' interest in the study of religion began at the discipline's origin and has remained an area of concern. Many of the founders of sociology such as Durkheim, Marx, and Weber perceived religion as having powerful influence on individuals and societies. One of the main reasons for sociologists to study religion is its persistence and differential development across societies and historical periods.

Sociologists tend to study the interaction between people in groups and try to understand the dynamics of group life and the influence that the group has on individual behavior. Since religious groups are important in societies, research is needed to examine whether membership across different religious groups and different levels of religious involvement affects various behaviors. Migration is an important form of behavior that individuals may employ when they confront negative situations within their social networks (Lee 1966).

Religion can be defined in many ways. According to Johnstone (1997:13), religion is "a system of beliefs and practices by which a group of people interprets and responds to what they feel is sacred and, usually, supernatural as well." Many religions are similar to one another in that they share common beliefs and practices. However, there are significant differences between religious groups. What may appear to be a minor difference to outsiders may be of utmost importance to members of a particular

religious group. Indeed, religious groups tend to emphasize unique beliefs or practices that distinguish them from other religious groups.

Wilson (1978:19) notes that “it is from social pressure that people derive the idea of a power outside themselves in dominion over them.” Durkheim also views religion as a symbolic representation of the relationship between the individual and the society. In other words, religion influences the individual as well as the society. Religion has been one of the strongest forces in societies throughout history (Wilson 1978).

Religion has been a main cause of conflict as well as a main source for avoiding and ending conflict. Some religious-based conflicts have been between subgroups within major religious groupings, while others have been between members of the world’s major religions. Indeed, religion has continued to be a cause of conflict between individuals within and between societies. The importance of religion in American society is indicated by the level of voluntary service that involves religious groups over other volunteer organizations. Clearly, religion continues to influence many social and political issues in today’s societies (Steensland et al. 2000). Furthermore, in the recent past and as far back as biblical times, religious identity and beliefs have been responsible for many prominent migration flows (Herberg 1965). Many movements into and out of settlements were often determined by religious beliefs and practices (Sutherland 1936:142).

## **Migration**

Migration can be defined in many ways. In demographic studies, it has typically been defined as a move that results in a permanent change in the place in which one lives. Many researchers indicate that the move must also be of a significant distance. In his

classic article on migration, Lee (1966) argues that no restriction on distance should be used in defining migration. To Lee, migration is a move of any distance that results in a change of residence. In other words, migration can be a short-distance move from one block to another, or a long-distance move from one country to another. There are also issues regarding whether or not permanency in the new residence should be considered as a defining factor in migration.

Past research shows that many individuals go through a series of short-term residences, particularly during young adult years (Morrison and DaVanzo 1986). Lee (1966) employs a comprehensive version of the “push-pull” model to help us understand this pattern of migration. This migration model contends that some individuals are pushed from one place by negative conditions, while others are pulled by positive factors to alternative places. He notes that obstacles between where a person lives and alternative places of residence help determine whether or not an individual will migrate. Lee further elaborates that the characteristics of individuals influence whether or not they will migrate and that individuals with different characteristics are impacted differently by the socioeconomic characteristics of places. Personal characteristics reflect the knowledge about alternative places, resources to support a move, and the level of willingness towards movement of individuals. Hence, individual characteristics and circumstances play key roles in the push-pull model of migration.

Migration can have a pervasive influence on communities as well as on individuals, and it offers a means for individuals to adjust to their social and personal situations (Toney, Stinner, and Kan 1983). The general consensus in migration literature

is that migration is a complex process that is determined by a large number of individual and place characteristics. Indeed, Lee (1966) maintains that the factors influencing migration decisions are countless. A guiding premise of this study is that inter-group marriage bestows a characteristic on couples that helps determine whether or not they migrate. Previous research indicates that individuals who marry outside the main group with which they identify face higher degrees of social pressure than couples who marry within their groups (Killian 2002; McNamara, Tempenis, and Walton 1999).

As past researchers have noted, there are many determinants of migration. In this study, characteristics that are most commonly recognized as important determinants of migration are included in a multivariate analysis (Lutz, Goujon, and Doblhammer-Reiter 1998; Shaw 1975). These characteristics are age, education, and length of residence. Logistic regression analysis is the analytical method used in this study, with migration occurring within two years of marriage serving as the dependent variable. Two key independent variables, inter-religious marriage and spouses attending church at the same frequency are examined. Age, education, and length of residence are introduced in logistic models to determine the influence of the key independent variables once these other important determinants of migration are controlled. Because the NLSY79 did not code some Protestant groups, separate analyses are provided for Catholics (Appendix B and D), Protestants (Appendix C and E). The separate analysis for Catholics offers a clear-cut comparison of inter-religious marriages.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

Inter-religious marriage is defined as marrying someone outside of one's religious affiliation, or, as Cavan (1970:313) defines it, "Marrying out of a religion means marrying into some other system." However, while inter-religious marriage is becoming more common, endogamous marriages remains the norm (Heaton 1990). Previous research shows inter-racial couples tend to have higher levels of education (Lieberson and Waters 1988; Qian, Blair, and Ruf 2001), lack of social support (Luke and Carington 2000; Okun 1996), higher divorce rates (Cheng and Yamamura 1957; Clark 1995), and that all are more likely to have experienced discrimination (Dainton 1999; Leigh and Letiecq 2004) as a result of inter-racial marriage.

Kalmijn (1998) found that most studies of inter-religious married couples have been conducted in religiously heterogeneous societies. In the United States, both Catholics and Protestants have a tendency to marry within, rather than outside, their group (1991). Glenn (1982) estimates that in the United States, 62 percent of Catholics are married within their group, 84 percent of Protestants are married endogenously, and 80 percent of Jews are married endogenously. Johnson (1980) found that in the United States, Catholics are somewhat more "closed," or endogamous, than Protestants.

Research shows that the American population is religiously diverse, with members from all of the world's largest religious groups being represented. Research also shows that numerous small religious groups have formed in United States. The 2000 American Religious Identity Survey (ARIS) indicates that just over 80 percent of



Americans identify with a religious group, with more identifying as Christian than with any other religion. Catholics are the largest single unified group (Table 1). They make up 24.5 percent of the population. Members of various Protestant religious groups make up about a third of the total U.S population, with the Baptist group being the largest of these groups. Baptists make up about 16.3 percent of the U.S population (Table 1). Table 1 also shows the percentage of NLSY79 respondents in specified religious groups based on questions asked in the 2000 survey.

Overall, the NLSY79 distribution is similar to the distribution for the American Religious Identity Survey. The major differences are that 16 percent of the NLSY79 respondents are in the general category of Protestants, compared to only 2 percent of the ARIS respondents. Twenty percent of the ARIS respondents are coded into other religions, compared to only 8 percent of the NLSY79 respondents. The reasons for these differences are likely related to dissimilar coding procedures used to collapse respondents who reported membership in small Christian religious groups (see Appendix A). The NLSY79 is coded in such a way that it is impossible to identify respondents who are in small Protestant or other Christian religious groups. For example, Mormons, members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, are coded as “Other Protestant.” The proportions in the six main Christian religious groupings reported by the ARIS and NLSY79 are similar. The percentage of respondents identifying themselves as Catholic in the NLSY79 is 28.8 compared to the 24.5 percent of respondents in the ARIS. Baptists make up 16 percent of the ARIS respondents, but they constitute 22 percent of the NLSY79 respondents. The religious group that comes closest to

**Table 2-1. Religious Identification in ARIS 2001 and 2000 Survey of NLSY 1979**

Religious Groups <sup>1</sup>	ARIS 2001		NLSY 1979	
	Total Number*	Total Percentage	Total Number	Total Percentage
Roman Catholic	50,873,000	24.5%	1495	28.8%
Jewish	2,831,000	1.3%	51	1.0%
Baptist	33,830,000	16.3%	1160	22.4%
Episcopalian <sup>2</sup>	3,451,000	1.7%	64	1.2%
Lutheran	9,580,000	4.6%	282	5.4%
Methodist <sup>3</sup>	14,150,000	6.8%	257	5.0%
Presbyterian	5,596,000	2.7%	117	2.3%
Protestant <sup>4</sup>	4,647,000	2.2%	834	16.1%
Other Religion <sup>5</sup>	42,238,000	20.3%	416	8.0%
No religion <sup>6</sup>	40,727,000	19.5%	508	9.8%
Total	207,980,000	100.0%	5,184	100.0%

Source: ARIS 2001: American Religious Identification Survey, 2001.

NLSY 1979: National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979.

Note: \*All ARIS-2001 are rounded to the nearest thousand

<sup>1</sup> See appendix A for ARIS-2001 table

<sup>2</sup> "Episcopalian" also included Anglican in ARIS-2001.

<sup>3</sup> "Methodist" also included Wesleyan in ARIS-2001.

<sup>4</sup> "Protestant" was identified as "no denomination supplied" in ARIS-2001, compared to "Protestant" identified in NLSY79 was combined.

<sup>5</sup> "Other Religion" identified in ARIS-2001 included Christian religious groups and other religion.

<sup>6</sup> "Refused" to self describe religious identification, Atheist, Agnostic, Humanist, and Secular are also included in "No Religion" for ARIS-2001.

Catholics is the Baptist group, and, depending on the type of question, sometimes Baptist shows a higher percentage than Catholic. While there appear to be no studies on whether marrying someone of another religion influences a couple's migration, there are studies that indicate that inter-religious couples encounter more problems than intra-religious couples. For example, there have been some studies on whether marrying someone of a different religion or marrying someone with a different level of church attendance might result in marital incompatibility (Call and Heaton 1997). However, according to Lehrer and Chiswick (1993), there are other factors that are also influenced by religion, such as

education, upbringing of children, the allocation of time and money, the cultivation of social relationships, the development of business and professional networks, and place of residence. Lehrer and Chiswick (1993) also suggest that older couples and those with a college education tend to have the lowest probability of marriage dissolution. Other studies suggest that religion may play an important role in marital incompatibility. Bumpass and Sweet (1972) note that inter-religious couples may have basic values that differ and that relatives and friends may not fully support the couple. Other researchers also agree that inter-religious married couples have a higher rate of marital instability (Landis 1949; Burchinal and Chancellor 1963; Christensen and Barber 1967).

### **Social Support**

The lack of social support and opposition to inter-group marriage reported by previous research is a cause of a higher likelihood of divorce. For inter-religious couples, divorce is one of the ways to alleviate the stress associated with marriages. It seems logical to expect that marriages involving other important groups would generate similar opposition and lead to a lack of social support. Migration may be means that some couples use, instead of divorce, as an attempt to escape stresses associated with lower levels of social support from friends and relatives.

A study based on a national sample of church members among the black population found that divorced blacks have lower levels of social support and a weaker social network than blacks who remain married. Some researchers have found that divorce may result in negative sanctions, such as social isolation and ostracism from other church members (Hargrove 1983; Aldous 1983). However, an interesting finding in

the same research shows that divorced black men were more likely to receive social support from church members than divorced black women, even though black women tend to be more religious and attend services more than black men (Taylor and Chatters 1988). These studies certainly supply evidence that inter-group couples are more stressed than intra-group couples.

Past studies indicate that the divorce rate tends to be higher for inter-religious married couples than for intra-religious couples (Monahan and Kephart 1954; Bahr 1981), although these rates vary across religious groups. Barlow (1977) indicates that about 35 percent of all marriages in the United States are inter-religious marriages among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. This finding is supported by other research (Burchinal and Chancellor 1963; Heiss 1961; Monahan 1973). High divorce rates were found in a study of inter-faith marriages between Mormons and members of other religious groups in Utah (Bahr 1981). Lehrer and Chiswick (1993) suggest that in order to maintain a marriage, both spouses are expected to be in a religion that discourages divorce. Call and Heaton (1997) found that higher religious attendance for both husband and wife reduces the risk of divorce. Their study did not examine whether or not different levels of church attendance for husbands and wives is related to divorce.

### **Religious Organization Attendance**

A study by Myers (2000) reveals that individuals are less likely to migrate when they are more integrated into their religious organization's socio-religious activities. Moreover, the rate of migration is reduced even more if there are one or more children in the household. Another interesting finding is that individuals who are members of strict

or conservative religious organizations are more likely to migrate than members of liberal or moderate organizations. Those who are more involved in their community and who report more relatives within an hour's drive are less likely to migrate (Myers 2000). This study also found a negative effect (when both church social activities and strict and conservative membership were factors) on the odds of moving for older people. The study indicates that individuals under the age of fifty within these conservative religious groups have higher odds of migration than older members do. This is similar to the relationship between age and migration for the general population. Church participation is age-related as reported by Olson (1993). He found that older people are more likely than younger people to attend church, place more importance on religion in everyday life, and to believe in miracles.

Some research indicates a negative relationship between church commitment and migration, regardless of age (Myers 2000). Myers found that religious attendance does not have any effect on migration and concludes that those who have higher levels of religious involvement and are in a more conservative religious group tend not to migrate as much. This suggests that those who marry a person of another religion would be expected to migrate more, because marrying someone with a different level of religious involvement might be considered abnormal. Members from more conservative denominations tend to have more social ties directly through the church. These church friendships promote religious involvement and identity (Olson 1993). Irwin, Tolbert, and Lyson (1999) found that individuals who attend church more often are less likely to migrate because of attachment to their home community.

## **Why People Migrate**

As previously noted, research indicates that there are many potential determinants of migration. Social demographers note that migration offers a means for individuals to find places to live that are suitable to their social and economic characteristics. While a few studies identify religion as sometimes being an important determinant of migration, a number of personal characteristics are commonly acknowledged as usually having significant effects on migration (Lee, Toney, Berry forthcoming; Shaw 1975). Most studies suggest that age is most strongly related to migration among young adults, who tend to have a higher migration rate than other age groups (Myers 2000; Olson 1993). Education and length of residence are other key factors considered in this study.

There are several possible reasons for higher migration rates for young adults than for other age groups. Some researchers suggest that young adults tend to adapt faster than older adults to a new environment (Shaw 1975). However, older adults tend to have stronger ties to their communities, which makes migration more socially and economically expensive for them. For example, Long (1972) found that families with children of school age are less likely to migrate than families with children of pre-school age. Some researchers have shown that individuals ages 18-28 are more likely to migrate than any other age groups because some youth migrate in order to attend college or to find a better job (Garasky 2002; Long and Hansen 1975). Young adults are also less likely to form attachments with their communities (Elder, King, and Conger 1996). In summary, older people are less likely to migrate because they tend to have more attachments to their work and social networks (Brooks 2005).

Education is also often related to migration. Generally, more highly-educated individuals tend to have higher propensities for migration than less-educated individuals (Long 1988). This is largely because they often need to migrate in order to gain an appropriate return on their investment in education (Lee et al., forthcoming). Cooke and Bailey (1996) note that the highly educated usually migrate to growing job markets. Reiger (1972) found that two-thirds of youth migrate for educational purposes. Under some social and economic conditions, less educated individuals have higher rates of migration than highly educated individuals.

### **Theoretical Framework**

In summary, research findings indicate that inter-group religious couples have lower levels of social support from relatives and friends than intra-group couples. These analyses have tended to focus on whether or not the difficulties faced by inter-group married couples are associated with divorce. There has not been a study on whether marrying someone from a different religious group or having a spouse who attends church at a different level of frequency results in higher migration propensities.

This research utilizes propositions drawn from the push-pull theory and migration selectivity perspectives of migration (Lee 1966). The push-pull theory primarily states that migration is a response individuals make to conditions at their place of residence in comparison with actual or perceived conditions at other places. Negative conditions in a place stimulate out-migration, and positive conditions stimulate in-migration. In his formulation of the push-pull perspective, Lee (1966) maintains that individuals with selected characteristics are more likely to respond to specified push-pull factors than

individuals with other characteristics. The research implies a lower level of social support as a push factor for inter-group married couples. If this is true, migration selectivity, or a higher rate of migration, should be observed for various inter-group married couples than for intra-group married couples. Because migration is a complex process in which individuals usually weigh numerous factors before deciding whether or not to migrate, there is a need to investigate the relationship between migration and a variety of heretofore unexamined individual characteristics, such as inter-religious marriage and spousal differences in church attendance.

On the basis of prior studies on migration, the two main hypotheses developed to guide this study are:

1. The odds of migration are higher for inter-religious couples than for intra-religious couples.
2. The odds of migration are higher for couples who attend church at different levels of frequency than for couples who attend church at equal levels of frequency.



## CHAPTER III

### DATA AND METHODS

#### **National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979**

The data for this study comes from the 1979 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY79). The original NLSY79 sample was designed to enable researchers to analyze the disparate life-course experiences of individuals as they enter and pass through the young adult years and into mid-life. Respondents were interviewed nineteen times between 1979 and 2000, with annual interviews conducted until 1994, and surveys conducted every other year afterwards. The data initially included interviews with 12,686 respondents from three samples that were drawn in 1978 from various groupings of the nation's adolescent and adult population. The primary sample is a nationally representative sample of 6,111 males and 6,111 females, first interviewed in 1979 at the ages of 14-22 years old. The NLSY79 also included additional independent samples of Hispanics, blacks, and economically disadvantaged white youth between the ages of 14 and 22, as well as a sample of young individuals who were in the military. Interviews with the subsample containing 1,280 military personnel who were 17-21 years of age as of December 31, 1978 were discontinued in 1984. The retention rate for the NLSY79 has remained at or above 80 percent for all of the surveys conducted through 2000. The final year of data available for this study is 2000. In 2000, the respondents were aged 35 to 41 years old.

The NLSY79 includes information about the respondents' county and state of residence at the time of each interview. Counties are identified with Federal Information

Processing Standards codes (FIPS codes), a set of numeric or alphabetic codes issued by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), to ensure uniform identification of geographic entities through all federal government agencies. A geo-code file with these codes is available on a limited basis to researchers who gain approval from the U. S. Department of Labor by ensuring that information will not be used to identify individual respondents. County codes are valuable for use in defining migration between interviews and for merging census and other data about the places in which respondents lived when interviewed.

In the 2000 survey, NLSY79 respondents were asked questions about their religious preferences and about how frequently they attended church. The specific question about religious preference or identity was: “What is your present religion, if any?” Respondents were also asked about the religious preference of their spouse/partner and about the frequency of church attendance by their spouse. The specific question was: “What is your spouse/partner’s present religion, if any?” Information gathered from respondents was coded as follows: 1) Protestant, Christian, No denomination known or Non-Denominational Church, 2) Baptist, 3) Episcopalian, 4) Lutheran, 5) Methodist, 6) Presbyterian, 7) Roman Catholic, 8) Jewish, 9) Other (Specify), and 10) None, No Religion. A weakness in this coding is that the Protestant category includes a large number of Protestant religious groups that may significantly differ from one another. Unfortunately, some of the marriages we classify as intra-religious marriages may be between dissimilar religious groups.

Information on frequency of church attendance was gathered about the respondent and his/her spouse/partner with the following questions: “In the past year, about how often have you attended religious services? In the past year, about how often has your spouse/partner attended religious services?” Information from these questions was coded as: 1) More than once a week, 2) About once a week, 3) Two or three times a month, 4) About once a month, 5) Several times or less during the year, or 6) Not at all.

### **Dependent Variable**

Migration is the dependent variable for this research. It is measured by comparing county of residence from the date of marriage to current spouse in 2000 with county of residence two years following marriage. Codes for this dependent variable are 0 for did not migrate and 1 for migrated within two years following marriage. This operational procedure specifies whether the respondent, and presumably the spouse, migrated shortly after marriage. This seems most suitable for analyzing whether the inter-group marriage was associated with migration since such a response would likely come soon after marriage.

### **Independent Variables**

There are two main independent variables and three other independent variables for this study. Whether the respondent is married to someone of the same religion is one of the main independent variables. We refer to this as “spousal religious identities.” This variable is constructed by cross-tabulation of respondent’s religion with the religion of the spouse. Results of this tabulation are shown in Table 3-1 and Table 3-2. Table 3-1

**Table 3-1. Religious Affiliation of Respondent and Spouse, 2000**

Respondent's Present Religious Affiliation*	Spouse Present Religious Affiliation**										Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1. Protestant	640 12.3%	33 .6%	2 .0%	6 .1%	5 .1%	2 .0%	76 1.5%	3 .1%	14 .3%	53 1.0%	834 16.1%
2. Baptist	38 .7%	925 17.8%	3 .1%	7 .1%	25 .5%	3 .1%	74 1.4%	0 .0%	35 .7%	50 1.0%	1160 22.4%
3. Episcopalian	0 .0%	3 .1%	38 .7%	1 .0%	1 .0%	2 .0%	13 .3%	1 .0%	2 .0%	3 .1%	64 1.2%
4. Lutheran	6 .1%	6 .1%	1 .0%	189 3.6%	6 .1%	3 .1%	48 .9%	0 .0%	1 .0%	22 .4%	282 5.4%
5. Methodist	4 .1%	23 .4%	1 .0%	4 .1%	179 3.5%	4 .1%	28 .5%	0 .0%	3 .1%	11 .2%	257 5.0%
6. Presbyterian	5 .1%	2 .0%	0 .0%	4 .1%	2 .0%	76 1.5%	16 .3%	0 .0%	3 .1%	9 .2%	117 2.3%
7. Roman Catholic	62 1.2%	49 .9%	12 .2%	33 .6%	26 .5%	13 .3%	1,164 22.5%	8 .2%	41 .8%	87 1.7%	1495 28.8%
8. Jewish	1 .0%	1 .0%	1 .0%	2 .0%	1 .0%	0 .0%	11 .2%	31 .6%	1 .0%	2 .0%	51 1.0%
9. Other	11 .2%	45 .9%	2 .0%	6 .1%	5 .1%	0 .0%	27 .5%	1 .0%	283 5.5%	36 .7%	416 8.0%
10. None	26 .5%	34 .7%	3 .1%	15 .3%	13 .3%	2 .0%	72 1.4%	4 .1%	21 .4%	318 6.1%	508 9.8%
Total	793 15.3%	1121 21.6%	63 1.2%	267 5.2%	263 5.1%	105 2.0%	1529 29.5%	48 .9%	404 7.8%	591 11.4%	5,184 100.0%

Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979

Notes: \*Present Religious Affiliation of Respondent, 2000 (R65335.00)

\*\*Present Religious Affiliation of Spouse, 2000 (R65386.00)

Shaded = Intra Religious Affiliation.

All others = Inter Religious Affiliation.

shows a crosstab of the religious affiliation of respondents and their spouses as coded in the NLSY79. This table shows the percentage of all marriages that are between members of the identified religious groups. For example, 12.3 percent of all marriages are between “other Protestants,” whereas only 0.6 of all marriages are between Jews. Nearly three-fourths (73.5 percent) of the marriages reported in the 2000 survey are between individuals with the same religious affiliation. Catholic couples make up 22.5 percent and Baptists 17.8 percent of the 5,184 marriages. For our logistic regression we coded these

into intra-group and inter-group couples. There are 3,843 intra-group couples and 1,341 inter-group couples.

Table 3-2 shows the rate of marriage between members of each of the respective religious groupings identified in the NLSY79. Baptists have the highest rate of intra-group marriage, with 76.6 of the Baptist respondents reporting being married to a Baptist. Episcopalians are more likely to marry outside their religion than any other group. Still, 59.4 percent of Episcopalians are married to another member of this group. The highest rate of intermarriage between any two of the groups is between Jews and Catholics, with 21.6 percent of the Jewish respondents reporting they are married to a Catholic. But only 0.9 percent of the Catholic respondents reported being married to a Jew. Marriage between members of some groups was very rare. For example, none of the 1,160 Baptist respondents reported being married to a Jew and only one Jewish respondent reported being married to a Baptist.

Table 3-3 shows results for the cross tabulation of respondent's and spouse's frequency of church attendance. The results are very similar to the results for inter-group marriages, with 71.6 percent of the respondents reporting being married to someone who goes to church at the same frequency as the respondent. Of the 5,197 respondents reporting this information, 1,474 (28.4 percent) reported a different frequency of church attendance for themselves and their spouses. Of the 964 respondents with the most frequent attendance (more than once a week), only 10 (or 0.2 percent) were married to a spouse who did not attend church service in the last year.

**Table 3-2. Religious Affiliation of Respondent and Spouse, 2000**

Respondent's Present Religious Affiliation*	Spouse Present Religious Affiliation**										Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1. Protestant	640 76.7%	33 4.0%	2 0.2%	6 0.7%	5 0.6%	2 0.2%	76 9.1%	3 0.4%	14 1.7%	53 6.4%	834 100%
2. Baptist	38 3.3%	925 79.7%	3 0.3%	7 0.6%	25 2.2%	3 0.3%	74 6.4%	0 0.0%	35 3.0%	50 4.3%	1,160 100%
3. Episcopalian	0 0.0%	3 4.7%	38 59.4%	1 1.6%	1 1.6%	2 3.1%	13 20.3%	1 1.6%	2 3.1%	3 4.7%	64 100%
4. Lutheran	6 2.1%	6 2.1%	1 0.4%	189 67.0%	6 2.1%	3 1.1%	48 17.0%	0 0.0%	1 0.4%	22 7.8%	282 100%
5. Methodist	4 1.6%	23 8.9%	1 0.4%	4 1.6%	179 69.6%	4 1.6%	28 10.9%	0 0.0%	3 1.2%	11 4.3%	257 100%
6. Presbyterian	5 4.3%	2 1.7%	0 0.0%	4 3.4%	2 1.7%	76 65.0%	16 13.7%	0 0.0%	3 2.6%	9 7.7%	117 100%
7. Roman Catholic	62 4.1%	49 3.3%	12 0.8%	33 2.2%	26 1.7%	13 0.9%	1,164 77.9%	8 0.5%	41 2.7%	87 5.8%	1,495 100%
8. Jewish	1 2.0%	1 2.0%	1 2.0%	2 3.9%	1 2.0%	0 0.0%	11 21.6%	31 0.8%	1 2.0%	2 3.9%	51 100%
9. Other	11 2.6%	45 10.8%	2 0.5%	6 1.4%	5 1.2%	0 0.0%	27 6.5%	1 0.2%	283 68.0%	36 8.7%	416 100%
10. None	26 5.1%	34 6.7%	3 0.6%	15 3.0%	13 2.6%	2 0.4%	72 14.2%	4 0.8%	21 4.1%	318 62.6%	508 100%

Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979.

Notes: Shaded = Intra- Religious Affiliation.

All others = Inter- Religious Affiliation.

**Table 3-3. Frequency of Religious Attendance of Respondent and Spouse, 2000**

Frequency of Respondent Religious Attendance*	Frequency of Spouse Religious Attendance**						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1. More than once a week	766 14.7%	99 1.9%	1 .0%	45 .9%	43 .8%	10 .2%	964 18.5%
2. About once a week	194 3.7%	920 17.7%	1 .0%	115 2.2%	81 1.6%	27 .5%	1338 25.7%
3. Two or three times a month	0 .0%	0 .0%	5 .1%	2 .0%	0 .0%	2 .0%	9 .2%
4. About once a month	83 1.6%	145 2.8%	2 .0%	795 15.3%	114 2.2%	41 .8%	1180 22.7%
5. Several times a year or less	58 1.1%	96 1.8%	0 .0%	95 1.8%	778 15.0%	68 1.3%	1095 21.1%
6. Not at all	22 .4%	33 .6%	0 .0%	28 .5%	69 1.3%	459 8.8%	611 11.8%
Total	1123 21.6%	1293 24.9%	9 .2%	1080 20.8%	1085 20.9%	607 11.7%	5197 100.0%

Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979.

Notes: \* Frequency of Religious Attendance of Respondent, 2000 (R65336.00)

\*\* Frequency of Religious Attendance of Spouse, 2000 (R65387.00)

Shaded= Intra- Frequency of Religious Attendance.

All others = Inter- Frequency of Religious Attendance.

Clearly, having a spouse with the same level of church attendance is important if statistical prevalence can be assumed to reflect its significance. For the logistic regression analysis, this variable is coded as 1) attended same frequency and 2) attended at different frequency.

In Table 3-4, we see the rate of marriage between spouses by their respective frequency of church attendance. This table shows that 79.5 percent of the respondents who attend church more than once a week are married to a spouse who also attends church more than once a week. However, within that group, only 1.0 percent of those respondents are married to an individual who never attends church. Of the respondents who never attend church, 75.1 percent are married to someone who also never attends

**Table 3-4. Frequency of Religious Attendance Between Respondent and Spouse, 2000**

Frequency of Respondent Religious Attendance*	Frequency of Spouse Religious Attendance**						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1. More than once a week	766 79.5%	99 10.3%	1 0.1%	45 4.7%	43 4.5%	10 1.0%	964 100%
2. About once a week	194 14.5%	920 68.8%	1 0.1%	115 8.6%	81 6.1%	27 2.0%	1,338 100%
3. Two or three times a month	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 55.6%	2 22.2%	0 0.0%	2 22.2%	9 100%
4. About once a month	83 7.0%	145 12.3%	2 0.2%	795 67.4%	114 9.7%	41 3.5%	1,180 100%
5. Several times a year or less	58 5.3%	96 8.8%	0 0.0%	95 8.7%	778 71.1%	68 6.2%	1,095 100%
6. Not at all	22 3.6%	33 5.4%	0 0.0%	28 4.6%	69 11.3%	459 75.1%	611 100%

Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979.

Notes: Both the Same and Different Frequency Religious Attendance is from Table 3-1.

The total calculation was divided from the total of respondent's frequency of religious attendance.

Shaded = Intra- Frequency of Religious Attendance.

All others = Inter- Frequency of Religious Attendance.

church. This suggests that having a spouse with a similar level of church involvement is an important consideration in marriage. Whether different levels of church attendance causes dissonance that leads to coping options such as migration has not been determined by previous research.

The other independent variables employed in this analysis are measured at the date of the marriage, since this is also the date from which migration is measured. Hence, the measurements are at the beginning of the interval over which migration is measured. This is most appropriate for the employment of independent variables (DaVanzo and Morrison 1981). Age is reported in single years of age in the NLSY79. For this research, age at the time of marriage and also the date from which migration is measured are categorized as follows: 1) 18-21 yrs, 2) 22-25 yrs, 3) 26-30 yrs, 4) 31-35 yrs, and 5) 36



years and older. In this study, educational attainment is categorized into the following five groups: 1) Less than High School Degree 2) High School Graduate, 3) Some College (including Vocational Degree), 4) College Graduate or higher, and 5) Other/ Missing.

The NLSY79 reports how long respondents had lived in the place in which they were living in 1979, the year of the first interview. For this study, length of residence at subsequent interviews is calculated according to subsequent changes in residence. If a migration had not occurred between 1979 and any subsequent interview, the number of years between 1979 and a corresponding subsequent interview is added to the length of residence reported in 1979. When a migration occurs, length of residence is assigned zero years at the beginning of the interval following the migration, and calculated for subsequent interview dates according to whether an additional migration has been made. More specifically, the number of years since the most recent migration is used as length of residence. For this research, length of residence at the time of marriage is coded as: 1) Less than 2 yrs, 2) 3-5 yrs, 3) 6-10 yrs, and 4) 11 yrs and over.

### **Descriptive Data**

Table 3-5 summarizes the variables used in this study. These control variables are not listed in order of importance, but they tend to be measured in this order. Those variables with a direct relationship to the hypotheses appear first, in this case the independent variable religion and church attendance, followed by the other control variables that are important to the study of migration.

**Table 3-5. Summary of the Dependent and Independent Variables**

---

<u>Dependent Variable</u>	
Migration	Yes and No
<u>Independent Variables</u>	
Spousal Religious Identities	Inter and Intra
Respondent and Spouse Attendance	Inter and Intra
<u>Control Variables</u>	
Age	1)18-21 yrs, 2) 22-25 yrs, 3) 26-30 yrs, 4) 31-35 yrs, 5) 36 yrs and older
Education	1) Less than High School, 2) High School Graduate, 3) Some College, 4) College Graduate and more, 5) Other/ Missing
Length of Residence	1) Less than 2-yrs, 2) 3-5 yrs, 3) 6-10 yrs, 4)11 yrs and over

---

**Analysis**

Logistic regressions are used in this study to examine the relationships among independent and dependent variables. This analytical technique is appropriate for investigating the effects of independent variables on dichotomous dependent variables (Field 2000). For this study, the data are transformed into person periods, or intervals, using the date of marriage for respondents who were still married at the time of the survey conducted in 2000. Each married respondent is represented once, but the date over which his/her migration is measured varies, as does the date at which personal characteristics are measured. Migration is measured over the two-year interval following the marriage, and the independent variables are measured at the beginning of that person

period or interval. This procedure assumes that the respondent's and his/her spouse's religion(s) reported in the 2000 survey and at the time of their marriage are the same. Similarly, the frequency of church attendance reported in the 2000 survey for the respondent and the frequency reported for the spouse are assumed to be the same as at the time of marriage. This is necessary to meet our objective of determining if inter-group marriages are more likely than intra-group marriages to be followed by migration.

There are two sets of four models in the logistic analysis. One set of models presents results with spousal religious identities as the main independent variable. The second set presents results with differences in church attendance as the key independent variable. The focus is on comparing the odds of migration for inter-group couples with the odds for intra-group couples. However, attention is paid to whether the effects of age, education, and length of residence are consistent with results reported in prior studies.

Logistic regression is used in this study to help explain which variables determine the married couple's migration chances. The dependent variable (migration) is coded as 1=Yes and 0=No, meaning that if the married couple living in a different county compared to the married couple living in the same county when examining for the two-year interval. The results are interpreted with an odds ratio which indicates the odds of migration for the independent variables compared to the dependent variable. An odds ratio defines how much less or more likely it is any one group will migrate than the compared group. An odds ratio greater than one indicates that the odds of migration will increase., A statistical significance level of .05, is used to signify statistical significance.

The following section reports the logistic regression results based on descriptive data of the independent variables and the control variable to migration.

### **Limitations**

The classification of religion of respondents and their spouses in the NLSY79 data was collected in 2000. Unfortunately, the only other time religious preference and frequency of church attendance were asked was in one of the first surveys when few of the respondents were married. A limitation with the measurement of our dependent variables is that the respondent's or his/her spouse's religion might have changed after their marriage. This would lead to a misclassification of respondents for our two dependent variables.

Another potentially serious limitation is the categories of religious groups available in the NLSY79. The "other Protestant" includes a diversity of religious groupings. Some of these are very different from one another but must be coded as an intra-group couple because of this data limitation. This is one of the reasons for employing two dependent variables that indicate religious differences between respondents and their spouses.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not married couples constituted of individuals of different religions or who attend church at a different frequency have higher odds of migration than couples of the same religion or church attendance frequency. Attention is be paid to the relationships among migration and age, education, and length of residence—variables that are typically associated with migration.

#### **Inter-Religious Marriage and Migration**

Table 4-1 presents the results of the multiple logistic regressions for examining the relationship between inter- and intra-religious married couples and migration. In Model 1, spousal religious identity is the only independent variable utilized. The difference between inter-religious couples and intra-religious couples is significant, but it does not support our hypothesis. The inter-religious couples are about 16 percent less likely to migrate than intra-religious couples. The hypothesis for this study predicted higher odds of migration for inter-religious couples. With length of residence introduced in Model 2, the odds of migration are again higher for the intra-religious couples than for the inter-religious couples, but the differences are not statistically significant. In Model 2, the inter-religious couples are 0.890 times more likely to migrate than intra-religious couples. The differences in odds between the inter-religious and intra-religious couples are very similar in Model 3 when age and education are the control variables and in

Model 4 when length of residence is reentered with age and education. These results lead us to reject our hypothesis of higher migration for inter-religious than for inter-religious couples.

The relationships between the other independent variables and migration are generally statistically significant and are consistent with findings reported in previous studies. The young adult age groups have much higher odds of migration than the oldest comparative group: over 35 years of age. The two youngest age groups, ages 18-21 and 22-25, are more than twice as likely to migrate as those in the oldest age category. These effects persist with education along with spousal religious identities introduced in Model 3 and when length of residence is added to these in Model 4. The odds of migration for high school drop-outs and high school graduates are much lower than the odds for college graduates. The odds of migration for those who did not finish high school are .548 in the full model, and for high school graduates the odds are .752. Couples for whom the reporting respondent has had some college have odds of 1.020 in the full model.

Of all the independent variables, length of residence has the strongest effect on migration. The odds of migration for newcomers, those with less than three years of residence, are approximately three times higher than the odds for those who lived in a place for more than ten years. The odds are 2.5 times as high for those at 3-5 years of residence and 1.4 times as high for those in the 6-10 years of residence category. These results are obtained in Model 2 when spousal religious identities and length of residence are the only independent variables and in Model 4 when age and education are also included.

To compensate for limitations in precisely distinguishing between inter-religious and intra-religious marriages, separate analyses were conducted for Catholics. Catholic respondents who report being married to a non-Catholic and those reporting marriage to another Catholic more clearly meet our objective of distinguishing between inter- and intra-religious married couples. Results of this analysis are so similar to those reported above that a detailed description is not provided here. The results are shown in Appendix B. Briefly, the odds of migration are lower for couples constituted of a Catholic and non-Catholic than for Catholic only couples. The differences are not statistically significant, and again, they do not support our hypothesis. Again, the odds are higher for young age groups compared to the older age group, higher for the less educated compared to college graduates, and much higher odds for newcomers compared to long-term residents persist.

### **Church Attendance and Migration**

Table 4-2 presents the four multiple logistic regression models for examining the relationships between inter- and intra-frequency of church attendance and migration. Table 4-2 also allows an examination of the relationships between migration and the four other independent variables as they are introduced into the models.

The effects of marriage between individuals who attend church at different frequencies on migration are statistically insignificant in all models. However, again the differences are opposite to those predicted by our hypothesis. In the basic model, the odds of migration are .853 for inter-attendance couples compared to the reference category of intra-religious couples. In Model 2, the odds of migration by couples who attend church at different frequencies are .873, and in Model 3 the odds are .877. In the full model,

**Table 4-1. Logistic Regression of Religious Composition to Migration**

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$	B	$e^{\beta}$	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$
<i>Independent</i>								
<u>Religion</u>								
Inter-Religious	-.178	.837*	-.213	.890	-.109	.897	-.144	.860
	(.086)		(.088)		(.088)		(.090)	
(Intra-Religious)	---		---		---		---	
<i>Control Variables</i>								
<u>Length of Residence</u>								
0-2 year			1.084	2.956***			1.106	3.023***
			(.090)				(.097)	
3-5 year			.850	2.340***			.926	2.525***
			(.102)				(.107)	
6-10 year			.184	1.202			.318	1.374*
			(.121)				(.126)	
(11 years and over)								---
<u>Age</u>								
18-21					.917	2.502***	.904	2.468***
					(.159)		(.162)	
22-25					.745	2.107***	.606	1.833***
					(.151)		(.154)	
26-30					.499	1.647**	.344	1.410*
					(.154)		(.157)	
31-35					.147	1.159	.046	1.047
					(.161)		(.164)	
(36 and older)					---		---	
<u>Education</u>								
Less than High School					-.825	.438***	-.601	.548***
					(.152)		(.156)	
High School Graduate					-.526	.591***	-.285	.752**
					(.094)		(.098)	
Some College					-.226	.798	.019	1.020
					(.149)		(.154)	
(College Graduate and more)					---		---	
Constant	-1.096		-1.572		-1.198		-1.798	
-2 Log Likelihood	4650.401		4466.121		4357.423		4189.823	
N	4201		4191		3969		3959	

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ 

Note: Variables in parentheses indicate comparison group.



**Table 4-2. Logistic Regression of Frequency of Religious Attendance to Migration**

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$	B	$e^{\beta}$	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$
<i>Independent</i>								
<u>Church Attendance</u>								
Inter-Attendance	-.159	.853	-.135	.873	-.132	.877	-.107	.899
	(.083)		(.084)		(.085)		(.087)	
(Intra-Attendance)	---		---		---		---	
<i>Control Variables</i>								
<u>Length of Residence</u>								
0-2 year			1.076	2.932***			1.103	3.015***
			(.090)				(.097)	
3-5 year			.829	2.291***			.910	2.485***
			(.102)				(.107)	
6-10 year			.172	1.188			.312	1.366*
			(.121)				(.126)	
(11 years and over)								---
<u>Age</u>								
18-21					.931	2.537***	.917	2.503***
					(.159)		(.162)	
22-25					.757	2.131***	.621	1.860***
					(.151)		(.154)	
26-30					.512	1.668**	.357	1.429*
					(.154)		(.157)	
31-35					.140	1.150	.036	1.037
					(.161)		(.164)	
(36 and older)					---		---	
<u>Education</u>								
Less than High School					-.829	.437***	-.608	.544***
					(.152)		(.156)	
High School Graduate					-.516	.597***	-.278	.757**
					(.094)		(.098)	
Some College					-.227	.797	.015	1.015
					(.149)		(.154)	
(College Graduate and more)					---		---	
Constant	-1.097		-1.581		-1.203		-1.798	
-2 Log Likelihood	4652.106		4172.911		4356.224		4172.911	
N	4203		4194		3970		3961	

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ 

Note: Variables in parentheses indicate comparison group.

Model 4, the odds of migration by couples constituted by individuals who attend church at different frequencies compared to couple who attend church at the same frequency are .899. As with inter-religious marriages, the results do not support our hypothesis. And again, the direction of the effects is actually in the opposite direction of that predicted by the hypothesis.

The effects of age, education, and length of residence are the same as those reported in Table 4-1 and are consistent with results found by other researchers. As reported for Table 4-1, the younger adults are more likely to migrate than the oldest category, the less educated are less likely to migrate than college graduates, and newcomers are much more likely to migrate than long-term residents.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to examine whether marrying a person of a different religion has an influence on migration behavior. The analysis also examines whether married couples who attend church at different frequencies have higher odds of migration than couples who attend church at the same frequency. The study draws on the migration perspective that suggests that some individuals are pushed from their places of residence by negative circumstances confronting them. Past studies have shown that marriage outside of one's socially significant group tends to increase the likelihood of migration. Further, migration researchers know that migration is influenced by numerous factors, and they call for the examination of these in order to sort factors through the many potential instigators of migration. The great body of research on religious groups in the United States indicates that many religions encourage marriage between other members of their respective religions. Statistical results presented in this study reflect this preference, as approximately 75 percent of the NLSY79 respondents are married to another member of their own religious group.

Based on these observations, in the separate bodies of research on migration and religion, the two following hypotheses were developed and tested:

- H1. Marrying a person of a different religion increases the likelihood of migration.
- H2. Couples who have different levels of religiosity, as measured by frequency of church attendance, have higher odds of migration than couples who have

the same level of religiosity.

Both of these hypotheses were rejected. In fact, the directions of the relationships were in the opposite direction than was predicted by the hypotheses, although the relationships were generally not statistically significant.

## **Discussion**

This research shows that inter-group couples, based on religion and church attendance, do not migrate more than intra-group couples. This finding suggests that the influence of social networks on migration may be more subtle than previously understood. Some social network theorists see social structure as consisting of relationships and links among individuals. Those individuals who are more embedded in the network have stronger ties (Turner 2003). Granovetter (1973) defines the strength of ties as a combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy, and the reciprocal services that characterize the ties, finding that they are usually highly intra-correlated. Social ties and connections are very important in religion. The assumption has been that couples who marry within the same religious tradition tend to have stronger social ties and social group support than those marrying into a different religious tradition. This can affect their migration chances because it may take inter-group couples longer to establish social ties and connections than intra-group couples who may already be fully tied to a church.

Church attendance itself also plays an important role in religion (Call and Heaton 1997). According to Firebaugh and Harley:

Church attendance lifecycle effects are plausible: over the lifespan

individuals typically marry, settle down in a community, and have children. Presumably they are more inclined to attend church at each successive stage. (1991:495)

Churches participate in significant life events and rituals, such as the christening of newborns, marriage, and deaths. Church attendance and involvement are also known to be positively associated with not only social networks but with support from church members as well (Taylor and Chatters 1988). Religious services and other activities offer regular opportunities for social contact between individuals with common religious beliefs and values, as well as bringing together individuals with similar status or characteristics (Clarke, Beeghley, and Cochran 1990; Wald, Owen, and Hill 1990). Such strong ties to church life, as mentioned by many researchers, may explain the lack of a relationship between marriage and church attendance and migration decisions. Perhaps those who know that they will be able to find a similar attachment in a new destination do not worry about leaving, nor do they have concerns about staying. The separate analysis in this study for the frequency of Protestant attendance to migration (Appendix E) shows no relationship between church attendance and migration. A possible explanation could be drawn from their high church attendance, which results in receiving more social resources. This may be why they migrate less than other religious groups (Ellison and George 1994).

Geographic location can be another reason for a lack of a relationship between spousal religious involvement and migration. Blau (1994:9) states that to marry a spouse whose religion is the same as one's own depends on the distribution of people in the place where one live. This suggests that location is important. When looking at married

couples, it may be more likely for them to migrate to a place where they share the same religious beliefs as others and be able to seek support there rather than migrate to a place where their religious beliefs may be a minority (e.g. Utah = Mormon). A person's religious denomination is also important to know because of the different distinctions in the teachings and practices regarding marriage and divorce, which play an important role in the formation of attitudes and subsequent marital behavior (Thornton and Camburn 1989). Religious teaching in the area of family values, for instance, may vary across religions because of the different levels of importance, and this may have an influence on migration decisions. Furthermore, some spouses often switch their religious faith or lose their religion after entering into a mixed marriage, to create endogamy (Glenn 1982; Heaton 1990).

This research suggests that religious differences between spouses do not influence their migration. However, as mentioned before, a limitation of our study is the use of broad categories of religious identities. Intermarriages between members of some religious groups might be more likely to lead couples to migrate. Hence, members of a religion that frowns on the marriage of its members to outsiders might lead to migration. The most serious limitation of this study was reliance on religious identity in 2000 to study migration prior to 2000. It is possible that one of the spouses changed his/her religious identity between the time of marriage and 2000 and thereby caused a misclassification of religious identity at the time of marriage.

Finally, many researchers have noted that migration may be influenced by numerous factors and that research is needed to examine whether these factors are indeed

influenced by migration . Our findings of no relationship between differences between spouses in two important aspects of religion, religious identity and church attendance, certainly imply such factors are not an important determinant of migration. This is surprising given that past research indicates differences between husbands and wives on other dimensions help to shape migration.

### **Final Comments**

Other factors having an influence on religion and migration may include having made a migration move prior to marriage, after a divorce, or after the death of a spouse. Other variables, such as race or ethnicity, community ties or lack thereof, and the presence or absence of children, may be similar. Although this study only looks at married couples, the possibility of the spouse having made multiple migrations prior to marriage may alter the likelihood of future migration. If a marriage has multiple mixes in it, like race or ethnicity as well as religion, this may be an interactive factor with migration. If the NLSY79 supplied spouse's race/ethnicity, it would be most interesting to know if racially-mixed and inter-religious marriages have a higher rate of influence on migration than either of these factors alone. Further, since those who have children are less likely to migrate than those without children (though varying with the child's age), this factor may interact with religion because some religious groups are more accepting of contraceptives than others (Landis 1949). This interaction of religion with family may affect the likelihood of migration.

Divorce is another important factor of marriage. In some literature, divorce rates tend to be higher for inter-religious married couples (Bahr 1981; Heaton 1990; Monahan

and Kephart 1954), although this varies across religious groups and can result from the lack of social support, which was mentioned in the previous section. Even though the divorce rate is an important factor, the NLSY79 does not report whether or not respondents have remained married. Some researchers have found that divorce may result in negative sanctions, such as social isolation and ostracism, from other church members (Aldous 1983; Hargrove 1983). Many researchers also agreed that inter-religious married couples show a higher rate in marital instability (Burchinal and Chancellor 1963; Christensen and Barber 1967; Landis 1949). However, Lehrer and Chiswick (1993) suggest that in order to maintain a marriage, both spouses are expected to be in a religion that is against divorce.

The results of this study provide a wider perspective on religion and migration. Not all inter-group relationships result in higher migration, but whether this is from a higher level of dissonance or due to other consequences is not clear. But it is important to keep in mind that religion is still considered to be one of the most powerful social institutions to influence both an individual as well as a group (Bair 1989).



## REFERENCES

- Aldous, Joan. 1983. "Problematic Elements in the Relationships Between Churches and Families." Pp. 67-80 in *Families and Religion: Conflict and Change in Modern Society*, edited by Joan Aldous and William V. D'Antonio. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bair, Ted M. 1989. "The Effect of Religiosity on the Marital Satisfaction of Utah Husbands and Wives Who are Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Utah State University, Logan, UT.
- Bahr, Howard. 1981. "Religious Inter marriage and Divorce in Utah and the Mountain States." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 20(3):251-261.
- Barlow, Brent A. 1977. "Notes on Mormon Interfaith Marriages." *The Family Coordinator* 26(2):143-150.
- Blau, Peter M. 1994. *Structural Contexts of Opportunities*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Brooks, W. Trevor. 2005. "Occupational Aspirations and Migration: A Comparison of Rural Youth with High, Medium, and Low Occupational Aspirations and Their Chances for Migration." M.S. thesis, Department of Sociology, Utah State University, Logan, UT.
- Bumpass, Larry L. and James A. Sweet. 1972. "Differentials in Marital Instability: 190." *American Sociological Review* 37:754-766.

- Burchinal, Lee B. and Loren E. Chancellor. 1963. "Survival Rates Among Religiously Homogonous and Interreligious Marriages." *Social Forces* 41(4):353-362.
- Call, Vaughn R.A. and Tim B. Heaton. 1997. "Religious Influence on Martial Stability." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 36(3):382-392.
- Cavan, Ruth Shonle. 1970. "Concepts and Terminology in Interreligious Marriage." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 9(4):311-320.
- Cheng, Chung K. and Douglas S. Yamamura. 1957. "Interracial Marriage and Divorce in Hawaii." *Social Forces* 36:77-84.
- Christensen, Harold T. and Kenneth Barber. 1967. "Interfaith vs. Intrafaith Marriage in Indiana." *Marriage and Family Living* 29:461-469.
- Clark, S. C. 1995. "Advance Report of Final Divorce Statistics, 1989 and 1990." *Monthly Vital Statistics Report* 42(8).
- Clarke, Leslie, Leonard Beeghley, and John Cochran. 1990. "Religiosity, Social Class, and Alcohol Use: An Application of Reference Group Theory." *Sociological Perspective* 33:201-218.
- Cooke, Thomas J. and Adrian J. Bailey. 1996. "Family Migration and the Employment of Married Women and Men." *Economic Geography* 72(1):38-48.
- Dainton, M. 1999. "African American, European American, and Biracial Couples' Meanings for and Experiences in Marriage." Pp. 147-165 in *Communication, Race, and Family: Exploring Communication in Black, White, and Biracial Families*, edited by Rhunette C. Diggs & Thomas J. Socha. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- DaVanzo, Julie and Peter A. Morrison. 1981. "Return and Other Sequences of Migration in the U.S." *Demography* 18:85-101.
- Elder, Glen H. Jr., Valarie King, and Rand D. Conger. 1996. "Attachment to Place and Migration Prospects: A Developmental Perspective." *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 6(4):393-425.
- Ellison, Christopher G. and Linda K. George. 1994. "Religious Involvement, Social Ties, and Social Support in a Southeastern Community." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 33(1):46-61.
- Field, Andy. 2000. *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS for Windows*. London: Sage Publication.
- Firebaugh, Glenn and Brian Harley. 1991. "Trends in U.S. Church Attendance: Secularization and Revival, or Merely Lifecycle Effects?" *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 30(4):487-500.
- Garasky, Steven. 2002. "Where Are They Going? A Comparison of Urban and Rural Youths' Locational Choices After Leaving the Parental Home." *Social Science Research* 31:409-431.
- Glenn, Norvald. 1982. "Interreligious Marriage in the United States: Pattern and Recent Trends." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 44(3):555-566.
- Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6):1360-1380.

- Hargrove, Barbara. 1983. "The Church, the Family, and the Modernization Process." Pp. 21-48 in *Families and Religion: Conflict and Change in Modern Society*, edited by Joan Aldous and William V. D'Antonio. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Heaton, Tim B. 1990. "Religious Groups Characteristics, Endogamy, and Interfaith Marriages." *Sociological Analysis* 51(4):363-376.
- Heiss, Jerold S. (1961). "Interfaith Marriage and Marital Outcome." *Marriage and Family Living* 23(3):228-233.
- Herberg, W. 1965. *Protestant-Catholic-Jew*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company Inc.
- Irwin, Michael, Charles Tolbert, and Tom Lyson. 1999. "There's No Place Like Home: Nonmigration and Civic Engagement." *Environment and Planning A* 31:2223-22238.
- Johnson, Richard A. 1980. *Religious Assortative Marriage in the United States*. New York: Academic.
- Johnstone, Ronald L. 1997. *Religion in Society: A Sociology of Religion, 5<sup>th</sup> ed*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kalmijn, Matthijs. (1998). "Intermarriage and Homogamy: Cause, Patterns, Trends." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:395-421.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1991). "Shifting Boundaries: Trends in Religious and Educational Homogamy." *American Sociological Review* 56:786-800.
- Killian, Kyle D. (2002). "Dominant and Marginalized Discourses in Interracial Couple's Narratives: Implications for Family Therapists." *Family Process* 41:603-618.

- Landis, Judson T. 1949. "Marriages of Mixed and Non-Mixed Religious Faith." *American Sociological Review* 14:401-407.
- Lee, Everett S. 1966. "A Theory of Migration." *Demography* 3(1):47-57.
- Lee, Ji-Youn, Michael B. Toney, and Helen E. Berry. 2003. "The Effects of Status Inconsistency Between Spouses on Migration in the United States: Propensities and Rural-Urban Destination Selections." *Korea Journal of Population Studies* 26(2):197-219.
- Lee, Ji-Youn, Michael B. Toney, and E. Helen Berry. Forthcoming. "Social Status Inconsistency and Migration." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*.
- Lehrer, Evelyn L. and Carmel U. Chiswick. 1993. "Religion as a Determinant of Marital Stability." *Demography* 30(3):385-404.
- Leigh, A. Leslie and Bethany L. Letiecq. 2004. "Marital Quality of African American and White Partners in Interracial Couples." *Personal Relationships* 11:559-574.
- Lieberson, Stanley and Mary C. Waters. 1988. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Long, Larry H. 1972. "The Influence of Number and Ages of Children on Residential Mobility." *Demography* 9:371-382.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. *Migration and Residential Mobility in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Long, Larry H. and Kristin A. Hansen. 1975. "Trends in Return Migration to the South." *Demography* 12:601-614.

- Luke, Carmen and Victoria Carrington. 2000. "Race Matters." *Journal of Interracial Studies* 21:5-25.
- Lutz, W., A. Goujon, and G. Doblhammer-Reiter. 1998. "Demographic Dimensions in Forecasting: Adding Education to Age and Sex." *Population and Development Review* 24:42-58.
- McNamara, Robert P., Maria Tempenis, and Beth Walton. 1999. *Crossing the Line: Interracial Couples in the South*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Monahan, Thomas P. 1973. "Some Dimensions of Interreligious Marriages in Indiana, 1962-67." *Social Forces* 52(2):195-203.
- Monahan, Thomas P. and William M. Kephart. 1954. "Divorce and Desertion by Religious and Mixed Religious Groups." *The American Journal of Sociology* 59(5):454-465.
- Morrison, Peter A. and Julie DaVanzo. 1986. "The Prism of Migration: Dissimilarity between Return and Onward Movers." *Social Science Quarterly* 67(3):504-516.
- Myers, Scott M. 2000. "The Impact of Religious Involvement on Migration." *Social Forces* 79(2):755-783.
- Okun, Barbara. 1996. *Understanding Diverse Families*. New York: Guilford.
- Olson, Daniel V.A. 1993. "Fellowship Ties and the Transmission of Religious Identity." Pp. 32-53 in *Beyond Establishment: Protestant Identity in a Post-Protestant Age*, edited by Jackson Carroll and Wade Clark Roof. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox.

- Qian, Zhenchao, Sampson Lee Blair, and Stacey D. Ruf. 2001. "Asian American Interracial and Interethnic Marriages: Differences by Education and Nativity." *International Migration Review* 35(2):557-586.
- Reiger, Jon H. 1972. "Geographic Mobility and the Occupational Attainment of Rural Youth: A Longitudinal Evaluation." *Rural Sociology* 37(2):189-207.
- Shaw, Paul R. 1975. *Migration Theory and Fact: A Review and Bibliography of Current Literature*. New York: Regional Science Research Institute.
- Steensland, Brain, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces* 79(1):291-318.
- Sutherland, Stella H. 1936. *Population Distribution in Colonial America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Taylor, Robert J. and Linda M. Chatters. 1988. "Church Members as a Source of Informal Social Support." *Review of Religious Research* 30(2):193-203.
- Thornton, Arland and Donald Camburn. 1989. "Religious Participation and Adolescent Sexual Behavior and Attitudes." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51:641-653.
- Toney, Michael B., Carol McKewen Stinner, and Stephen Kan. 1983. "Mormon and Nonmormon Migration in and out of Utah." *Review of Religious Research* 25(2): 114-126.
- Turner, Jonathan H. 2003. *The Structure of Sociological Theory*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Wald, Kenneth D., Dennis E. Owen, and Samuel S. Hill. 1990. "Political Cohesion in Churches." *Journal of Politics* 52:197-215.

Wilson, John. 1978. *Religion in American Society: The Effective Presence*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: PrenticeHall.



APPENDICES

**Appendix A. Self Described Religious Identification of U.S. Adult Population, 1990-2001**

Christian Religious Groups	1990		2001	
	Number	%	Number	%
Catholic	46,004,000		50,873,000	24.5
Baptist	33,964,000		33,830,000	16.3
Protestant - no denomination supplied	17,214,000		4,647,000	2.2
Methodist/Wesleyan	14,174,000		14,150,000	6.8
Lutheran	9,110,000		9,580,000	4.6
Christian - no denomination supplied	8,073,000		14,190,000	6.8
Presbyterian	4,985,000		5,596,000	2.7
Pentecostal/Charismatic	3,191,000		4,407,000	2.1
Episcopalian/Anglican	3,042,000		3,451,000	1.7
Mormon/Latter-Day Saints	2,487,000		2,787,000	1.3
Churches of Christ	1,769,000		2,503,000	1.2
Jehovah's Witness	1,381,000		1,331,000	0.6
Seventh-Day Adventist	668,000		724,000	0.3
Assemblies of God	660,000		1,106,000	0.5
Holiness/Holy	610,000		569,000	0.3
Congregational/United Church of Christ	599,000		1,378,000	0.7
Church of the Nazarene	549,000		544,000	0.3
Church of God	531,000		944,000	0.5
Orthodox (Eastern)	502,000		645,000	
Evangelical	242,000		1,032,000	0.5
Mennonite	235,000		346,000	
Christian Science	214,000		194,000	
Church of the Brethren	206,000		358,000	
Born Again	204,000		56,000	
Nondenominational	195,000		2,489,000	1.2
Disciples of Christ	144,000		492,000	
Reformed/Dutch Reform	161,000		289,000	
Apostolic/New Apostolic	117,000		254,000	
Quaker	67,000		217,000	
Full Gospel	51,000		168,000	
Christian Reform	40,000		79,000	
Foursquare Gospel	28,000		70,000	
Fundamentalist	27,000		61,000	
Salvation Army	27,000		25,000	
Independent Christian Church	25,000		71,000	
<b>Total Christian</b>	<b>151,225,000</b>	<b>86.2</b>	<b>159,030,000</b>	<b>76.5</b>

**Self Described Religious Identification of U.S. Adult Population,1990-2001 cont.**

Other Religious Groups	1990		2001	
	Number	%	Number	%
Jewish	3,137,000		2,831,000	1.3
Muslim/Islamic	527,000		1,104,000	0.5
Buddhist	401,000		1,082,000	0.5
Unitarian/Universalist	502,000		629,000	0.3
Hindu	227,000		766,000	0.4
Native American	47,000		103,000	
Scientologist	45,000		55,000	
Baha'I	28,000		84,000	
Taoist	23,000		40,000	
New Age	20,000		68,000	
Eckankar	18,000		26,000	
Rastafarian	14,000		11,000	
Sikh	13,000		57,000	
Wiccan	8,000		134,000	
Deity	6,000		49,000	
Druid			33,000	
Santeria			22,000	
Pagan			140,000	
Spiritualist			116,000	
Ethical Culture			4,000	
Other unclassified	837,000		386,000	
<b>Total Other Religions</b>	<b>5,853,000</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>7,740,000</b>	<b>3.7</b>
<b>NO RELIGION GROUPS</b>				
Atheist			902,000	0.4
Agnostic	1,186,000		991,000	0.5
Humanist	29,000		49,000	0
Secular			53,000	0
No Religion	13,116,000		27,486,000	13.2
<b>Total No Religion Specified</b>	<b>14,331,000</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>29,481,000</b>	<b>14.1</b>
<b>Refused</b>	<b>4,031,000</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>11,246,000</b>	<b>5.4</b>
<b>TOTAL IDENTIFICATION</b>	<b>175,440,000</b>		<b>207,980,000</b>	

Source: American Religious Identification Survey, 2001 (Exhibit 1, pg 12-13)

**Appendix B. Logistic Regression of Catholic to Migration**

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$	B	$e^{\beta}$	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$
<i>Independent</i>								
<u>Religion</u>								
Inter-Religious	-.021	.979					-.007	.993
	(.166)						(.178)	
(Intra-Religious)		---						---
<i>Control Variables</i>								
<u>Length of Residence</u>								
0-2 year			1.031	2.803***			1.086	2.963***
			(.168)				(.180)	
3-5 year			.763	2.144***			.914	2.495***
			(.198)				(.209)	
6-10 year			.326	1.385			.444	1.559
			(.221)				(.230)	
(11 years and over)			---				---	
<u>Age</u>								
18-21					.742	2.100*	.733	2.082*
					(.315)		(.322)	
22-25					.643	1.902*	.570	1.768
					(.300)		(.370)	
26-30					.256	1.292	.129	1.138
					(.313)		(.319)	
31-35					.058	1.060	-.001	.999
					(.323)		(.329)	
(36 and older)					---		---	
<u>Education</u>								
Less than High School					-.555	.574	-.379	.685
					(.292)		(.301)	
High School Graduate					-.234	.791	.034	1.035
					(.189)		(.198)	
Some College					.034	1.035	.260	1.297
					(.263)		(.273)	
(College Graduate and more)					---		---	
Constant	-1.220		-1.651		-1.428		-2.030	
-2 Log Likelihood	1330.125		1286.749		1252.192		1200.592	
N	1241		1243		1173		1159	

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ 

Note: Variables in parentheses indicate comparison group.

**Appendix C. Logistic Regression of Protestant<sup>a</sup> to Migration**

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	B	e <sup>β</sup>	B	e <sup>β</sup>	β	e <sup>β</sup>	B	e <sup>β</sup>
<i>Independent</i>								
<u>Religion</u>								
Inter-Religious	-.274	.760*					-.257	.774
(Intra-Religious)		---						---
<i>Control Variables</i>								
<u>Length of Residence</u>								
0-2 year			1.206	3.342***			1.235	3.438***
			(.136)				(.147)	
3-5 year			1.053	2.865***			1.111	3.038***
			(.149)				(.159)	
6-10 year			.052	1.053			.199	1.220
			(.188)				(.197)	
(11 years and over)			---				---	
<u>Age</u>								
18-21					1.042	2.834***	1.019	2.769***
					(.229)		(.235)	
22-25					.779	2.180***	.550	1.733*
					(.219)		(.226)	
26-30					.675	1.963**	.482	1.619*
					(.221)		(.227)	
31-35					.162	1.176	.066	1.069
					(.235)		(.241)	
(36 and older)					---		---	
<u>Education</u>								
Less than High School					-1.007	.365***	-.672	.511**
					(.225)		(.233)	
High School Graduate					-.594	.552***	-.330	.719*
					(.139)		(.147)	
Some College					-.563	.569*	-.288	.749
					(.241)		(.250)	
(College Graduate and more)					---		---	
Constant	-1.123		-1.750		-1.251		-1.878	
-2 Log Likelihood	2127.078		2029.470		1995.418		1884.268	
N	1956		1966		1859		1844	

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ Note: <sup>a</sup> Protestant includes Baptist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Methodist  
Variables in parentheses indicate comparison group.

**Appendix D. Logistic Regression of Frequency of Catholic Attendance to Migration**

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$	B	$e^{\beta}$	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$	B	$e^{\beta}$
<i>Independent</i>								
<u>Church Attendance</u>								
Inter-Attendance	-.356	.701*					-.277	.758
	(.163)						(.173)	
(Intra-Attendance)		---						---
<i>Control Variables</i>								
<u>Length of Residence</u>								
0-2 year			1.031				1.060	2.885***
			(.168)				(.180)	
3-5 year			.763				.879	2.407***
			(.198)				(.211)	
6-10 year			.326				.435	1.544
			(.221)				(.230)	
(11 years and over)			---					---
<u>Age</u>								
18-21					.742	2.100*	.701	2.015*
					(.315)		(.321)	
22-25					.643	1.902*	.538	1.713
					(.300)		(.307)	
26-30					.256	1.292	.113	1.119
					(.313)		(.320)	
31-35					.058	1.060	-.044	.957
					(.323)		(.329)	
(36 and older)					---			---
<u>Education</u>								
Less than High School					-.555	.574	-.344	.709
					(.292)		(.302)	
High School Graduate					-.234	.791	.048	1.049
					(.189)		(.199)	
Some College					.034	1.035	.266	1.305
					(.263)		(.273)	
(College Graduate and more)					---			---
Constant	-1.143		-1.651		-1.428		-1.939	
-2 Log Likelihood	1322.752		1286.749		1252.192		1196.721	
N	1241		1243		1173		1159	

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ 

Note: Variables in parentheses indicate comparison group.

**Appendix E. Logistic Regression of Frequency of Protestant<sup>a</sup> Attendance to Migration**

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$	$\beta$	$e^{\beta}$	B	$e^{\beta}$
<i>Independent</i>								
<u>Church Attendance</u>								
Inter-Attendance	-.104	.901					-.058	.943
	(.119)						(.127)	
(Intra-Attendance)		---						---
<i>Control Variables</i>								
<u>Length of Residence</u>								
0-2 year			1.206	3.342***			1.228	3.413***
			(.136)				(.147)	
3-5 year			1.053	2.865***			1.095	2.989***
			(.149)				(.159)	
6-10 year			.052	1.053			.183	1.200
			(.188)				(.197)	
(11 years and over)			---				---	
<u>Age</u>								
18-21					1.042	2.834***	1.026	2.790***
					(.229)		(.235)	
22-25					.779	2.180***	.569	1.767*
					(.219)		(.225)	
26-30					.675	1.963**	.496	1.642*
					(.221)		(.228)	
31-35					.162	1.176	.059	1.061
					(.235)		(.241)	
(36 and older)					---		---	
<u>Education</u>								
Less than High School					-1.007	.365***	-.710	.492**
					(.225)		(.235)	
High School Graduate					-.594	.552***	-.319	.727*
					(.139)		(.147)	
Some College					-.563	.569*	-.298	.742
					(.241)		(.250)	
(College Graduate and more)					---		---	
Constant	-1.152		-1.750		-1.251		-1.921	
-2 Log Likelihood	2130.145		2029.470		1995.418		1886.646	
N	1955		1966		1859		1843	

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ Note: <sup>a</sup> Protestant includes Baptist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Methodist  
Variables in parentheses indicate comparison group.