



Cleveland State University
EngagedScholarship@CSU

ETD Archive

2008

Worship Styles, Music and Social Identity

Terri Lynne Johnson
Cleveland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive>

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Recommended Citation

Johnson, Terri Lynne, "Worship Styles, Music and Social Identity" (2008). *ETD Archive*. 654.
<https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive/654>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in ETD Archive by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.

WORSHIP STYLES, MUSIC AND SOCIAL IDENTITY:

A COMMUNICATION STUDY

TERRI LYNNE JOHNSON

Bachelor of Arts in Communication

Cleveland State University

Spring, 2006

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree

MASTERS OF APPLIED COMMUNICATION THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

at the


CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

May, 2008

THESIS APPROVAL
SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION

This thesis has been approved for the
School of Communication


And the College of Graduate Studies by:



Thesis Committee Chairman
School of Communication

4/25/08


(Date)



Committee Member
School of Communication

4/25/08

(Date)



Committee Member
School of Communication

4/29/08

(Date)

DEDICATION

In the summer of 2007, I was given an article by a friend and member of my church that spurred my curiosity to explore this topic of worship music and identity. She lost her battle with cancer on December 13th, 2007, at the age of 53. This thesis is dedicated in memory of MaryBeth McConnell (Ph.d). Thank you, MaryBeth. I am confident that we will see each other again, face-to-face.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the many people who gave their time, patience and guidance in the completion of this thesis. To my thesis advisor, Dr. Jill Rudd and my committee members, Dr. Kimberly Neuendorf and Dr. Guowei Jian for their continued guidance throughout the conceptualization and writing of this thesis.

First, I would like to thank my friend and advisor, Dr. Jill Rudd, for her direction and encouragement, not only in the writing of this thesis, but throughout the program. Thank you Jill, you have been an invaluable support to me both personally and academically.

Thank you, Dr. Neuendorf for encouraging me to explore my passion and always being available to answer questions and provide clear instruction. Your enthusiasm and obvious love for statistics has been an inspiration.

I would also like to thank Dr. Guowei Jian for his kindness and guidance, particularly in the conceptualization and organization of this thesis. Thank you, Dr. Jian for providing immediate response to my many questions. I am truly grateful to you for your insight and wisdom.

To my office mates, Bettina and Bridget, thank you for the laughter we shared throughout the program and to Carolyn, thank you for your encouragement and perspective during the final days of this thesis endeavor.

Finally, I would like to thank the members of Trinity Lutheran Church who took the time to complete my survey and provided continual encouragement and support. And last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, who gives me life and purpose.

“I will sing a new song to the Lord, for he has done marvelous things” Psalm 98:1

**"Next to the Word of God, music deserves the highest praise.
The gift of language combined with the gift of song was given
to man that he should proclaim the Word of God"**

Martin Luther

WORSHIP STYLES, MUSIC AND SOCIAL IDENTITY:

A COMMUNICATION STUDY

TERRI LYNNE JOHNSON

ABSTRACT

This study explored worship style, music and social identity from a communication perspective. Specifically, this study was interested in understanding the variables that influence worship music preference. Results indicated that Missouri Synod Lutherans who prefer traditional worship components identify more strongly with the larger organization, the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (LCMS). Moreover, music preference strongly predicts worship style preference. In addition, parishioner's perception of self-disclosure in hymns and praise songs was also examined. Results indicated that certain dimensions of self-disclosure are more prevalent in hymns and praise songs than others and perceived self-disclosure is stronger with those who attend a contemporary worship service than those who attend a traditional service.

Research participants completed a questionnaire survey, which utilized the *Revised Self-Disclosure Scale* to measure their perception of self-disclosure through worship music and the *Identification with a Psychological Group* scale to measure their identification with the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod. Additionally, the survey measured music preference, worship preferences, lifestyle values and religiosity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose.....	3
Rationale.....	4
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
Traditional Worship Service.....	6
Contemporary Worship Service.....	8
Social Identity Theory.....	9
Organizational Identity.....	12
Musical Identity.....	14
Musical Identity and Worship Music.....	16
Musical Identity and Values.....	18
Self-Disclosure and Worship Music.....	20
III. METHODS.....	25
Overview.....	25
Participants.....	27
Procedures.....	28
Instruments.....	28
IV. RESULTS.....	32
V. DISCUSSION.....	54

Limitations.....	67
Directions for Future Study.....	68
Conclusion.....	69
REFERENCES.....	71
APPENDIX.....	87
Survey.....	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Factor Analysis of Worship Elements.....	33
II. Prediction of Organizational Identity.....	35
III. Prediction of Traditional Factor by music preference.....	37
IV. Prediction of Contemporary Factor by music preference.....	37
V. Prediction of Traditional Factor by music preference with controls.....	40
VI. Prediction of Contemporary Factor by music preference with controls.....	41
VII. Logistic Regression.....	43
VIII. Prediction of Traditional Factor by lifestyle values.....	45
IX. Prediction of Contemporary Factor by lifestyle values.....	45
X. Prediction of Traditional Factor by internal individual values.....	46
XI. Prediction of Contemporary Factor by internal individual values.....	46
XII. Prediction of Traditional Factor by internal interpersonal values.....	46
XIII. Prediction of Contemporary Factor by internal interpersonal values.....	46
XIV. Prediction of Traditional Factor by external dimension values.....	46
XV. Prediction of Contemporary Factor by external dimension values.....	46
XVI. Prediction of Traditional Factor by self-disclosure.....	50
XVII. Prediction of Contemporary Factor by self-disclosure	50
XVIII. Prediction of Traditional Factor by self-disclosure dimensions.....	50
XIX. Prediction of Contemporary Factor by self-disclosure dimensions.....	50
XX. Self-disclosure through singing hymns/worship songs.....	51
XXI. DV#1: Intended Disclosure Dimension of Self-Disclosure Scale.....	51

XXII. DV#2: Amount Dimension of Self-Disclosure Scale..... 52

XXIII. DV#3: Positive/Negative Dimension of Self-Disclosure Scale.....52

XXIV. DV#4: Control of Depth Dimension of Self-Disclosure Scale.....52

XXV. DV#5: Honesty/Accuracy Dimension of Self-Disclosure Scale..... 52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Music is used as a form of communication throughout the world, not just for entertainment purposes. For instance, in many cultures, “music constitutes a core feature of life” (Lull, 1985, p.363) communicating practical information regarding history, legal matters, and even medical care (Wallis & Malm, 1984). An example of this can be found in the early Native American culture where religious rituals, games, tribal ceremonies and relationships were often accompanied with songs and music (Hamm, 1983). Therefore, since music is able to convey various socio-cultural norms and beliefs (Lull, 1985) and create shared understanding, it is “appropriately placed within the tradition of the discipline of communication” (Chesebro, Fougler, Nachman, & Yannelli, 1985, p. 115).

Historically, music has been a vehicle for expressing group and cultural identities because it has the ability to transcend social boundaries, express cultural meaning, and amplify message content that oftentimes block communication (Chafee, 1985). For instance, during the 1960s when the United States was experiencing major upheaval and unrest, music provided the younger generations, particularly the baby-boomers, a vehicle for expressing to the establishment their opinions about the war, feminism, civil rights and sexual freedom.

For many of the boomers, rock and roll wasn't just music: it was a cause, a cult, a movement. It divided parents and children, as well as teaching its devotees styles, attitudes, ideologies and behaviors (Eyerman & Jamison, 1995, 1998; Eyerman, 2002; Peddie, 2006). It separated them from the rest of society and enabled them to form their own, separate identity or subcultures. If one were to recall the many social rebellions and rallies of the sixties, they were often accompanied by music that allowed the expression of deep feelings and values, more so than words alone (Dunaway, 1987). Thus, music has the ability to combine both affect and cognitive components of communication (Stern, 2004).

Since the late 1950s and early 1960s popular music has become an important way for many people to distinguish themselves from others (Frith, 1981, 1987a). Specifically, the boomer generation believed their music is what set them apart from previous generations and allowed them to view themselves in a positive manner (Hamilton, 1999). A generation that found its youthful identity in music would look for religious identity in music as well, and it was quite clear that if those from the boomer generation were to come back to the churches and religion they had previously shunned, this identity (i.e., their music) would need to come with them. And so began the Jesus Movement.

Rock-n-roll was simple and it allowed for the expression of deep emotions. Most of all, it gave voice to values and ideas, as well as longings and anxieties. This music was, for the baby boom generation, their means for articulating their identity, marking their place in society (Hamilton, 1999) and communicating what they believed. Since music was extremely important to baby boomers and the vehicle they used to communicate, it was apparent that if they were to become involved in the church, the church needed to use

music as a means of communication. Thus, Jesus Rock was born (Romanowski, 1992). Since its inception, Jesus Rock (which is better known as Contemporary Christian Music) has continued to change and reflect our society and culture.

Throughout the Christian church, conflict abounds (Becker et al., 1993; Becker, 1998; Hoekema, 1994; Starcke and Dyck, 1996) furthermore, there is an ongoing war that many have dubbed the “Worship Wars” (Dawn, 1995). The traditional services, the in-group, have been the norm for centuries. However, as our society changes, many churches are offering contemporary services in order to communicate to today’s culture. On the surface, the conflict appears to be over the issue of music. Many theologians, as well as lay people, agree that this is a critical issue. However, they differ in their assessment as to why. Some focus on the lyrics (preferring substance over form) and some focus on the music (preferring style over structure). Others focus on whether music should be cognitive or emotive. These issues are not new to this generation. In Joseph Herl’s book, *Worship Wars in Early Lutheranism* (2004), he addresses the issues that were pertinent in the sixteen century. Here too, debates over music in worship were salient.

Purpose

Music genres provide a common ground to share culture, enabling us to communicate who we are and what we believe. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate music preference, worship style, and social identity from a communication perspective. Oftentimes, particularly within the church, conflict over music preferences is common. One perspective of this difference is related to parishioners’ identity. Therefore, it is appropriate to examine this conflict using Social Identity Theory as a framework.

When individuals distinguish themselves from a larger, more prominent culture, a subculture develops. These subcultures develop an “us-versus-them,” or in-group versus out-group mentality. This can best be understood through Tajfel’s Theory of Social Identity (Tajfel, 1970, 1974, 1975, 1978). Social Identity Theory (SIT) posits that groups view themselves positively or negatively depending on how they compare with other groups, producing a competitive dynamic that encourages group members to enhance their group status (Tajfel, 1972).

Music is a vehicle capable of communicating and creating understanding. Furthermore it enables individuals and groups to distinguish themselves from others, declaring their identity and place in society. One way to examine the social identity of worshippers is to examine the role music plays in communicating their social identity among other Christians. Perhaps the reason an individual prefers contemporary or traditional worship music is because their music preferences are a part of their social identity and influences the way in which they want to communicate. Or conversely, perhaps their social identity is communicated through the worship music they prefer. By building upon Social Identity Theory research and examining individual music preferences we may gain valuable insight into why worship music preference exists.

Rationale

Recently, communication scholars have been calling for the need to incorporate religious perspectives into academic research (Christians, 2004; Griffin, 2004; Medhurst, 2004; Muehlhoff, 2004; Schultze, 2005; Stout & Buddenbaum, 1996)). We are able to respond to this need by using a communication framework to examine worship music as a form of self-disclosure, building upon the idea of God as a significant other (Chatam-

Carpenter, 2006). Using Social Identity Theory as a theoretical framework for understanding conflict within religious organizations, we are able to explore how worship music is perceived as a form of self-disclosure to God and other worshippers, and how self-disclosure is enhanced when our social identity is understood and acknowledged (Karbo, 2006).

Social Identity Theory has been used to study organizational culture (Hatch & Schultz, 2004; Clair, Beatty, & Maclean, 2005), musical identity (MacDonald, Hargreaves, & Miell, 2002), and religious identity (Herriot, 2007). These ideas of different identities merged in an article written by John L. Pauley (2005). His research examined the identity of the Contemporary Christian Music (CCM) community when boundaries began to fade between the secular and the sacred (see Gormly, 2003 for further discussion). This study seeks to build upon Pauley's research by examining competing identities within a religious denomination from a Social Identity framework. By using a social identity perspective, it is logical that one could achieve a greater understanding of the conflict that exists within the churches of today.

It is almost certain that music styles and language will continue to evolve and change. It is therefore pertinent that we examine this continual controversy through a communication perspective, and get beyond the surface issue of music to what may be a critical factor in the conflict: social identity.

Therefore, this study seeks to answer the following questions: What is the role of worship music preference as a form of communication as well as what influencing factors help parishioners develop a worship style preference?

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review begins by presenting a historical perspective of two different worship styles as well as key terms and concepts that are used throughout this study. It then provides an overview of Social Identity Theory as a framework for investigating the role of worship music.

Traditional Worship Service

In the sixteenth century, October 31, 1517, Martin Luther nailed his 95 theses to the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg. These theses or concerns addressed issues of purgatory, indulgences and other teachings of the church. It was an act that began the Reformation and, ultimately, changed the world. Within weeks, all of Europe had heard about Luther's theses, and eventually Luther was declared an outlaw. Anyone could kill him on sight (see Bainton, 1950).

Perhaps unnoticed in the furor over theology was a significant change that Luther made almost as an after thought. His primary focus in reforming the mass (which would later be referred to as a *worship service*) was to give it back to the people. In fact, Joseph Herl (2004) believed that perhaps one reason why Martin Luther devised German text

chorales was so that the laity could participate in worship and gain a collective religious identity. Martin Luther emphasized using the vernacular language (which at the time was German) and was known to use traditional folk tunes as a source for composing *singable* Lutheran hymns (Noll, 2007). Luther held music in high esteem and composed many hymns that are still used in the church today. Consequently, the music written by Martin Luther, and those that are similar in form, give worshippers in the Lutheran church today a sense of identity.

If one were to define traditional, the meaning of the term is somewhat ambiguous, as traditions within particular parishes may differ considerably. However, for the purpose of this research, the term traditional will refer to orders of services and hymns that are found in the standard Lutheran hymnals. A traditional worship service follows a *liturgy*, which in this context signifies “the specific, historic ordering of public worship developed in the earliest centuries of the Church” (Dawn, 1995, p. 242).

Within the traditional liturgy there are various parts such as: the invocation, the confession, the absolution, the kyrie, a confession of faith or creed, the collect, the offertory, a sermon, and a benediction. There are three readings each Sunday that follow a particular schedule. The first reading will often come from the Old Testament, the second reading from the New Testament, and the third reading from one of the four Gospels. The pastor preaches from a pulpit and wears an *alb* (i.e., a white robe) with a colored *stole* (i.e., a band of colored cloth about seven and a half to nine feet long and three to four inches wide. The center of the stole is worn around the back of the neck and the two ends hang down parallel to each other in front). The color of the stole matches the altar *paraments*, which change according to what part of the church year is being observed.

The service will often utilize *responsive readings* where the liturgist will read a portion followed by the congregation responding. The traditional service also contains written prayers, the Lord's Prayer, and *traditional hymns*. Traditional hymns are usually accompanied by an organ and are sung in the traditional service. These hymns are found in the Lutheran hymnbook and are organized according to the church year and topical considerations (e.g., adoration, faith, justification, etc.)

The traditional service in this case study, utilizes the liturgy and order of services contained within the Lutheran Hymnal, Lutheran Worship, Creative Worship and/or the Lutheran Service Book. The service begins with a prelude and ends with a postlude that is played on the famous von Beckerath organ. The organ always accompanies the hymns and often a processional will take place at the beginning of a service.

Contemporary Worship Service

Worship music is the primary difference between traditional and contemporary worship services. Some contemporary services will blend the two worship styles by following the traditional liturgy and inserting contemporary praise songs throughout the service. On the other hand, contemporary worship services may differ considerably between particular parishes and even within the same congregation. Scripture passages are read, but not necessarily all three of the readings as stated above. The pastor may or may not wear an alb or preach from a pulpit. The leader will often pray spontaneously, meaning that the prayers are not written down. Some contemporary services may utilize responsive readings, written prayers, and other parts of the liturgy.

A contemporary service does not necessarily follow any set order (or liturgy) and is usually designed to reach different demographics than the traditional service. Although

there may be many differences in the formatting between a traditional and contemporary service, the most predominant difference is the instrumentation and style of the worship music that is sung, and therefore that is the focus of this study.

Contemporary praise songs are typically accompanied by a full band (e.g., drums, guitar, bass, etc.) and are sung in the contemporary service. This will differ considerably between parishes and even within the same church as praise bands vary significantly from one another. Some bands may have a piano player or even a violinist, while others have a flautist or a saxophonist. Although the lyrics to the songs are about God and our relationship to Him, the style of music incorporates different genres such as rock, blues, pop, country and folk. Frequently, several songs are sung in succession.

The contemporary service in this study is very informal. Parishioners drink coffee and often eat during the service. The pastor does not wear an alb and usually only two of the three scripture passages are read. Two different worship teams take turns leading the service. One worship team is composed of five members: a drummer, bassist, lead guitarist, and two rhythm guitarists. The three guitarists also provide vocals. The other worship team is composed of eight members: a drummer, bassist, violinist, percussionist, two rhythm guitarists, a pianist, and a worship leader. Six of the members also provide vocals. These two teams take turns leading worship on a bi-monthly rotation.

Social Identity Theory

Social Identity Theory (SIT) is often considered a “grand theory” in that it attempts to give an overall explanation of social life, history, or human experience. The theory is complex, multifaceted and dynamic. Consequently, different aspects of Social Identity Theory have been the focus of attention at different times (Hewstone & Greenland, 2000;

Stets & Burke, 2000; Stryker & Burke, 2000; Turner, 1999). Its predecessor was Realistic Group Conflict Theory, which was pioneered in social psychology by Muzafer Sherif and colleagues (1954). Tajfel and Turner (1986) sought to further Realistic Group Conflict Theory by focusing on the psychological processes of social conflict.

Social Identity Theory is a theory of group membership and behavior (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995). It has been defined as, “the individual’s knowledge that he/she belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional and value significance to him/her of the group membership” (Tajfel, 1972, p.31). This knowledge of belonging is very prominent within Christian churches. Furthermore, according to SIT, groups view themselves positively or negatively depending on how they compare with other groups. This produces a competitive dynamic that encourages group members to enhance their group status. Tajfel and Turner (1986) found that when a group’s positive identity is challenged or impeded by an out-group, conflict would often ensue.

Social Identity Theory grew out of Henri Tajfel’s early work on perceptual accentuation effects (Tajfel, 1957, 1959) and his concern and interest in the social psychology of intergroup conflict, prejudice, discrimination and social change (Tajfel, 1963, 1969, 1973). Although Tajfel initially conceived the theory, it became formalized in the 1970s and early 1980s through collaboration with students and colleagues at the University of Bristol. During this time period, Tajfel (1970; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy & Flament, 1971) conducted several experiments that explored the tendency individuals have to favor the in-group over the out-group. Results of the studies confirmed that in-group bias is a ubiquitous aspect of intergroup relations.

The two major tenets of the theory are Tajfel and Turner's (1979) discussion of intergroup relations and Turner's (1982) cognitive redefinition of group membership. This can be explained by visualizing two extremes of social behavior on opposite ends of a continuum. At one end is interpersonal behavior where two individuals interact with no effect whatsoever of the social groups they are a part of. On the other end is intergroup behavior where two groups of individuals interact purely on the basis of the groups that they are a part of (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Most interaction falls somewhere between these two extremes.

For example, even though many social categories are categorical (e.g., Lutheran/Baptist), it is a matter of degree as to the extent in which an individual identifies with each category. According to Social Identity Theory, the self-concept is comprised of both a personal identity (e.g., physical attributes, interests, abilities) and a social identity (e.g., American, female, Christian) and often there is a difference in behavior between these two identities. When social identity is salient, one acts as a group member, whereas when personal identity is salient, one does not (Abrams & Hogg, 1990).

In the 1970s, Tajfel developed a foundation of Social Identity Theory by connecting the following three social-psychological processes: *social categorization*, *social comparison* and *social identification* (Ellemers, Haslam, Platow, & Van Knippenberg, 2003). In Tajfel's initial writings about this theory (Tajfel, 1974, 1975, 1978), he developed the idea that these three processes interact with each other in situations where individuals define themselves at the group level rather than the individual level.

The first social-psychological process, *social categorization*, is when people tend to identify themselves and others, not as distinct individuals, but in terms of social categories

(Ellemers, et al., 2003): a group in which one belongs, or the in-group and the group in which one does not belong, or the out-group (Ellemers, et al., 2003). The second social-psychological process, *social comparison*, is when people tend to determine the value of groups and individuals by comparing them on various dimensions with other groups (Ellemers et al, 2003). Finally, the third social-psychological process, *social identification*, is when a person's identity tends to influence their perceptions of, and responses to, a social situation (Ellemers, et al., 2003). Although Social Identity Theory focuses on intergroup behavior, particularly conflict, it also "portends to be a unifying theory of organizational behavior because what and how people think as members of social groups influences subsequent behavior and attitudes in social systems" (Korte, 2006, p.166).

Organizational Identity

Ashforth and Mael (1989) were among the first to apply Social Identity Theory to the organization. Their research defined organizational identity as a "psychological reality [existing] beyond its membership" which "enables the individual to conceive of, and feel loyal to, an organization or corporate culture" (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p.26).

Furthermore, the SIT literature supports the importance of distinct values and practices in providing a unique identity (Oakes & Turner, 1986) as well as recognizing that institutions often use written forms to communicate and preserve that unique identity (Seul, 1999).

Organizational identity is prominent whenever members of an organization ask themselves, "Who are we?" (Albert & Whetten, 1985). It is the member's collective understanding of what it is that distinguishes their organization from others, those characteristics that they believe to be central and relatively permanent (Albert & Whetten, 1985). These core features of identity are presumed to be resistant to change because they

are tied to the history of the organization (Brown & Starkey, 2000; Gioia, Shultz, & Corley, 2000, 2004), which often results in what theorists call “structural inertia” (Hannan & Freeman, 1984). The theory of structural inertia posits that the older an organization is, the less likely they are to introduce changes (Chou & Russel, 2006; Delacroix & Swaminathan, 1991; Kelly & Amburgey, 1991).

Fundamental to most theoretical and empirical definitions of organizational identity is that identity consists of features and characteristics that are central, enduring and distinctive (Gioia, Shultz, & Corley, 2004). Oftentimes, intergroup conflict results when an organization adds members who are not tied to the history of the organization, and therefore have different ideas of what is central, enduring and distinctive. One way to reduce this type of intergroup conflict is to develop “superordinate goals” which can only be accomplished when groups work together (Sherif, 1958).

In the year 2000, the first issue of the journal *Academy of Management Review* was dedicated to the subject of identity within organizations. Several of the articles dealt with the subject of multiple identities (Brickson, 2000; Gioia, Shultz, & Corley, 2000; Pratt & Foreman, 2000a; Pratt & Foreman, 2000b; Scott & Lane, 2000) and there was some consensus that multiple, and often competing identities are a common phenomenon within organizations (Pratt & Foreman, 2000b; Scott, 2007).

Although an organization needs to manage these multiple identities, literature suggests that multiple identities provide various benefits within an organization that allows the organization to adapt more readily to change (Pratt & Foreman, 2000a). Research also suggests that various small groups and dyads are frequently the source of these numerous

identities (Pratt & Foreman, 2000a) which results in several differing views about what is central, distinctive and enduring about the organization (Pratt & Foreman, 2000a).

When a church offers two completely different worship styles with completely different styles of music, oftentimes there are differing views about what is central, distinctive and enduring. Frequently, those who have been a part of the organization for a longer period of time attend a more *traditional* style of worship and have a stronger identification with the organization. Conversely, those who attend a more *contemporary* service are often new to the organization and, therefore, do not have a strong identification with the larger organization. Based on these findings, the following research question was advanced.

RQ1: Does worship preference predict organizational identification?

Musical Identity

“One can say that music and other forms of cultural expression can articulate as well as fuse a group, offering a sense of group belonging and collectivity...” (Eyerman, 2002, p. 447). In fact, research has shown that an individual’s music preference is able to predict their political affiliation (Fox & Williams, 1974; Timpany, 2007), aggression tendencies (Meng-Jinn, Miller, Grube, & Waiters, 2006) and personality (Pearson & Dollinger, 2004; Rentfrow & Gosling, 2003). Moreover, several studies have been conducted that use music preferences to test Social Identity Theory. Some researchers have studied the impact of music on social identity through ethnographic methods (see Cavicchi, 1998; *Satisfied: Consumption*, 2002) and others have utilized experiments to study the impact of music on social identity, particularly intergroup behavior (Bakagiannis & Tarrant, 2006; North & Hargreaves, 1999; Tarrant, Hargreaves & North, 2001; Tarrant,

et al., 2001). The ethnographic study *Satisfied: Consumption, Identity, and Widespread Panic* (2002) investigated issues of identity by participating with the fans and culture surrounding the band *Widespread Panic*. Results indicate that music is often used to communicate identities as well as provide individuals a framework with which they are able to define their world. In addition, a three-year ethnographic study amid Springsteen fans, investigated how the culture surrounding music helps to create communities and shape identities (Cavicchi, 1998).

Other experimental studies such as those conducted by Tarrant (2001), correlated participants' levels of self-esteem (Julian, Bishop, & Fiedler, 1966) with their ratings of the in-group and out-group. Tarrant found that individuals with lower self-esteem scores rated the out-group as liking unpopular music more and the in-group as liking it less. According to SIT, a need for positive social identity and self-esteem is what motivates intergroup discrimination (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Tajfel, 1978a) and increased discrimination is often a result of a low or threatened self-esteem. Therefore, the participants created more distance between the in-group and the out-group if they had lower levels of self-esteem. Further research conducted by North and Hargreaves (1999) examined how music preference can be used to make social judgments. Results indicated that subjects who expressed a preference for popular music were perceived more positively than if they expressed a preference for unpopular music (see also Zillmann & Bhatia, 1989).

Nicholas Cook (1998) expresses the concept of musical identity quite succinctly; "Deciding what music to listen to is a significant part of deciding and announcing to people not just who you 'want to be'but who you *are*... 'music' is a very small word to encompass something that takes as many forms as there are cultural or sub-cultural

identities” (p.5). Sardiello (1994) expounds on this idea, explaining that subcultures often define themselves in terms of distinct languages, symbols and lifestyles. Memberships in these groups help individuals develop their personal and social identity and music can be an important factor in their creation and maintenance (Sardiello, 1994). This is because music is able to express who we are, what our identity is and to which group we belong (Dolfsma, 1999).

An example of how music is used in this search for identity and meaning can be found during the stage of adolescence (North, Hargreaves, & O’Neill, 2000). During this stage of life, many experience an identity crisis. They want to know who they are and to what group they belong. Since adolescents spend increasingly more time exploring different musical genres (Avery, 1979), music is where many find the identity that they are searching for, therefore resolving the identity crisis (Marcia, 1966; Newman & Newman, 1988). Once a particular genre of music is successful in resolving an identity crisis, as was common to those of the baby boom generation, it is probable that the genre becomes an integral part of an individual’s social identity, which is then carried into adulthood.

Musical Identity and Worship Music

Music is an important element of church worship (Fisher, 2004; Herl, 2004; Midian, 1999; Miller & Strongman, 2002). However, non-denominational churches were the first to incorporate music with which the baby boomer generation was able to identify and that embraced and communicated to their culture and social identity (Gormly, 2003). Many mainline denominations have been slow to adopt this musical style (Chou & Russell, 2006) because they also had developed identities that were intertwined with the music they sang. However, in 1962, a group of British church musicians attempted to connect with the

boomer generation by revitalizing church singing. They were searching for a new, simple music without traditional ecclesiastical accent that would “catch the ear of our time” (Hamilton, 1999, p.31). They experimented with various poetic forms and instrumentation to accompany hymns, but primarily, they were attempting to connect with the baby-boomer generation by addressing the social issues with which they were so preoccupied (Hamilton, 1999).

Unfortunately, they were not able to break with the forms they knew. For all their openness to new creative currents, the English hymn reformers failed to make a connection with the music of the baby boom generation: rock-n-roll (Hamilton, 1999). Without a change of music, a change in the church would have to wait for other reformers. Music within the church remained somewhat constant in structure and style until the middle of the twentieth century and it was during this time period, when church music changed dramatically and began to reflect the surrounding culture. This has often been referred to as the “Jesus Movement, which was a curious synthesis of American fundamentalism and the 1960s counterculture” (Romanowski, 1992, p.79).

The music that resulted from this movement, *Jesus Rock*, was the predecessor to Contemporary Christian Music (Romanowski, 1992) which is the popular music industry’s fastest growing genre (Eidenmuller, 1996) and is often used in contemporary worship services. This music encompasses a wide variety of musical styles current on the popular charts, including folk, easy listening, contemporary rock and pop, hard rock, new wave, heavy metal, soul gospel, jazz-rock, a cappella, and rap (Romanowski, 1992, 2000). Romanowski (1992) defines it as “evangelical popular music that co-opted existing popular music styles with religious lyrics added for ecclesiastical purposes, specifically, worship

and evangelism.....no other form of popular music was distinguished solely by its ‘spiritual’ dimension” (p.79).

If music preference is part of an individual’s social identity, communicating to others not only who they are but who they want to be and their means for marking their place in society, it is therefore pertinent to examine the possible relationship between music and worship style preference. Furthermore, because music is often generationally bound, it is necessary to account for differences in age, sex, education and income when looking at the way music communicates this identity. Therefore, in order to understand this possible connection, the following research question is advanced:

RQ2: Does music preference predict worship style preference?

Musical Identity and Values

Several studies have been conducted that apply identity theory to music choice (see Macdonald, Hargreaves, and Miell, 2002; Tarrant, et al., 2001) as well as the economic benefits of a strong musical identity among youth which allows them to express their various socio-cultural values through different styles of music (see Dolfsma, 1999; Frith, 1987a). These values, which are often subjective, encompass a wide variety of concerns ranging from moral and ethical to ideological and social (see Feather, 1975; Hechter, Nadel, & Michod, 1993; Kahle, 1983).

An individual’s attitudes, beliefs, opinions, hopes, needs, desires, prejudices and fears all contribute to their value system which finds expression in behaviors and lifestyles (Mitchell, 1983). Much of the value research (Kahle, Beatty, and Homer, 1986; Maslow, 1954; Mitchell, 1983; Rokeach, 1973) looks at how values influence behavior and how they impact the choices individuals make in every aspect of their lives; from vocational and

educational choices to what kind of car to drive (Carman, 1978; Dukes, 1955; Feather, 1970; Gutman, 1982; Holland, 1966, 1973; Reynolds & Gutman, 1984; Rosenberg, 1957). Likewise, “one’s liking for particular kinds of music is a powerful way of communicating one’s basic socio-cultural values for almost all people” (Dolfsma, 1999, p. 1035).

If one were to apply value research in the context of music and worship styles, one may find that people who value fun and excitement listen to music that is more upbeat and prefer a more informal worship style; whereas people who value being well-respected may listen to music that is more complex and prefer a more formal style of worship. The idea is that as one begins to understand the different values that individuals hold, one can begin to understand their behavior and the choices that they make (Kahle, Poulos, & Sukhdial, 1988).

A study conducted by North and Hargreaves (1999) investigated the differences between the perceptions of various personality characteristics and values of fans who listen to three musical styles: Indie Pop, Classical, and Chart Pop. These characteristics and values included such things as, “They are unconventional,” “They are pro-establishment,” and “It is important to them to spend a large amount of their time having fun” (for complete list see North & Hargreaves, 1999). Therefore, by investigating an individual’s values, we may see if there is a connection between values, music preference, and worship style choice. Based on these findings, the following research question was advanced.

RQ3: Is there a relationship between lifestyle values and worship and music style preferences?

Self-Disclosure and Worship Music

McCroskey and Richmond (1977) defined self-disclosure as “any information about the self that is intentionally or unintentionally communicated to another person through verbal or nonverbal messages” (p.40). Even though many music consumers listen to music primarily for entertainment value, most artists will agree that the intent of their messages is contained primarily within the lyrics themselves (Booth, 1976; Gill, 1990; Gonzalez & Makay, 1983; Irvine & Fitzpatrick, 1972; Knupp, 1981; Molokotos-Liederman, 2004; Radwan, 2004; Smith, 1980). For example, Amy Grant, one of Contemporary Christian Music’s (CCM) top selling artists, believes that by employing a medium that appeals to a wider audience there is a greater chance of “her audience to truly hear her message” (Gill, 1990, p.15).

Several studies have analyzed the messages contained in religious song lyrics. Gonzalez and Makay (1983) analyzed the gospel music of Bob Dylan, Mary Gill (1990), the music of Amy Grant and Jon Radwan (2004), the popular Newsboys song *Shine*. Each of these studies examined lyrics containing a religious verbal message that the artist intended to send. According to Infante, Rancer and Womack (1977) intention is the element that defines true communication. Therefore, when analyzing music, particularly those with religious messages, one must consider the intention of the sender as well as the intention of the receiver.

One study that attempted to look at the intentions of the receiver was conducted by Michael Eidenmuller (1996). He found that religious music listeners attend to lyrics more carefully and frequently and are more likely to agree with the messages in the lyrics than nonreligious music listeners. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that when parishioners

sing hymns and songs of praise, they are conscious of the words that they are singing. In addition, results from a study conducted by Jensen (2001) explored how self-disclosure was enhanced if background music was employed. By implication, when parishioners gather together and sing songs of faith, the music allows them to develop greater intimacy with God and other parishioners along various dimensions.

Research has shown that self-disclosure often leads to intimacy. For example, a study in 1980 (Waring, Tillman, Frelick, & Weisz, 1980) interviewed a random sample of adults about their views on intimacy and found that most people identified “sharing private thoughts, dreams, attitudes, beliefs, and fantasy” (p.473) as important elements for intimacy. Further research has shown that self-disclosure is often the strongest predictor of relational closeness (Afifi & Guerrero, 1995; Karbo, 2006) and is considered the most important verbal behavior that is capable of creating and sustaining relational intimacy (Derlega, Metts, Petronio, & Margulis, 1993).

Jourard, the founding father of self-disclosure theory and research, believed that self-disclosure allowed individuals to validate thoughts and feelings and come to a fuller understanding of how they conform to the world around them (Duck & Pittman, 1994). Worship music, both traditional and contemporary, allows parishioners to do this. As they sing the words they come to a fuller understanding of their faith as well as their thoughts and feelings in relation to that faith. Thus, music is able to bring together intellect and feeling and enables personal expression, reflection and emotional development.

According to Chelune and colleagues (1984), positive disclosure statements are associated with greater intimacy. One way to examine worship songs as a form of self-disclosure is to look at the messages contained within the songs. Most likely, they contain

disclosures about attitudes, beliefs, and identity as well as reflect positive statements about both God and the relationship of the worshipper to Him. Therefore, it is probable that singing praise and worship songs enables parishioners to develop greater intimacy with God and others.

An example of one of the most popular praise songs at this time, found listed on the Internet (“Top 25”, n.d.), is *Here I am to Worship* (Hughes, 2000). The lyrics to this song are as follows:

Light of the World, You stepped down into darkness
Opened my eyes let me see.
Beauty that makes this heart adore You
Hope of a life spent with You.
Here I am to worship, here I am to bow down,
Here I am to say that You’re my God.
You’re altogether lovely, altogether worthy, altogether wonderful to me.
King of all days, O so highly exalted
Glorious in heaven above.
Humbly You came to the earth You created.
All for love’s sake became poor.
And I’ll never know how much it cost to see my sin upon that cross.

In the summer of 2004, LCR (Lutheran Church of the Resurrection) counted down 10 of the most popular Lutheran hymns as selected by members and church officials (Frith, n.d.). The top Lutheran hymn was “A Mighty Fortress” written by Martin Luther. The lyrics to the first verse of this hymn are as follows:

A mighty fortress is our God, A trusty shield and weapon.
He helps us free from every need that hath us o'ertaken.
The old evil foe now means deadly woe; Deep guile and might
Are His dread arms in fight; on earth is not His equal.

These songs disclose how one feels about God and how they view themselves. The language of traditional hymns is often more formal and less clear with little or no personal pronouns, whereas the language of contemporary praise songs is informal and more direct with many personal pronouns. Although the language in these two worship songs differs considerably, both songs speak of the positive aspects of God and the relationship of the parishioner to Him. Therefore, it seems relevant to study the sender's perception of what these songs mean and how they enable the sender to communicate and develop intimacy with God and others.

In Karen Karbo's (2006) article on friendship, she writes about how intimacy is developed through self-disclosure (which often is comprised of different dimensions) as well as social identity support. For example, if an individual views him/her self as a Lutheran first and a dancer only on Tuesday evenings, their closest friends are likely to be other Lutherans because they support their primary social identity (Karbo, 2006). Other research has found that identity (self-knowledge and self-esteem), as well as a shared social identity (Karbo, 2006) are important for intimacy (Waring, Tillman, Frelick, & Weisz, 1980). Thus, if being a "contemporary" or "traditional" worshipper is part of an individual's social identity, the worship music they sing together may allow them to develop intimacy with God and other worshippers because they share that identity. Furthermore, the intimacy or act of self-disclosure through worship music may be a reflection of that social identity. Therefore, if intimacy is developed through self-

disclosure and self-disclosure is comprised of different dimensions, the following research questions were advanced.

RQ4: Are there certain dimensions of self-disclosure that are more prevalent in worship music than other dimensions?

RQ5: Is there a difference between traditionalists and contemporaries in their perceived self-disclosure through worship music?

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Overview

Presently in the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (LCMS) there are primarily two types of worship services. One is traditional, with organ and hymns; the other is contemporary, with a variety of instruments and praise songs. Those who engage in traditional worship often have a strong commitment to the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (LCMS) and therefore identify with traditional Lutheranism. This identity is often communicated through traditional hymnody.

According to Social Identity Theory, groups strive to positively distinguish themselves from other groups by generating a collective purpose that needs to be maintained in order for the group to survive (Seul, 1999). The purpose of the traditional worship style is to preserve the “one true faith” by keeping the hymns and forms that have communicated that faith throughout the generations. On the other hand, the purpose of the contemporary worship style is to communicate that faith by utilizing music forms that speak to the culture of today.

As presented earlier in the literature review, Social Identity Theory posits that the following three social-psychological processes interact with each other in situations where individuals define themselves at the group level rather than the individual level: *social categorization*, *social comparison* and *social identification* (Ellemers, Haslam, Platow, & Van Knippenberg, 2003).

The first social-psychological process, *social categorization*, is when people tend to identify themselves and others, not as distinct individuals, but in terms of social categories (Ellemers et al., 2003): a group in which one belongs, or the in-group and the group in which one does not belong, or the out-group (Ellemers, et al., 2003). This categorization can be demonstrated in this study by the two types of worship services in the LCMS: traditional and contemporary.

The second social-psychological process, *social comparison*, is when people tend to determine the value of groups and individuals by comparing them on various dimensions with other groups (Ellemers, et al., 2003). This dimension of comparison in this study is the different type of worship music in the LCMS: hymns and praise songs.

The third social-psychological process, *social identification*, is when a person's identity tends to influence their perceptions of, and responses to, a social situation (Ellemers, et al., 2003). This identification can be demonstrated in this study by the perception parishioners have of the different music styles that are sung in the LCMS.

According to Yin (1994) case studies are appropriate when “the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context” (p. 1). Therefore, in order to further investigate the role of music and social identity within the LCMS church, a case study approach was utilized with a local LCMS congregation. A survey was created and

administered that attempted to measure variables that contribute to worship preferences and Lutheran identity.

Participants

The present study surveyed parishioners from a Missouri-Synod Lutheran Church located in a metropolitan area in the mid-west. This urban congregation conducts five different services throughout the weekend with an average of 250-300 people (including children) attending. Two services were excluded from the data collection due to uncontrollable variables: one service serves African immigrants (40-60 people) and is conducted in Swahili and the other service is a new service (less than a year) that meets at a different location. Average attendance for those eligible to complete the survey was approximately 200 people. 161 surveys were completed (over an 80% response rate).

The 161 participants were 18-87 years of age ($M=45.92$, $SD=15.899$). Of those surveyed, 39% ($N=63$) were male and 61% ($N=97$) were female; over 90% were White/Caucasian ($N=148$), 4.4% Hispanic-American ($N=7$), 1.9% Arab-American ($N=3$), .6 % Black/African-American ($N=1$), .6% Native-American ($N=1$) and .6% other ($N=1$).

Twenty-eight percent ($N=45$) of those surveyed attended some college, over 25% ($N=41$) completed a four-year degree, and over 11% ($N=19$) completed a graduate degree. Twenty percent ($N=32$) completed high school and over 5% ($N=9$) did not complete their high school education. Fifty-two percent ($N=80$) of those surveyed have a yearly income of less than \$40,000 and 9.3% ($N= 15$) have a yearly income of over \$100,000.

Procedures

Surveys were self-administered and distributed throughout the month of February at various church gatherings such as committee meetings, worship services, social functions, and choir rehearsals until sample goal was reached. The survey is comprised of scales and questions that measure self-disclosure, identification, values, worship preferences, music preferences, religiosity, age, race, income, family size, and sex (see Appendix: section VII). Participants signed a consent form, which was kept separate from the actual survey.

Instruments

Revised Self-Disclosure Scale (RSDS)

This is a self-report survey developed by Wheelless and Grotz (1976) that attempts to assess self-disclosure with a specific person or “target.” It was used in this particular study to measure how parishioners use worship music to self-disclose to God and others. It consists of thirty-one items that measure the following five “dimensions” of self-disclosure: Honesty-Accuracy, Positive-Negative, Control of Depth, Intended Disclosure, and Amount (Appendix: section V).

Honesty-Accuracy dimension reflects “the degree to which the disclosures are perceived to be true representations of the inner self,” whereas *positive-negative* dimension focuses on “whether the content of disclosures is perceived to reflect positively or negatively on the discloser” (McCroskey & Richmond, 1977, p.41). McCroskey and Richmond (1977) go on to define *control of depth* as “the degree to which the individual perceives he or she can control the depth or intimacy of what is disclosed” (p.41). Wheelless and Grotz (1976) defined *intent* as “the conscious intent (willingness) of the individual to make self revealing disclosure[s]” (p.339) and they referred to the *amount*

dimension as “a function of both the frequency and duration of the disclosive messages” (p.338). Survey responses range from 1, “strongly disagree,” to 7, “strongly agree.” Reliabilities for the RSDS range from $\alpha = .81$ to $\alpha = .91$ (Wheless & Grotz, 1978, p.323).

Identification with a Psychological Group Scale (IDPG)

Identification with a psychological group (IDPG) or organization is defined as the perception of shared experiences and shared characteristics of group members. It differs conceptually from the related organizational commitment construct in that IDPG focuses on perceptions rather than affect. This is a self-report survey developed by Mael and Tetrick (1992). In Mael and Tetrick’s study, the ten items were found to have a coefficient alpha of .76. They used factor analysis to uncover the underlying structure of the ten items. After rotation two components emerged, a six-item component equivalent to perceived Shared Experiences (IDPG-SE, $\alpha = .81$) and a four-item component equivalent to Shared Characteristics (IDPG-SC, $\alpha = .66$). The ten-item scale is used in this study to measure the extent to which worshippers identify with the LCMS (see Appendix: section III).

List of Values (LOV)

This list of values was developed by Lynn Kahle (1983) to measure values of the American people. It distinguishes between external and internal values and accounts for the importance of interpersonal relations, personal factors, and apersonal factors in value fulfillment (Bearden & Netemeyer, 1999, p.115). It is composed of nine values that were extracted by building upon the research of Feather (1975), Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy, Rokeach’s (1973) 18 terminal values and other values research. In Kahle’s study, a three factor representation of the nine values was found with composite reliability estimates of

.69 for a factor representing internal individual values, .68 for an external values factor, and .58 for an internal values factor (Homer & Kahle, 1988).

The nine values are: sense of belonging, excitement, warm relationships with others, self-fulfillment, being well respected, fun and enjoyment of life, security, self-respect, and a sense of accomplishment (see Appendix: section VI).

Religiosity Measure (Rohrbaugh & Jessor, 1975)

This scale was “developed in an attempt to evaluate the impact of religion on the respondent’s daily, secular life as well as to determine the extent of individual participation in ritual practices” (Hill & Hood, 1999, p.307). It operationalized Glock’s (1959) four dimensions of religiosity (ritual, consequential, ideological, and experiential) in two-item subscales. Rohrbaugh and Jessor (1975) conducted a discriminant validity analysis which indicated that this instrument measured the individual’s personal orientation and was not primarily the result of his/her identification with a social structure or religious network. The cronbach coefficient alphas for their study were over .90, indicating high internal consistency for the instrument. Because this study is conducted in a religious context, it is used to gain a better understanding of the relationships between variables (see MacGeorge et al., 2007; Hollander, 1988).

Worship/Music Preferences

The survey included questions concerning worship preferences in an attempt to measure other variables between the two different styles of worship (see Appendix: section II), as well as questions concerning preferred music genres (Appendix: section I).

Demographic Profile

The questionnaire also asked the following demographic information: age, ethnicity, level of education, income, sex, marital status, and family size. The final questions asked about church attendance.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Traditional and Contemporary worship style have long been recognized as legitimate distinctions for describing differences in worship services, particularly within the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod. This study conceptualized traditional and contemporary worship style based on specific components each service offered in the church chosen for this study.

A fourteen-item measurement was developed for this study that attempted to operationalize worship style differences. Participants were asked to what extent they liked certain components of worship on a scale of 1-9 (1=not at all, 9=very much). These questions were factor analyzed using principle component analysis with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation. The analysis yielded two factors explaining a total of 65.76% of the variance for the entire set of variables. Factor 1 was labeled traditional worship due to the high positive loadings of traditional worship elements: *I like to recite the creed, I like the altar paraments to change colors according to the church year, I like responsive readings, I like formality, I like to sing from a hymnal or bulletin, I like the pastor to wear a robe, I*

like the pastor to preach from a pulpit, I like to sing the liturgy, I like the organ. The first factor explained 37.82% of the variance (see Table I).

The second factor derived was labeled contemporary worship due to high positive loadings of contemporary worship elements: *I like drums, I like guitar, I like to clap my hands to the music when I sing, I like the words to be displayed on a screen, I like informality.* The variance explained by this factor was 27.94% (see Table II). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (.903) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (.000) both indicate that the set of variables are meritoriously related for factor analysis. Rotation converged in three iterations.

Table I: Factor Analysis of Worship Elements

	Loadings		Communality
	Factor 1: Traditional	Factor 2: Contemporary	
B3: I like to recite the creed in worship	.818	-.039	.670
B14: I like the altar paraments to change colors according to the church year	.806	-.139	.668
B4: I like responsive readings in worship	.803	-.020	.646
B5: I like formality in worship	.775	-.407	.766
B9: I like to sing from a hymnal or bulletin	.774	-.392	.753
B8: I like the pastor to wear a robe during worship	.762	-.443	.777
B11: I like the pastor to preach from the pulpit	.725	-.405	.689
B13: I like to sing the liturgy	.716	-.132	.529
B2: I like the organ in worship	.560	-.343	.431
B7: I like drums in worship	-.240	.872	.818
B1: I like a guitar in worship	-.119	.818	.684
B6: I like to clap my hands to the music when I sing	-.093	.782	.620
B10: I like the words of the songs to be displayed on a screen	-.273	.757	.648
B12: I like informality in worship	-.217	.679	.508
Cronbach’s Alpha	.926	.865	
Eigenvalue	5.295	3.912	
% of total variance	37.82 %	27.94%	
Total Variance		65.76%	

In order to align the worship components in the same direction, another factor analysis was conducted with the contemporary items reverse coded. The results were similar, which indicated that these fourteen items are not two separate poles, but independent factors that are orthogonal. Therefore it is possible that participants could prefer elements of both factors in their worship. To further examine the concept of traditional and contemporary worship, a one-item self-categorization question was used: #G1 “Which service do you attend?” (recoded with traditional as 0 and contemporary as 1). In order to confirm the traditional and contemporary worship factors, correlations were run between each factor and the forced choice self-categorization attendance measure: #G1 “Which service do you attend?” Results showed a significant negative correlation (-.444**) between the #G1 variable and the traditional factor and a significant positive correlation between the #G1 variable and the contemporary factor (.582**). The factors from the first factor analysis were then saved as variables and used for further investigation.

Research Question One

The first research question asked: “Does worship preference predict organizational identification?” This question was examined by using the *Identification with a Psychological Group Scale (IDPG)* developed by Mael and Tetrick (1992). In this study the scale’s reliability with all ten items included was $\alpha = .859$. The scree plot indicated that this was a unidimensional scale, and therefore one scale was created using all ten items. To answer this research question, a multiple regression statistic was utilized using the IDPG scale as the dependent variable and the contemporary and traditional factors as the independent variables.

The multiple regression results showed a significant overall prediction of organizational identity, with 16.5% of the variance explained by the two predictors. The traditional factor significantly and uniquely relates to organizational identity ($\beta = .406^{**}$) and was also significantly correlated with the dependent variable ($r = .405^{**}$), both at the .01 level (see Table II). The contemporary factor was not related significantly to the IDPG. Substantively, the model is shown to be significant. Therefore, the worship elements that one prefers can be used to predict their identification with the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (LCMS). Those who prefer traditional elements of worship will have a stronger organizational identification with the LCMS. Therefore the answer to this question is, “Yes, worship preference does predict organizational identification.”

Table II: Prediction of Organizational Identity

Variable	r	Final β	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F
Traditional Factor	.405**	.406**	.165**	.152**	13.390**
Contemporary Factor	-.013	-.023			

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Research Question Two

The second question asked: “Does music preference predict worship style preference?” This question was examined by asking participants to rate how much they liked or disliked various music genres using a scale of 1-9 (1 = not at all, 9 = very much). To answer this question, multiple and logistic regression statistics were utilized. First, two multiple regressions were run: one with the traditional factor as the DV and one with the contemporary factor as the DV. The sixteen musical genres (*World* and *Ska* were not included due to excessive missing data) were entered together in one IV block. Both multiple regressions showed a significant overall relationship with preferred music genres,

with 34.1% of the variance of the traditional factor and 27.9% of the variance of the contemporary factor being explained by the sixteen predictors (see Tables III and IV).

Classic Rock ($\beta = .245^*$), *Rap/HipHop* ($\beta = .233^*$), and *Country* ($\beta = .245^*$) were all found to significantly and uniquely relate to the contemporary factor at a .05 level (see Table V). Furthermore, *Classic Rock*, *Rap/HipHop*, *Country*, *Pop*, *Punk*, *Latin*, *R&B/Soul*, and *Techno/Dance* all had statistically significant positive correlations with the contemporary factor (DV) at a .05 level.

Folk/Indie ($\beta = .301^*$), *Country* ($\beta = .206^*$), *Heavy Metal* ($\beta = .282^*$) and *Opera* ($\beta = .404^{**}$) were all found to significantly and uniquely relate to the traditional factor (see Table III). Statistically significant positive correlations for the traditional factor were found with *Folk/Indie*, *Classical*, *Blues* and *Opera* as well as a statistically significant negative correlation with *Punk/Grunge*. This negative correlation indicates that the more one prefers traditional elements of worship, the less they prefer the genre of *Punk/Grunge*. Substantively, both regression models are shown to be significant. Therefore the music genres one prefers can be used to predict one's preference for worship style.

Table III: Prediction of Traditional Factor by music preference

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	R ² Adjusted	F
A1: Classic Rock	.021	-.191	.341**	.224**	2.916**
A2: Folk/Indie	.265*	.301*			
A3: Classical	.252*	.120			
A4: Jazz	.125	-.123			
A5: Blues	.196*	.172			
A6: Rap/HipHop	-.060	-.110			
A7: Country	.071	.206*			
A8: Pop	-.050	-.074			
A9: Big Band	.123	-.159			
A10: Punk/Grunge	-.174*	-.176			
A12: Alternative	-.071	-.175			
A13: Heavy Metal	.037	.282*			
A15: Latin	.082	-.151			
A16: R&B/Soul	.053	.142			
A17: Techno/Dance	.070	.199			
A18: Opera	.369**	.404*			

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table IV: Prediction of Contemporary Factor by music preference

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	R ² Adjusted	F
A1: Classic Rock	.268*	.245*	.279*	.151*	2.175*
A2: Folk/Indie	.046	.009			
A3: Classical	-.058	-.003			
A4: Jazz	.084	.183			
A5: Blues	.064	-.145			
A6: Rap/HipHop	.291*	.233*			
A7: Country	.261*	.245*			
A8: Pop	.235*	.062			
A9: Big Band	.016	.052			
A10: Punk/Grunge	.173*	.164			
A12: Alternative	.049	-.136			
A13: Heavy Metal	.128	-.108			
A15: Latin	.187*	.204			
A16: R&B/Soul	.235*	-.004			
A17: Techno/Dance	.210*	-.003			
A18: Opera	-.117	-.128			

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Demographics

Oftentimes, other variables such as *age*, *sex*, *income* and *education* contribute to an individual's music preference. In order to control for these variables, two more multiple regressions were conducted: one regression with the traditional worship factor as the DV, and one with the contemporary worship factor as the DV. The first block entered was *age* and *sex* (recoded 0 = female and 1 = male). This block explained 9.3% of the variance for the traditional worship factor (significant at the .05 level) and 12.4% of the variance for the contemporary worship factor (significant at the .01 level). This indicates that 9.3% of the variance in the traditional worship factor and 12.4% of the variance in the traditional worship factor can be explained by sex and age.

Sex (coded as maleness) had a unique and significant relationship ($\beta = -.312^*$) and a significant negative correlation ($-.287^*$) with the contemporary factor, meaning that males prefer contemporary worship significantly less than females.

Age did not contribute significantly and uniquely to either worship factor. However, as can be seen in Summary Tables VI and VII, *age* (Block #1) had statistically significant correlations with both the traditional and the contemporary factor. It has a significant positive correlation with the traditional factor (.304**) meaning the older one is, the more one prefers traditional elements of worship and, conversely, it has a significant negative correlation with the contemporary factor (-.196*): the younger one is the more one prefers contemporary elements of worship.

The second block entered was *education* and *income*. In this block, the R^2 change for the contemporary factor was significant (.083*). This indicates that 8.3% of the variance in the contemporary factor can be explained by education and income. The final

betas showed no significance with either the contemporary or traditional factor indicating that neither of these two variables (*education* and *income*) were shown to have a unique or significant contribution (see Table V). However, the contemporary factor did have statistically significant negative correlations with both *education* (-.251*) and *income* (-.337*), meaning that those in lower income brackets with less formal education prefer contemporary elements of worship (see Table VI).

The last block entered was music preferences. Both multiple regressions showed a significant overall relationship with preferred music genres, with 28.9% of the variance of the traditional factor (significant at the .05 level) and 19.6 % of the variance of the contemporary factor (α = near significant) being explained by the sixteen predictors, after allowing for age, sex, education, and income. Significant betas, which indicate that the following music genres significantly and uniquely relate to the traditional factor (see Table VI), were found with *Folk/Indie* (.388**) *Country* (.233*) *Heavy Metal* (.306*) and *Opera* (.283*). Furthermore, there were statistically significant positive correlations between the traditional factor and *Folk/Indie* (.270*), *Classical* (.229*), *Jazz* (.175*), and *Opera* (.355**).

With the contemporary factor (see Table VI), a significant beta was found with *Classic Rock* (.295*), indicating that *Classic Rock* significantly and uniquely related to the contemporary factor. Moreover, significant positive correlations were found with *Classic Rock* (.272*), *Rap/HipHop* (.277*), *Country* (.235*), *Pop* (.225*), *Latin* (.188*), *R&B/Soul* (.220*), and *Techno/Dance* (.191*).

Substantively, the total model is shown to be significant in each case. Therefore the music genres one prefers can be used to predict one's worship style preference, even when controlling for age, sex, education and income.

Table V: Prediction of Traditional Factor by music preference with controls

Block #	Variable	r	Final β	R ² Change
1	G8: Age	.304**	.209	.093*
	Male	.003	-.074	
2	G6: Education	-.018	-.059	.005
	G7: Income	.156	.205	
3	A1: Classic Rock	.027	-.201	.289*
	A2: Folk/Indie	.270*	.388**	
	A3: Classical	.229*	.054	
	A4: Jazz	.175*	-.066	
	A5: Blues	.224*	.071	
	A6: Rap/HipHop	-.032	.020	
	A7: Country	.082	.233*	
	A8: Pop	-.049	-.081	
	A9: Big Band	.135	-.136	
	A10: Punk/Grunge	-.151	-.141	
	A12: Alternative	-.049	-.109	
	A13: Heavy Metal	.038	.306*	
	A15: Latin	.191	-.055	
	A16: R&B/Soul	.101	.107	
A17: Techno/Dance	.103	.146		
	A18: Opera	.355**	.283*	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Total Equation

R² = .387

Adjusted R² = .239

F = 2.616

$p = .001$

Table VI: Prediction of Contemporary Factor by music preference with controls

Block #	Variable	r	Final β	R ² Change
1	G8: Age	-.196*	-.077	.124**
	Male	-.287*	-.312*	
2	G6: Education	-.251*	-.082	.083*
	G7: Income	-.337**	-.215	
3	A1: Classic Rock	.272*	.295*	.196 α
	A2: Folk/Indie	.030	-.006	
	A3: Classical	-.012	.134	
	A4: Jazz	.052	.026	
	A5: Blues	.083	.044	
	A6: Rap/HipHop	.277*	.090	
	A7: Country	.235*	.170	
	A8: Pop	.225*	.049	
	A9: Big Band	.051	-.033	
	A10: Punk/Grunge	.155	.205	
	A12: Alternative	.024	-.222	
	A13: Heavy Metal	.102	-.578	
	A15: Latin	.188*	.239	
	A16: R&B/Soul	.220*	.072	
	A17: Techno/Dance	.191*	.010	
	A18: Opera	-.053	-.089	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

$\alpha = .05 < p < .10$

Total Equation

R² = .403

Adjusted R² = .259

F = 2.796

$p = .001$

Finally, a logistic regression was also used to predict worship style preferences from music preferences using the self-categorization or forced-choice attendance measure (see Table VII). The Cox and Snell indicated that 30.7% of the variance was explained while the Nagelkerke R indicated that 41.8% of the variance was explained. The Hosmer and Lemeshow Test showed a Chi-Square of 2.584 and a significance of .958 (non-significance with this test means a good model fit).

The overall model shows four musical genres that have a significant unique contribution in predicting worship style preference. *Classic Rock* had a significance of .013 and an Exp (B) of 1.452 (a positive relationship). This means that for every 1-point increase in liking *Classic Rock*, the odds of preferring contemporary worship increases by 45.2%. *Rap/HipHop* had a significance of .012 and an Exp (B) of 1.426, *Latin* had a significance of .020 and an Exp (B) of 1.459 and *Techno/Dance* had a significance of .042 and an Exp (B) of .731(negative relationship) which means that for every 1 point increase in liking techno/dance, the odds of preferring contemporary worship decreases by 26.9%.

This model predicts correctly 66.7% of participants as preferring traditional worship and 88.6% of participants as preferring contemporary worship. The model therefore correctly classified 80.4% of the participants. This beyond chance classification is significant, as shown through the Press' Q which is 41.29 ($p \leq .001$). Therefore, the answer to this question is: "Yes, music preference does predict worship style preference" (see Table VI).

Table VII: Logistic Regression

DV: "Which service do you attend most often (0) traditional or (1) contemporary?"

Independent Variables	B	S.E.	Wald	Sig.	Exp (B)
Block 1					
A1: Classic Rock	.373	.150	6.147	.013	1.452
A2: Folk/Indie	-.084	.121	.485	.486	.919
A3: Classical	-.151	.156	.938	.333	.859
A4: Jazz	-.122	.187	.426	.514	.885
A5: Blues	-.155	.197	.343	.558	.891
A6: Rap/HipHop	.355	.141	6.298	.012	1.426
A7: Country	.049	.116	.176	.675	1.050
A8: Pop	.034	.160	.044	.833	1.034
A9: BigBand	.145	.141	1.059	.303	1.156
A10: Punk/Grunge	.054	.165	.107	.744	1.056
A12: Alternative	.025	.157	.025	.875	1.025
A13: Heavy Metal	.084	.143	.348	.555	1.088
A15: Latin	.378	.163	5.405	.020	1.459
A16: R&B/Soul	.098	.157	.388	.533	1.103
A17: Techno/Dance	-.314	.154	4.148	.042	.731
A18: Opera	-.187	.139	1.805	.179	.830
Constant	-2.273	1.490	2.327	.127	.103

Table 1 Statistics

-2LL	107.154		
Chi-square	41.037	df=16	Sig.< .001
Cox & Snell R Square	.307		
Nagelkerke R Square	.418		
Hosmer and Lemeshow Test	2.584	df=8	Sig. .958

Classification Results

	Final Predicted Group		Percentage Correct
	Traditional	Contemporary	
Traditional	28(66.7%)	14(33.3%)	66.7%
Contemporary	8(11.4%)	62(88.6%)	88.6%
			80.4%

Press'Q for Logistic Regression

$$\text{Press Q} = \frac{[112 - (90 \cdot 2)]^2}{112(2-1)}$$

Press Q = 41.29
df = 1
Xcrit² = 10.83
p = .001

Research Question Three

The third question asked: “Is there a relationship between lifestyle values and worship style and music genre preference?” This question was examined by using the List of Values set of measures (LOV) developed by Lynn Kahle (1983) to assess values of the American people. Two multiple regressions were utilized, one with the contemporary factor as the dependent variable and the other with the traditional factor as the dependent variable. Both regressions used the LOV items as the independent variables. The nine lifestyle values were entered together in one IV block. Although the LOV items seem to be strongly intercorrelated, an examination of the tolerances and condition indexes reveals no substantial problem with multicollinearity.

Neither of these regressions was shown to be significant. However, there were significant positive correlations with the contemporary worship factor (see Table IX) and *excitement* (.179*), *warm relationships* (.245*) and *fun and enjoyment in life* (.151*). There were also significant positive correlations with the traditional worship factor (see Table IX) and *self-fulfillment* (.218*), *being well respected* (.167*), and *self-respect* (.160*). Therefore, the more one values excitement, warm relationships and fun and enjoyment in life, the more they prefer contemporary worship components and the more one values self-fulfillment, being well-respected, and self-respect, the more they prefer traditional worship components. Although these correlations are statistically significant they are small and result in non-significant regression equations overall.

Table VIII: Prediction of Traditional Factor by lifestyle values

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	R ² Adjusted	F
Sense of Belonging	.024	-.125	.073	.013	1.214
Excitement	.020	.026			
Warm Relationships	.114	.096			
Self-Fulfillment	.218*	.188			
Being well-respected	.167*	.131			
Fun and enjoyment in life	.057	-.089			
Security	.119	.027			
Self-respect	.160*	.071			
A sense of accomplishment	.111	-.072			

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table IX: Prediction of Contemporary Factor by lifestyle values

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	R ² Adjusted	F
Sense of Belonging	.133	.099	.082	.022	1.373
Excitement	.179*	.122			
Warm Relationships	.245*	.219*			
Self-Fulfillment	.068	-.028			
Being well-respected	.050	-.050			
Fun and enjoyment in life	.151*	.016			
Security	.077	.042			
Self-respect	.055	.078			
A sense of accomplishment	.115	.085			

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Further analysis was conducted using the three-factor representation of the nine values. The reliabilities for these three factors for this study were as follows: internal individual values (.695), external dimension values (.676) and internal interpersonal values (.522). Three separate regressions were run with each worship factor as the dependent variable and one of the three value factors as the independent variable. Results indicated that internal individual values was significant with the traditional factor, internal interpersonal values was significant with the contemporary factor, and external dimension values were near significant with the traditional factor (see Tables X-XV).

Table X: Prediction of Traditional Factor by internal individual values

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	F
Internal Individual Values	.167*	.167*	.028	4.207

Table XI: Prediction of Contemporary Factor by internal individual values

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	F
Internal Individual Values	.121	.121	.015	2.198

* p < .05

* p < .01

Table XII: Prediction of Traditional Factor by internal interpersonal values

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	F
Internal Interpersonal Values	.103	.103	.011	1.605

Table XIII: Prediction of Contemporary Factor by internal interpersonal values

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	F
Internal Interpersonal Values	.235	.235*	.055	8.689

* p < .05

* p < .01

Table XIV: Prediction of Traditional Factor by external dimension values

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	F
External Dimension Values	.132 α	.132 α	.017	2.651

Table XV: Prediction of Contemporary Factor by external dimension values

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	F
External Dimension Values	.110	.110	.012	1.827

* p < .05

* p < .01

$\alpha = .05 < p < .10$

In order to examine the second part of question three, “Is there a relationship between lifestyle values and music preferences?” correlations were conducted between all of the music genres and all of the lifestyle values. There were significant negative correlations between a *sense of belonging* and *Blues* (-.184*) and *R&B/Soul* (-.147*).

There were significant positive correlations between *excitement* and *Punk/Grunge* (.257**), *Ska* (.176*), and *Alternative* (.288**). *Self-Fulfillment* had a significant negative correlation with *Rap/Grunge* (-.134*), but positive correlations with *Pop* (.200**) and *Latin* (.142*). *Being well respected* had a significant negative correlation with *Heavy Metal* (-.157*) but a positive correlation with *World* (.221*). *Punk/Grunge* (.172*), *Alternative* (.192*), *World* (.237*), and *Techno/Dance* (.170*) were all positively correlated with *fun and enjoyment of life*. *Security* had a significant negative correlation with *Folk/Indie* (-.146*) and *accomplishment* had a significant negative correlation with *Jazz* (-.135*). This suggests that there is some relationship between certain music preferences and lifestyle values.

Research Question Four

The fourth question asks: “Are there certain dimensions of self-disclosure that are more prevalent in worship music than other dimensions?” This question was examined by using the revised self-disclosure scale (RSDS) developed by Wheelless and Grotz (1976) that attempts to assess self-disclosure with a specific person or “target.” It consists of thirty-one items that measure the following five dimensions of self-disclosure: *Honesty-Accuracy*, *Positive-Negative*, *Control of Depth*, *Intended Disclosure*, and *Amount*. Scales were constructed with these variables; one scale included all 31 items, as suggested by the creators of the scale. The reliability for the RSDS scale in this study was $\alpha = .778$.

Items that shifted in the factor analysis were: #E3: *I intimately disclose who I really am openly and fully*, #E8: *I often discuss feelings about myself*, #E16: *I often talk about myself*, #E17: *I usually talk about myself for long periods of time*, #29: *I cannot reveal myself when I want to because I do not know myself thoroughly enough*, and #E30: *I*

am not confident that my expressions of my own feelings, emotions, and experiences are true reflections of myself. However, because the scale was being adapted in a way that was not intended, the researcher used the original scale, which has been shown in previous research to be reliable and valid.

In order to explore this question, scales were created with each dimension of the RSDS. The reliabilities for this study were as follows: *Intended Disclosure* ($\alpha = .709$), *Amount* ($\alpha = .749$), *Positive/Negative* ($\alpha = .797$), *Control of Depth* ($\alpha = .677$), and *Honesty/Accuracy* ($\alpha = .806$). Participants were asked to think about the hymns and/or praise songs that they sing during worship as they answered these questions about self-disclosure.

The means for each dimension was as follows: *Intended Disclosure* (M = 20.86, SD = 4.01), *Amount* (M = 23.9, SD = 6.88), *Positive/Negative* (M = 32.64, SD = 6.7), *Control of Depth* (M = 16.88, SD = 5.32) and *Honesty/Accuracy* (M = 39.85, SD = 7.96). Next, the total mean score for each dimension was divided by the number of questions in each dimension. For example *Intended Disclosure* had a mean score of 20.86 and four questions that measured this dimension. The average score for *Intended Disclosure* then is 5.21 ($20.86 \div 4$), *Honesty/Accuracy* = 4.98 ($39.85 \div 8$), *Positive/Negative* = 4.66 ($32.64 \div 7$), *Amount* = 3.41 ($23.9 \div 7$), and *Control of Depth* = 3.37 ($16.88 \div 5$). The highest mean scores were found in the dimensions that measure *intended disclosure* and *honesty/accuracy* and the lowest mean scores were found in the dimensions that measure *amount* and *control of depth*. Paired samples t-tests were then conducted on all five dimensions of the self-disclosure scale. Results indicated that all paired means were

significantly different from one another except the *amount* and *control of depth* dimensions.

Research Question Five

Finally, the fifth research question asks: “Is there a difference between traditionalist worshippers and contemporary worshippers in their perceived self-disclosure through worship music?” Two more multiple regressions were conducted, one regression with the traditional worship factor as the DV (see Table X), and one with the contemporary worship factor as the DV (see Table XI). The independent variable was the self-disclosure scale. Both regressions were non-significant equations overall. However, there was a statistically significant positive correlation with the contemporary factor (.143*).

Next, two more regressions were run that entered the five dimensions of self-disclosure in one block as the independent variable. One regression utilized the traditional worship factor as the DV (see Table XII) and one the contemporary worship factor as the DV (see Table XIII). Both of these regressions were non-significant equations overall. However, there were statistically significant, positive correlations between the contemporary worship factor and the dimensions of self-disclosure that measure *control of depth* and *amount* (see Table XIII). There were no statistically significant correlations with the traditional worship factor (see Table XII).

Table XVI: Prediction of Traditional Factor by self-disclosure

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	F
Self-Disclosure	.056	.056	.003	.424

Table XVII: Prediction of Contemporary Factor by self-disclosure

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	F
Self-Disclosure Scale	.143*	.143	.020	2.795

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ **Table XVIII: Prediction of Traditional Factor by self-disclosure dimensions**

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	F
Intended Disclosure	.076	-.009	.044	1.185
Honesty/Accuracy	.122	.106		
Positive/Negative	.120	.089		
Control of Depth	-.046	.107		
Amount	-.132	-.195		

Table XIX: Prediction of Contemporary Factor by self-disclosure dimensions

Variable	r	Final β	R ²	F
Intended Disclosure	.015	.002	.059	1.639
Honesty/Accuracy	.154	.092		
Positive/Negative	-.057	-.045		
Control of Depth	.225*	.200		
Amount	.170*	.039		

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Further analysis was conducted using a MANOVA to determine if there are any significant differences in an individual's perception of their self-disclosure through the worship music they sing based on the service that they most frequently attend (see Table XIV). Since the omnibus or overall test was near significant (.059), it is useful to look at the individual ANOVA tables which illustrate how each dependent variable differs between the two worship styles. Looking at the ANOVA Tables XVII and XVIII, we find significant differences in the *Positive/Negative* dimension of the self-disclosure scale (.018*) and the *Control of Depth* dimension of the self-disclosure scale (.015*). Those

who attend a contemporary worship service have a lower mean score on the *Positive/Negative* dimension and a higher score on the *Control of Depth* dimension than those who attend a traditional worship service. However, the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is significant ($p = < .001$), which is undesirable. This shows that the dependent variables are still highly correlated after the model was imposed.

Both the regression and MANOVA results indicate that the answer to this question is, "No, there is not a difference between traditionalists and contemporaries in their perceived self-disclosure through worship music?" However, the ANOVA tables indicate that there is a difference between certain dimensions of self-disclosure.

Multivariate Tests:

Table XX: Self-disclosure through singing hymns/worship songs

	Effect	Value	F-Value	Sig.	Observed Power
G1.Attend	Pillai's Trace	.073	2.190	.059	.704
	Wilks' Lambda	.927	2.190	.059	.704
	Hotelling's Trace	.078	2.190	.059	.704
	Roy's Largest Root	.078	2.190	.059	.704

ANOVA Tables that help interpret MANOVA results

Table XXI: DV#1: Intended Disclosure Dimension of Self-Disclosure Scale

Type of Worship Service	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Power
1.Contemporary 2. Traditional	20.9128 20.8083	.386	1	.386	.025	.874	.053
Error		2211.642	144	15.359			
Corrected Total		2212.027	145				

Table XXII: DV#2: Amount Dimension of Self-Disclosure Scale

Type of Worship Service	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Power
1. Contemporary 2. Traditional	24.3023 22.5500	108.524	1	108.524	2.305	.131	.326
Error		6778.990	144	47.076			
Corrected Total		6887.514	145				

Table XXIII: DV#3: Positive/Negative Dimension of Self-Disclosure Scale

Type of Worship Service	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Power
1. Contemporary 2. Traditional	31.5581 34.3333	272.197	1	272.197	5.754	.018	.664
Error		6812.543	144	47.309			
Corrected Total		7084.740	145				

Table XXIV: DV#4: Control of Depth Dimension of Self-Disclosure Scale

Type of Worship Service	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Power
1. Contemporary 2. Traditional	17.7442 15.6167	159.972	1	159.972	6.100	.015	.689
Error		3776.555	144	26.226			
Corrected Total		3936.527	145				

Table XXV: DV#5: Honesty/Accuracy Dimension of Self-Disclosure Scale

Type of Worship Service	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Power
1. Contemporary 2. Traditional	39.7326 40.0000	2.528	1	2.528	.040	.841	.055
Error		9002.849	144	62.520			
Corrected Total		9005.377	145				

Further Analysis

Further analysis indicates that there is a significant positive relationship between religiosity and self-disclosure (.311**) at the .01 level and significant positive relationships between religiosity and both the contemporary factor (.146*) and traditional factor (.148*). Moreover, a significant positive correlation was also found between *organizational identity* and question #G3: *How long have you been attending this church?* (.151*).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The current study investigated worship style, music and social identity from a communication perspective. Utilizing Social Identity Theory as a framework, worship music was also examined as a form of self-disclosure.

Research Question One

The first research question was interested in whether worship preference predicted organizational identity. To investigate traditional and contemporary worship, a fourteen-item measurement was developed for this study that attempted to operationalize worship style differences. A factor analysis yielded a two-factor solution. One factor was labeled traditional worship and included the following worship elements: *I like to recite the creed, I like the altar paraments to change colors according to the church year, I like responsive readings, I like formality, I like to sing from a hymnal or bulletin, I like the pastor to wear a robe, I like the pastor to preach from a pulpit, I like to sing the liturgy, I like the organ.*

The second factor derived was labeled contemporary worship and included the following worship elements: *I like drums, I like guitar, I like to clap my hands to the music*

when I sing, I like the words to be displayed on a screen, I like informality. There were no significant relationships between organizational identity (which was measured using the IDPG scale) and the contemporary factor. However, results of this study indicated that those who prefer traditional components of worship have a stronger identification with the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod.

These findings support previous research, as Seul (1999) recognized that institutions often use written forms to communicate and preserve their unique identity. The creed, liturgy, responsive readings, and hymnals are all written forms of communication that have been in existence since the beginning of the reformation. These core features of identity are resistant to change because they are tied to the history of the organization (Brown & Starkey, 2000; Gioia, Shultz, & Corley, 2000, 2004) and are central, enduring and relatively permanent (Albert & Whetten, 1985).

Organizational identity is prominent whenever members of an organization ask themselves “Who are we?” (Albert & Whetten, 1985). It is the member’s collective understanding of what it is that distinguishes their organization from others, those characteristics that they believe to be central and relatively permanent (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Furthermore, according to the theory of “structural inertia” (Hannan & Freeman, 1984), the older an organization, the less likely they are to introduce changes (Chou & Russel, 2006; Delacroix & Swaminathan, 1991; Kelly & Amburgey, 1991). The Lutheran Church Missouri Synod has been in existence for over a century and during this time period has, for the most part, utilized the liturgy and traditional hymns found within the standard Lutheran hymnals. These services often distinguish Lutherans from other denominations, giving them a sense of collective identity.

Fundamental to most theoretical and empirical definitions of organizational identity is that identity consists of features and characteristics that are central, enduring and distinctive (Gioia, Shultz, & Corley, 2004). There are several clear and distinctive differences in the two worship styles. For example, the permanence of the organ, hymnals and pulpit are in stark contrast to the temporal, ever-changing components found in the contemporary style of worship. In a contemporary worship service, instruments are portable, the accompaniment is ever changing and words to the songs are projected on a screen for the moment, and then lost. New songs are constantly being written and old songs are frequently rearranged. Perhaps the symbolism found in the variability of the contemporary worship service and the predictability of the traditional worship service is a representation of organizational identity. The components of a contemporary worship service are temporal, always changing, and lived in the moment, whereas the components of a traditional worship service are permanent, constant, and resistant to change.

Further analysis found a positive relationship between *organizational identity* and question #G3: *How long have you been attending this church?* This suggests that those who have been attending Trinity for a longer period of time have a stronger identification with the LCMS. This is supported by organizational identity research that found when an organization adds new members who are not tied to the history of the organization they have different ideas about what is central, enduring and distinctive (Gioia, Shultz, & Corley, 2004).

It is interesting to note, however, no significant relationship exists between the length of time an individual has been a Lutheran and their identification with the LCMS. Perhaps this is explained by the broader term “Lutheran”, which encompasses all synods

and the more narrow term “LCMS.” That is, those who identify themselves as Lutheran have not categorized themselves as belonging to the group of LCMS Lutherans. Again, this can be explained by the SIT term, *social categorization* (Ellemers, et.al., 2003) which is conceptualized as the recognition individuals have of belonging to one group and not the other. It is important to recognize, however, that a strong Lutheran identity does not translate into a stronger faith. For example, significant positive relationships, of somewhat equal strength, were found between religiosity and both the contemporary and traditional factors.

The implications at the organizational level suggest that as the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod continues to grow and change, newer members may identify to a lesser degree with the organization. Moreover, differing views about what is central, distinctive and enduring creates multiple identities, which will allow the organization to adapt more readily to change (Pratt & Foreman, 2000a). Perhaps, as an organization develops multiple identities, the differences that exist between groups are lessened, which, according to Social Identity Theory, results in less conflict (Herriot, 2007). However, if the dominant identity (traditional) does not adapt to the changing environment and other possible forms of worship, conflict will continue to erupt.

This is not implying that those who enjoy traditional worship must change their worship style, however, adaptation and acceptance of other possibilities will help reduce the conflict. Likewise, concentrating on superordinate goals will also help to reduce conflict (Sherif, 1958). This is accomplished because superordinate goals are not unique to only one group within an organization but to all of the groups within the organization, which helps members develop a unified vision and a distinct social identity.

The specific church in this case study frequently gathers together members from both services and develops superordinate goals that focus on the larger mission of *Trinity Lutheran Church*. At the same time, Trinity also highlights specific ministries within the church, creating multiple identities that allow the organization to adapt to change.

Research Question Two

The second research question investigated whether music preference predicted worship style preference. Analysis indicated that there is a positive relationship between music preference and worship style preference. The more one prefers contemporary components of worship the more they prefer the genres of *Classic Rock, Rap/HipHop, Country, Pop, Punk, Latin, R&B/Soul* and *Techno/Dance*. All of these music genres include drums, guitar, and informality, which were all components of the contemporary worship factor; therefore this relationship is not surprising.

Conversely, the more one prefers traditional components of worship the more they prefer the genres of *Folk/Indie, Classical, Blues* and *Opera*. Research indicates that Opera and Classical music appeals to older, well-educated individuals with higher income levels (Keaney & Oskala, 2007). Furthermore, these genres do not contain heavy drums, which are often the last instrument to be accepted into a traditional church setting and the most recognizable instrument in popular music (Hunt, 2007). In fact, it is doubtful that if one were to sample different radio stations, one would be able to find a popular song that does not contain drums. Further investigation of the data, revealed that drums had a strong negative relationship with every component of the traditional worship factor.

Since research shows that Opera and Classical music appeal to a certain demographic (Keaney & Oskala, 2007), this study investigated age, sex, income and

education in order to further examine worship and music preference. Results indicated that those who prefer traditional worship are older, better educated, and have higher income levels than those who prefer contemporary worship. These findings indicate that demographics are an important factor in worship style as expected, but that music preference still largely influences an individual's worship style choice.

Generations have often used music as a vehicle for expressing their identity primarily because music has the ability to transcend social boundaries, express cultural meaning, and amplify message content that oftentimes block communication (Chafee, 1985). Perhaps this occurs because music is able to offer a sense of group cohesiveness (Cavicchi, 1998; Eyerman, 2002), which allows an individual to feel they are a part of a group (Tajfel, 1972). This has several implications for the church.

First, knowing what genres of music one prefers enables those in leadership to design effective worship services that will cross social boundaries and offer a sense of community as well as amplify the content of the message. For this reason, when churches are considering worship music they must consider the current memberships' music preference as well as the music preferences of those they are trying to reach. Furthermore, one must take into consideration that younger, less educated, individuals in lower income brackets appear to prefer a contemporary worship style. Therefore it is important, not only from an outreach perspective, but from a financial perspective, that rather than dismantle particular styles of worship it would make sense to add additional forms of worship that incorporate a variety of musical genres.

Social comparison, the second social psychological process in Social Identity Theory, provides theoretical support for these findings. When people determine the value

of groups and individuals by comparing them on various dimensions (Ellemers, et al., 2003), it produces a competitive dynamic that encourages group members to enhance their group status. Tajfel and Turner (1986) found that when a group's positive identity is challenged or impeded by an out-group, conflict would often ensue. Further research has shown that if one perceives the group to be threatened, then one's social identity and self-esteem is threatened, causing fear, which leads to conflict (Herriot, 2007). Thus, as parishioners understand that their preferred music is not only accepted, but also valued, they feel more secure which increases their self-esteem and reinforces their social identity. As a result, the conflict that often results (Ellemers, et al., 2003) from this musical comparison may lessen.

Research Question Three

The third research question was interested in the relationship between lifestyle values and worship style and music genre preference. The regressions performed on the three-factor representation of the nine values found that internal interpersonal values can predict contemporary worship style. The internal interpersonal values are: *warm relationships with others* and *fun and enjoyment in life*. The contemporary worship factor included: *I like to clap my hands to the music when I sing, I like drums in worship, I like informality in worship, I like the words of the songs to be displayed on a screen, and I like guitar in worship.*

These contemporary worship components are also characteristics of warm relationships and fun and enjoyment in life. For example, a warm relationship is often informal, as is the contemporary service. Likewise, hand clapping is often an indication that an individual is having fun and enjoying a particular event or moment. Furthermore,

when the words of the songs are displayed on a screen, it can be likened to watching a movie or television, which is often an informal leisure activity. Therefore, individuals who value warm relationships and fun and enjoyment in life attend a worship service that reinforces these values.

The regressions performed on the three-factor representation of the nine values found that internal individual values can predict traditional worship style. The internal individual values are: *excitement, self-fulfillment, self-respect, and a sense of accomplishment*. Further analysis indicated that the more one values *self-respect, self-fulfillment, and being well respected* the more they prefer traditional worship components

This traditional factor was composed of the following items: *I like to recite the creed, I like the altar paraments to change colors according to the church year, I like responsive readings, I like formality, I like to sing from a hymnal or bulletin, I like the pastor to wear a robe, I like the pastor to preach from a pulpit, I like to sing the liturgy, I like the organ*. The individual components that make up the traditional worship factor lend themselves to issues of respect. The creed, liturgy, and responsive readings are recited in unison, which demonstrates an element of respect for God and other parishioners.

The traditional worship factor was also positively related to *self-fulfillment*. As discussed previously, this study found that those who prefer traditional worship components have achieved a higher level of formal education and enjoy higher income levels than those who prefer contemporary worship components. Perhaps, the higher income and education allows them to ascend Maslow's hierarchy and concentrate on self-fulfillment. Maslow's hierarchy is often depicted as a pyramid consisting of the following five levels: physiological needs, safety, love and belonging, esteem, and self-actualization.

The bottom level represents physiological needs such as food, clothing and shelter. The higher needs in this hierarchy only come into focus when the lower needs in the pyramid are satisfied. Self-actualization is at the topmost level of the pyramid. This is the instinctual need of humans to make the most of their abilities and to strive to be the best they can: self-fulfillment.

In addition, these findings indicate a relationship between lifestyle values and music genres. Although there were several significant relationships, of particular interest are those genres that contribute to a greater understanding of the values described in the previous paragraph. For example, those who valued *being well respected* disliked *Heavy Metal* but liked *World* music. *Heavy Metal* is often depicted as a genre that attracts longhaired youth with little interest in school and no ambition, hardly a well-respected image. However, liking *World* music brings images to mind of well-rounded, well-traveled, ambitious and open-minded individuals.

Further positive relationships were found between those who valued *fun and enjoyment* and the genres of *Punk/Grunge*, *Alternative*, *World*, and *Techno/Dance*. These genres call to mind images of young people clapping, dancing and having fun. *World* music was positively related to both *being well respected* and *fun and enjoyment in life*. However, those who value fun and enjoyment most likely add adventure and novelty to the above image of a well-traveled individual.

Although a *sense of belonging* was not mentioned in the previous paragraph, it was an interesting finding that a negative relationship existed between a *sense of belonging* and the genres of *Blues* and *R&B/Soul*. In other words, the more that one values a *sense of belonging* the less they like *Blues* and *R&B/Soul*. This finding brings to mind an image of

a lone, depressed male listening to the blues in a dark, lonely room. Thus, perhaps this stereotypical image provides an explanation as to why those who value *belonging* dislike these genres.

Research indicates an individual's attitudes, beliefs, opinions, hopes, needs, desires, prejudices, and fears all contribute to their value system, which finds its expression in behaviors and lifestyles (Mitchell, 1983). When a parishioner identifies with a traditional style of worship and has values such as *self-respect* and *self-fulfillment* that contribute to their individual identity, in the social context of church, they may perceive those who value *fun and enjoyment* and identify with a contemporary worship style as frivolous or irresponsible. Conversely, those who identify with a contemporary worship style and value *fun and enjoyment* may perceive those who identify with a traditional worship style and value *self-respect* and *self-fulfillment* as stuffy and boring. These relationships that exist between values and worship and music preference can apply to the third social-psychological process, *social identification*. Parishioner's identities often influence their perceptions of, and responses to social situations (Ellemers, et al., 2003) or in this case differing worship styles.

Research Question Four

Participants were asked to keep in mind the songs/hymns that they sing in worship as they responded to the self-disclosure measure developed by Wheelless and Grotz (1976). Self-disclosure is comprised of the following five dimensions: Honesty/Accuracy, Intended Disclosure, Positive/Negative, Amount, and Control-of-Depth. Research question four was primarily interested in whether or not certain dimensions of self-disclosure were perceived as more prevalent in worship music than other dimensions. Respondents were

asked about their level of agreement with statements intended to measure perceived self-disclosure. Participants agreed that the following three dimensions were present in the hymns and praise songs that they sing in worship: *Honesty/Accuracy*, *Positive/Negative*, and *Intended Disclosure*. Participants disagreed that the *Control of Depth* and *Amount* dimensions were present in the singing of hymns and praise songs.

The honesty/accuracy dimension included statements such as: *My self-disclosures are completely accurate reflections of who I really am* and *I am always honest in my self-disclosures*. The Bible teaches that all people are born sinful, and are in need of a Savior. Many of the hymns and praise songs that are sung in worship services emphasize this fact and they are often used as a vehicle for confessing sin to God and declaring the forgiveness that was won by Jesus' death on the cross. These confession songs are believed to be honest and accurate disclosures of the sinfulness of man and the righteousness of God. Additionally, for the most part, those who attend worship services believe God to be omnipotent and omnipresent, yet involved with their life. Worship music, both hymns and praise songs, reinforce this belief. Lutherans also believe that the Bible is inherent and true and Luther's hymns are "tied closely to biblical texts....carefully constructed vehicles for gospel teaching" (Noll, 2007). Therefore, the fact that the self-disclosure dimension of *honesty/accuracy* is perceived in the singing of hymns and praise songs is consistent with the intended purpose of hymns and praise songs.

The positive/negative dimension of self-disclosure contained statements such as: *I normally reveal bad feelings about myself* and *I usually disclose positive things about myself*. As explained in the above paragraph, many hymns and worship songs declare man's sinfulness. Furthermore, there was a positive relationship with the traditional factor

but a negative relationship with the contemporary factor. This suggests that parishioners in the contemporary service perceive their self-disclosures in worship as containing more negative disclosures than positive and vice versa for those in a traditional service. A possible explanation for this different, although small, relationship could be the fact that the traditional service utilizes a spoken confession whereas the contemporary service generally uses songs as a confession. One can find support for this difference in Jensen's research (2001) that explored how self-disclosure was enhanced when background music is present. Church musicians in both a traditional and contemporary setting could utilize this finding by softly playing music during prayers and spoken confessions, therefore enhancing perceived self-disclosure.

The third dimension was *intended disclosure*. It included such statements as: *When I reveal my feelings I consciously intend to do so* and *When I express my feelings I am always aware of what I am doing*. It is of particular interest that worshippers agree that intent is present when singing praise songs and hymns. When one chooses to participate, it could be argued that these messages are intended to vocalize thoughts of intimacy and reverence. This suggests that participants are not just "going through the motions" during a worship service but are cognizant of their attempt to communicate a message to God and others.

This dimension of self-disclosure is often where one finds disagreement among communication scholars. For example, Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967) suggest the axiom "You cannot not communicate," indicating that all behavior communicates something, regardless of the intent of the sender to communicate a message. However, Jason Bavelas writes "all behavior is not communicative, although it may be informative"

(1990, p.599). The difference in these two axioms is found in the intent of the sender (see Infante, Rancer, & Womack, 1997). Thus, according to Infante's (1997) conceptualization of communication, it could be argued that hymns and praise songs are a form of communication.

Respondents disagreed that the *Amount* and *Control of Depth* dimensions were present in the singing of hymns and praise songs. Because a hymn/praise song has predetermined words and a beginning and end, there is no control of the depth or the amount of disclosure, so it is not surprising that those surveyed disagreed that these two dimensions were relevant. Thus, when examining the role of self-disclosure in the future, one may want to reconsider "amount" and "control of depth" as factors in understanding the communication of music. These initial findings may indicate that they are irrelevant self-disclosure measures in this context.

Research Question Five

This question examined the differences in perceived self-disclosure between those who prefer traditional worship components and those who prefer contemporary worship components. This question was investigated using a variety of methods. Although no significant equations were found in either worship style, further examination found a significant positive correlation with the contemporary factor. Therefore the more one perceives their worship music to be a form of self-disclosure to God and others; the more they prefer contemporary elements of worship. One can conclude from this finding that although the relationship is small, the informality and spontaneity that is present when singing praise songs in a contemporary style of worship lends itself to the perception of self-disclosure.

Further investigation examining the role of religiosity and self-disclosure indicated a strong relationship between the two. These findings suggest that those who score higher on the religiosity measure perceive to a greater degree the worship songs they sing as a form of self-disclosure. The religiosity scale developed by Rohrbaugh and Jessor (1975) attempts to “evaluate the impact of religion on the respondent’s daily life as well as determine the extent of individual participation in ritual practices” (Hill & Hood, 1999, p.307). Therefore, it can be concluded that as religion begins to impact an individual’s daily life and they increase in their participation and personal devotion, they will begin to perceive to a greater extent, a sense of self-disclosure in the singing of praise songs and/or hymns.

Thus, it is important to develop religiosity or to use a religious term, create disciples. This is accomplished through bible studies, fellowship and worship. As parishioners develop and grow in their faith, they will begin to perceive a sense of self-disclosure in the singing of hymns and praise songs, which will result in relational closeness and intimacy with God and other parishioners (Affifi & Guerrero, 1995; Karbo, 2006; Derglega, Metts, Petronio, & Margulis, 1993).

Limitations

The present study had several limitations. First, it utilized a case study approach and therefore, cannot be generalized. However, it provides a template on which to build and model future studies. Although this study examined organizational identity within the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod, other levels of organizational identity could have yielded different results. The study could have examined the organizational identity of the

individual church (Trinity Lutheran), the larger denomination “Lutheran” (not LCMS), and the religion (Christian).

Another limitation was the application of the revised self-disclosure scale to a different context. The revised self-disclosure scale was adapted to measure worship music as a form of communication with God. Using this scale in this context seemed to limit the interpretation typical of self-disclosure studies. Moreover, there was difficulty with interpreting Rohrbaugh and Jessor’s (1975) religiosity scale. The scale was found in the book *Measures of Religiosity* (Hill & Hood, 1999) and scoring instructions were unclear.

A further limitation was the shortcomings that are an inevitable outcome of exploratory research. Because previous research conceptualizing contemporary and traditional worship was limited, the study represented a promising, but cautious exploration of these concepts that could perhaps benefit from further development. First, further development of worship components could prove to be valuable, extending the understanding of the role of worship music as a form of communication and a representation of organizational identification. For example, *I like guitar in worship* could be separated into different types of guitar (i.e., electric, classical, rhythm). This could be repeated for various worship components. Additionally, it was evident by responses to a variety of questions on the survey, particularly the last three questions (#G11, #G12, #G13) that further clarification and conceptualization was needed.

Directions for Future Study

If one were to build on the findings of this study, there are some improvements and changes to the survey, discussed in the previous paragraph, that could be implemented in future research. Additionally, this study could be replicated with different churches and

populations. The results could be analyzed and compared to this research. It would be enlightening to note the differences between urban and suburban Lutheran churches as well as inter-denominationally. In addition, surveying churches that offered one worship style as opposed to churches that offered several worship styles would offer a unique perspective.

Different methodologies could be employed in order to measure or explore the issue of Social Identity within the context of a worshipping community. It is possible that, because the survey was conducted in the church, individual's answers reflected their social identity as a Lutheran. Experiments could be conducted to further investigate this possibility.

Additionally, in order to better understand communication, specifically messages of self-disclosure, a content analysis of different worship and praise songs could be enlightening. One could code the various dimensions of self-disclosure that are present such as honesty/accuracy, positivity/negativity, and intended disclosure and then analyze a variety of hymns and praise songs.

Conclusion

This study explored worship style, music and social identity from a communication perspective. In order to do this, a number of variables were examined. Results indicated that Lutherans who prefer traditional worship components identify more strongly with the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (LCMS). Moreover, music preference strongly predicts worship style preference.

Lull (1985) understood that music was not only a form of communication but that music was communication, able to express various socio-cultural norms and beliefs. This

research was interested in music as communication. Music genres provide a common ground to share culture, enabling us to communicate who we are and what we believe. The findings of this study indicate that music preferences provide insight into how one identifies with the church and the implications for church leadership. There are clear distinctions between those who prefer contemporary or traditional styles of worship and their music preferences. Therefore, music must be given adequate attention in the church.

Of particular interest to church leaders, from a Social Identity perspective is to reduce and alleviate the conflict over music by creating superordinate goals (Sherif, 1958). Rather than concentrating on music style, it would be advantageous to concentrate on the common goal of the organization and use different music genres to accomplish that goal. Furthermore, as churches develop a greater understanding of the variables that contribute to identity and worship style preference, they can more effectively communicate to their parishioners, their community, their city and the world.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M.A. (1988). Comments on the motivational status of self-esteem in social identity and intergroup discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 18*, 317-334.
- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M.A. (1990). An introduction to the social identity approach. In D. Abrams & M.A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 1-9). New York, NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Afifi, W.A., & Guerrero, L.K. (1995). *Maintenance behaviors in same sex friendships: Sex differences, equity and associations with relational closeness*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Network on Personal Relationships, Williamsburg, VA.
- Albert, S., & Whetten, D.A. (1985). Organizational identity. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 263-295). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Ashforth, B.E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 20-39.
- Avery, R. (1979). Adolescents use of the mass media. *American Behavioral Scientist, 23*, 53-70.
- Bainton, R. (1950). *Here I stand: A life of Martin Luther*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press.
- Bakagiannis, S., & Tarrant, M. (2006). Can music bring people together? Effects of shared musical preference on intergroup bias in adolescence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 47*, 129-136.

- Bavelas, J.B. (1990). Behaving and communicating: A reply to Motley. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 54, 593-602.
- Bearden, W.O., & Netemeyer, R.G. (Eds.). (1999). *Handbook of marketing scales: Multi-item measures for marketing and consumer research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Becker, P.E., Ellingson, S.J., Flory, R.W., Griswold, W., Kniss, F., & Nelson, T. (1993). Straining at the tie that binds: Congregational conflict in the 1980s. *Review of Religious Research*, 34, 193-209.
- Becker, P. (1998). Congregational models and conflict: A study of how institutions shape organizational process. In N.J. Demerath, P.D. Hall, T. Schmitt & R. Williams (Eds.), *Sacred companies: Organizational aspects of religion and religious aspects of organizations* (pp. 231-255). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Booth, M.W. (1976). The art of words in songs. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 62, 242-249.
- Brickson, S. (2000). The impact of identity orientation on individual and organizational outcomes in demographically diverse settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 25 (1), 82-101.
- Brown, A.D., & Starkey, K. (2000). Organizational identity and learning: A psychodynamic perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 25 (1), 102-120.
- Carley, K. (1991). A theory of group stability. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 331-354.
- Carman, J.M. (1978). Values and consumption patterns: A closed loop. In H.K. Hunt (Ed.), *Advances in consumer research* (pp. 403-407). Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research.

- Cavicchi, D. (1998). *Tramps like us: Music and meaning among Springsteen fans*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chafee, S.H. (1985). Popular music and communication research: An editorial epilogue. *Communication Research, 12*, 413-424.
- Chatham-Carpenter, A. (2006). Internal self-esteem: God as symbolic interactionism's "significant other"? *Journal of Communication and Religion, 29*, 103-126.
- Chelune, G.J., Waring, E.M., Vosk, B.N., Sultan, F.E., & Ogden, J.K. (1984). Self-disclosure and its relationship to marital intimacy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40*, 216-219.
- Chesebro, J.W., Fougler, D.A., Nachman, J.E., & Yannelli, A. (1985) Popular music as a mode of communication, 1955-1982. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 2*, 115-135.
- Chou, H.G., & Russell, R. (2006). The effects of organizational characteristics on the adoption of the contemporary worship style among Taiwanese congregations. *Review of Religious Research, 48* (1), 33-49.
- Christians, C.G. (2004). Christian scholarship and academic pluralism. *Journal of Communication and Religion, 27*, 11-24.
- Clair, J.A., Beatty, J.E., & Maclean, T.L. (2005). Out of sight but not out of mind: Managing social identities in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 30* (1), 78-95.
- Cook, N. (1998). *Music: A very short introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dawn, M.J. (1995). *Reaching out without dumbing down: A theology of worship for this urgent time*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

- Delacroix, J., & Swaminathan, A. (1991). Cosmetic, speculative, and adaptive organizational change in the wine industry: A longitudinal study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 631-661.
- Derlega, V.J., Metts, S., Petronio, S., & Margulis, S.T. (1993). *Self-disclosure*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dolfsma, W. (1999). The consumption of music and the expression of values: A social economic explanation for the advent of pop music. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 58, 1019-1046.
- Duck, S., & Pittman, G. (1994). In M.L. Knapp & G.R. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (pp. 676-695). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dukes, W.F. (1955). Psychological study of values. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 24-50.
- Dunaway, D.K. (1987). Music as political communication in the United States. In J. Lull (Ed.), *Popular music and communication*. (pp. 2-52). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Eidenmuller, M.E. (1996). Contemporary religious music preference and audience orientation: Do the lyrics really matter? *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 19, 37-47.
- Ellemers, N., Haslam, S.A., Platow, M.J., & Van Knippenberg, S.A. (2003) In S.A. Haslam, D. Van Knippenberg, M.J. Platow & N. Ellemers (Eds.), *Social identity at work* (pp. 3-26). New York, NY: Psychology Press, LTD.
- Eyerman, R. (2002). Music in movement: Cultural politics and old and new social movements. *Qualitative Sociology*, 25(3), 443-458.

- Eyerman, R., & Jamison, A. (1995). Social movements and cultural transformation: Popular music in the 1960s. *Media, Culture, and Society*, 17, 449-468.
- Eyerman, R., & Jamison, A. (1998). *Music and social movements: Mobilizing traditions in the twentieth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feather, N.T. (1970). Educational choice and student attitudes in relation to terminal and instrumental values. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 22, 127-144.
- Feather, N.T. (1975). *Values in education and society*. New York: Free Press.
- Fisher, A.J. (2004). *Music and religious identity in counter-Reformation Augsburg, 1580-1630*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Fox, W.S., & Williams, J.D. (1974). Political orientation and music preferences among college students. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 38, 352-371.
- Frith, J. (n.d.). *LCR top ten hymns of all time*. Retrieved January 6, 2008, from <http://www.lcrchurch.org/toptenhymns.htm>.
- Frith, S. (1981). *Sound effects: Youth, leisure and the politics of rock 'n' roll*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Frith, S. (1987a). The industrialization of popular music. In J.Lull (Ed.), *Popular music and communication*. (pp. 2-52). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Frith, S. (1987b). Towards an aesthetics of popular music. In R. Leppert & S. McClary (Eds.), *Music and society: The politics of composition, performance and reception* (133-150). Cambridge: Cambridge, UP.
- Gill, M. (1990). The music of Amy Grant: A new wrapping for a timeless message. *The Journal of Communication and Religion*, 13 (1), 12-24.

- Gioia, D.A., Shultz, M., & Corley, K.G. (2000). Where do we go from here? *Academy of Management Review*, 25 (1), 145-147.
- Gioia, D.A., Shultz, M., & Corley, K.G. (2004). Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability. In M.J. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds.), *Organizational identity*. (pp. 349-376). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Glock, C. (1959). The religious revival in America? In J. Zahn (Ed.), *Religion and the face of America* (45-88). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gonzales, A., & Makay, J.J.(1983). Rhetorical ascription and the gospel according to Dylan. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 69, 1-14.
- Gormly, E. (2003). Evangelizing through appropriation: Toward a cultural theory on the growth of contemporary Christian music. *Journal of Media and Religion*, 2 (4), 251-265.
- Griffin, E. (2004). A believer's attempt to integrate faith and scholarship. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 27, 25-31.
- Gutman, J. (1982). A means-end chain model based on consumer categorization processes. *Journal of Marketing*, 46, 60-72.
- Hamilton, M.S. (1999). The triumph of the praise songs: How guitars beat out the organ in the worship wars. *Christianity Today*, 43 (8), 28-34.
- Hamm, C. (1983). *Music in the new world*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Hannan M., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49, 149-164.
- Hatch, M.J., & Schultz, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Organizational identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Hechter, M., Nadel, L., & Michod, R.E. (1993). *The origin of values*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Herl, J. (2004). *Worship wars in early Lutheranism: Choir, congregation, and three centuries of conflict*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Herriot, P. (2007). *Religious fundamentalism and social identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Hewstone, M., & Greenland, K. (2000). Intergroup conflict. *International Journal of Psychology*, 35(2), 136-144.
- Hill, P.C., & Hood, R.W. (Eds.). (1999). *Measures of religiosity*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.
- Hoekema, D. (1994). Church unplugged. *The Christian Century*, 111, 668-669.
- Hogg, M.A., Terry, D.J., & White, K.M. (1995). A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychological Quarterly*, 58 (4), 255-269.
- Holland, J.L. (1966). *The psychology of vocational choice: A theory of personality types and model environments*. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell.
- Holland, J.L. (1973). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hollander, B.A. (1988). The priming of religion in political attitudes: The role of religious programming. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 21, 67-83.
- Homer, P., & Kahle, L.R. (1988). A structural equation analysis of the value-attitude-behavior hierarchy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 638-646.
- Hughes, T. (2000). Kingsway's Thankyou Music.

- Hunt, J. (2007). *Introducing contemporary worship into a traditional church*. Retrieved on December 4, 2007 from: <http://joshhunt.com/contemp.html>.
- Infante, D.A., Rancer, A.S., & Womack, D.F. (1997). *Building communication theory*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Irvine, J.R., & Fitzpatrick, W.G. (1972). The musical form in rhetorical exchange: Theoretical considerations. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58, 272-284.
- Jensen, K.L. (2001). The effects of selected classical music on self-disclosure. *Journal of Music Therapy*, 38 (1), 2-27.
- Julian, J.W., Bishop, D.W., & Fiedler, F.E. (1966). Quasi-therapeutic effects of intergroup competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 321-327.
- Kahle, L.R. (1983). *Social values and social change: Adaptation to life in America*. New York: Praeger.
- Kahle, L.R., Beatty, S.E., & Homer, P.M. (1986). Alternative measurement approaches to consumer values: The list of values (LOV) and values and lifestyle segmentation (VALS). *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (3). 405-409.
- Kahle, L.R., Poulos, B., & Sukhdial, A. (1988). Changes in social values in the United States during the past decade. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 2, 35-41.
- Karbo, K. (2006). Friendship: The laws of attraction. *Psychology Today*, 39 (6), 90-95.
- Keaney, E. & Oskala, A. (2007). The golden age of the arts? Taking part survey findings on older people and the arts. *Cultural Trends*, 16 (4), 323-355.
- Kelly, D., & Amburgey, T.L. (1991). Organizational inertia and momentum: A dynamic model of strategic change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 689-713.

- Knupp, R.E. (1981). A time for every purpose under heaven: Rhetorical dimensions of protest music. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 46, 377-389.
- Korte, R.F. (2006). A review of social identity theory with implications for training and development. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 31(3), 166-180.
- Lull, J. (1985). On the communicative properties of music. *Communication Research*, 12, 363-372.
- MacDonald, R., Hargreaves, D., & Miell, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Musical identities*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- MacGeorge, E.L., Bodie, G.D., Sietman, G.L.B., Geddes, B., Faris, J.L., & Samter, W. (2007). Individual prayer behavior in times of personal distress: Typological development and empirical examination with a college student sample. *Journal of Communication & Religion*, 30, 1-39.
- Mael, F.A., & Tetrick, L.E. (1992). Identifying organizational identification. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52 (4), 813-825.
- Marcia, J. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 551-558.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.
- McCroskey, J.C., & Richmond, V.P. (1977). Communication apprehension as a predictor of self-disclosure. *Communication Quarterly*, 25(4), 40-43.
- Medhurst, M.J. (2004). Religious belief and scholarship: A complex relationship. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 27, 40-47.
- Meng-Jinn C., Miller, B.A., Grube, J. W., & Waiters, E. D. (2006). Music, substance use, and aggression. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 67 (3), 373-381.

- Midian, A. (1999). *The value of indigenous music in the life and ministry of the church: The United Church in the Duke of York Islands*. Apwitiire: Studies in Papua New Guinea Studies.
- Miller, M.M., & Strongman, K.T. (2002). The emotional effects of music on religious experience: A study of the Pentecostal-charismatic style of music and worship. *Psychology of Music, 30*, 8-27.
- Mitchell, A. (1983). *The nine American lifestyles*. New York: Warren Books, Inc.
- Molokotos-Liederman, L. (2004). Sacred words, profane music? The *Free Monks* as a musical phenomenon in contemporary Greek orthodoxy. *Sociology of Religion, 65* (4), 403-416.
- Muehlhoff, T.M. (2004). Faith and scholarship: points of overlap. *Journal of Communication and Religion, 27*, 53-57.
- Newman, B., & Newman, P. (1988). Differences between childhood and adulthood: the identity watershed. *Adolescence, 23*, 551-557.
- Noll, M. (2007). The gospel truth. *Christian History & Biography, 95*, 18.
- North, A.C., & Hargreaves, D.J. (1999). Music and adolescent identity. *Music Education Research, 1*, 75-92.
- North, A.C., Hargreaves, D.J., & O'Neill, S.A. (2000). The importance of music to adolescents. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*, 255-272.
- Oakes, P., & Turner, J.C. (1986). Distinctiveness and the salience of social category memberships: Is there an automatic perceptual bias toward novelty? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 16*, 325-344.

- Pauley, J. L. II. (2005). Jesus in a Chevy? The rhetoric of boundary-work in contemporary Christian music. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 28, 71-98.
- Pearson, J.L., & Dollinger, S. J. (2004). Music preference correlates of Jungian types. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 36 (5), 1005-1009.
- Peddie, I. (Ed.). (2006). *The resisting muse: Popular music and social protest*. UK: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Pratt, M. G., & Foreman, P.O. (2000a). Classifying managerial responses to multiple organizational identities. *Academy of Management Review*, 25 (1), 18-42.
- Pratt, M.G., & Foreman, P.O. (2000b). The beauty of and barriers to organizational theories of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 25 (1), 141-143.
- Radwan, J. (2004). Religious identity via pop music: "Shine". *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 27, 187-216.
- Rentfrow, P.J., & Gosling, S.D. (2003). The do re mi's of everyday life: The structure and personality correlates of music preferences. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 84 (6), 1236-1256.
- Reynolds, T. J., & Gutman, J. (1984). Advertising is image management. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 24 (1), 27-38.
- Rohrbaugh, J., & Jessor, R. (1975). Religiosity in youth: A personal control against deviant behavior. *Journal of Personality*, 43, 136-155.
- Rokeach, M.J. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Romanowski, W.D. (1992). Roll over Beethoven, tell Martin Luther the news: American evangelicals and rock music. *Journal of American Culture*, 15, 79-88.

- Romanowski, W.D. (2000). Evangelicals and popular music: The contemporary Christian music industry. In B.D. Forbes & J.J. Mahan (Eds.), *Religion and popular culture in America* (pp. 103-124). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1957). *Occupations and values*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Sardiello, (1994). Secular rituals and popular culture: A case for Grateful Dead concerts and dead head identity. In J.S. Epstein (Ed.), *Adolescents and their music: If it's too loud, you're too old* (pp.115-140). New York: Garland.
- Satisfied: Consumption, identity, and widespread panic* (2002). Paper submitted to the International Communication Association's 2003 Annual Conference. San Diego: CA.
- Schultze, Q.J. (2005). The "God-Problem" in communication studies. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 28, 1-22.
- Scott, C.R. (2007). Communication and social identity theory: Existing and potential connections in organizational identification research. *Communication Studies*, 58 (2), 123-138
- Scott, S.G., & Lane, V.R. (2000). A stakeholder approach to organizational identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 25 (1), 43-62.
- Seul, J.R. (1999). Ours is the way of God: Religion, identity, and intergroup conflict. *Journal of Peace Research*, 36 (5), 553-569.
- Sherif, M. (1958). Superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup conflict. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 63(4), 349-356.

- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B.J., Hood, W.R., & Sherif, C.W. (1954). *Experimental study of positive and negative intergroup attitudes between experimentally produced groups*. Norman: University of Oklahoma.
- Smith, S.A. (1980). Sounds of the south: The rhetorical saga of country music lyrics. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 45, 169-182.
- Starke, F.A., & Dyck, B. (1996). Upheavals in congregations: The causes and outcomes of splits. *Review of Religious Research*, 38(2), 159-174.
- Stern, J. (2004). Marking time: Using music to create inclusive religious education and inclusive schools. *Support for Learning*, 19 (3), 107-113.
- Stets, J.E., & Burke, P.J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63 (3), 224-227.
- Stout, D.A., & Buddenbaum, J.M. (1996). *Religion and mass media: Audiences and adaptations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Stryker, S., & Burke, P.J. (2000). The past, present, and future of an identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(4), 284-297.
- Tajfel, H. (1957). Value and the perceptual judgment of magnitude. *Psychological Review*, 64, 192-204.
- Tajfel, H. (1959). Quantitative judgment in social perception. *British Journal of Psychology*, 50, 19-29.
- Tajfel, H. (1963). Stereotypes. *Race*, 5, 3-14.
- Tajfel, H. (1969). Cognitive aspects of prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25, 79-87.
- Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American*, 223, 96-102.

- Tajfel, H. (1972). Experiments in a vacuum. In J. Israel & H. Tajfel (Eds.). *The context of social psychology: A critical assessment* (pp.25-42). London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1973). The roots of prejudice: Cognitive aspects. In P. Watson (Ed.), *Psychology and Race* (pp. 76-95). Penguin: Harmondsworth.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information*, 14, 101-118.
- Tajfel, H. (1975). The exit of social mobility and the voice of social change. *Social Science Information*, 14, 101-118.
- Tajfel, H. (1978a). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroups relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1978b). Interindividual behaviour and intergroup behaviour. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 27-60). London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M.G., Bundy, R.P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 149-178.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worschel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & L. W. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

- Tarrant, M., Hargreaves, D.J., & North, A.C. (2001). Social categorization, self-esteem, and the estimated musical preferences of male adolescents. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 141*, 565-581.
- Tarrant, M., North, A.C., Edridge, M.D., Kirk, L.E., Smith, E.A., & Turner, R.E. (2001). Social identity in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence, 24*, 597-609.
- Timpany, J. (2007). *Music and public opinion: A reference-group based analysis of the relationship between musical preferences and political attitudes*. Paper presented at the Midwestern Political Science Association Annual Meeting. Chicago, IL.
- Top 25 Praise Songs 2007 Edition*. Retrieved on January 6, 2008, from www.worshipmusic.com/3859718832.html.
- Turner, J.C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, J.C. (1999). Some current themes in research on social identity and self-categorization theories. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 6-34). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Wallis, R., & Malm, K. (1984). *Big sounds from small peoples: The music industry in small countries*. London: Constable.
- Waring, E.M., Tillman, M.P., Russell, L., & Weisz, G. (1980). Concepts of intimacy in the general population. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 26*, 167-172.
- Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J.H., & Jackson, D.D. (1967). *Pragmatics of human communication: A study of interaction patterns, pathologies, and paradoxes*. New York: Norton.

- Wheeless, L.R., & Grotz, J. (1976). Conceptualization and measurement of reported self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research, 2*, 338-346.
- Wheeless, L.R., & Grotz, J. (1978). Revised self-disclosure. In R.R. Rubin, P. Palmgreen & H.E. Sypher (Eds.), *Communication research measures: A sourcebook* (pp. 322-326). New York: NY: Guilford Press.
- Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Zillmann, D., & Bhatia, A. (1989). Effects of associating with musical genres on heterosexual attraction. *Communication Research, 16*, 263-288.

APPENDIX

Survey on Lifestyles, Self-Disclosure, and Religiosity

Thank you for taking the time to answer this survey about communication, music and religion. Please answer all of the questions to the best of your ability. You are not being judged or evaluated by your answers; and this survey is confidential, please be as truthful and honest as possible. Please read the instructions at the beginning of each section before answering.

Section I.

Instructions: Indicate on a scale of 1-9 how much you like the following music genres where 1= not at all and 9 =very much. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER) Circle N/A for Not Applicable if you have never heard of a particular music genre.

			NOT AT ALL						VERY MUCH		
A1.	Classic Rock	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A2.	Folk/Indie	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A3.	Classical	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A4.	Jazz	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A5.	Blues	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A6.	Rap/Hip Hop	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A7.	Country	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A8.	Pop	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A9.	Big Band	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A10.	Punk/Grunge	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A11.	Ska	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A12.	Alternative	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A13.	Heavy Metal	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A14.	World	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A15.	Latin	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A16.	R& B/Soul	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A17.	Techno/Dance	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A18.	Opera	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Section II.

Instructions: Indicate on a scale of 1-9 how much you like the following to be included in your worship, where 1= not at all and 9 = very much.

B1. I like a guitar in worship (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)
 NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B2. I like the organ in worship
 NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B3. I like to recite the creed in worship
 NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B4. I like responsive readings in worship
NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B5. I like formality in worship
NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B6. I like to clap my hands to the music when I sing
NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B7. I like drums in worship
NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B8. I like the pastor to wear a robe during worship
NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B9. I like to sing from a hymnal or bulletin
NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B10. I like the words of the songs to be displayed on a screen
NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B11. I like the pastor to preach from the pulpit
NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B12. I like informality in worship
NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B13. I like to sing the liturgy
NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

B14. I like the altar paraments to change colors according to the church year
NOT AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY MUCH

Section III.

Instructions: Indicate on a scale of 1-7 how much you agree with the following statements about the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (LCMS) where 1= strongly disagree and 9 = strongly agree.

C1. When someone criticizes the LCMS, it feels like a personal insult
STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

C2. I'm very interested in what others think about the LCMS

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

C3. When I talk about the LCMS, I usually say “we” rather than “they”

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

C4. The LCMS’s successes are my successes

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

C5. When someone praises the LCMS, it feels like a personal compliment

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

C6. I act like an LCMS person to a great extent

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

C7. If a story in the media criticized the LCMS, I would feel embarrassed

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

C8. I don’t act like a typical LCMS person

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

C9. I have a number of qualities typical of LCMS people

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

C10. The limitations associated with LCMS people apply to me also

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

Section IV.

Instructions: The following questionnaire consists of seven multiple-choice items with one fill-in-the-blank item. Please answer the question by circling the appropriate letter for the multiple choice items and providing the most accurate number for the fill-in-the-blank question.

D1. How many times have you attended religious services during the past year? _____

- D2. Which of the following describes your practice of prayer or religious meditation?
- Prayer is a regular part of my daily life
 - I usually pray in times of stress or need but rarely at any other time
 - I pray only during formal ceremonies
 - I never pray
- D3. When you have a serious personal problem, how often do you take religious advice or teaching into consideration?
- Almost always
 - Usually
 - Sometimes
 - Never
- D4. How much influence would you say that religion has on the way that you choose to act and the way that you choose to spend your time each day?
- No influence
 - A small influence
 - Some influence
 - A fair amount of influence
 - A large influence
- D5. Which of the following statements comes closest to your belief about God?
- I am sure God really exists and that He is active in my life
 - Although I sometimes question His existence, I do believe in God and believe He knows of me as a person
 - I don't know if there is a personal God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind
 - I don't know if there is a personal God or a higher power of some kind, and I don't know if I ever will
 - I don't believe in a personal God or in a higher power
- D6. Which one of the following statements comes closest to your belief about life after death (immortality)?
- I believe in a personal life after death, a soul existing as a specific individual spirit
 - I believe in a soul existing after death as a part of a universal spirit
 - I believe in a life after death of some kind, but I really don't know what it would be like.
 - I don't know whether there is any kind of life after death, and I don't know if I will ever know
 - I don't believe in any kind of life after death
- D7. During the past year, how often have you experienced a feeling of religious reverence

- or devotion?
- a. Almost daily
- b. Frequently
- c. Sometimes
- d. Rarely
- e. Never

- D8. Do you agree with the following statement? “Religion gives me a great amount of comfort and security in life.”
- a. Strongly disagree
 - b. Disagree
 - c. Uncertain
 - d. Agree
 - e. Strongly Agree

Section V.

Instructions: This next section is asking about how you use hymns/praise songs as a form of self-disclosure to God and to other parishioners

Indicate on a scale of 1-7 how much you agree with the following statements where 1=strongly disagree and 7=strongly agree. Many of the statements are similar to other statements. Do not be concerned about this. Work quickly, just record your first impression. **Please keep in mind the songs/hymns that you sing during worship throughout this next section.**

E1. My self-disclosures are completely accurate reflections of who I really am

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

E2. Only infrequently do I express my personal beliefs and opinions

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

E3. I intimately disclose who I really am openly and fully

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

E4. On the whole, my disclosures about myself have more negative content than positive

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

E5. I do not always feel completely sincere when I reveal my own feelings, emotions, behaviors or experiences

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

E6. When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying

- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E7. On the whole, my disclosures about myself contain more positive content than negative
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E8. I often discuss feelings about myself
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E9. I usually disclose negative things about myself
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E10. I often disclose intimate, personal things about myself, without hesitation
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E11. I am always honest in my self-disclosures
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E12. I am not always honest in my self disclosures
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E13. I normally express my good feelings about myself
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E14. When I wish, my self-disclosures are completely accurate reflections of who I really am
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E15. When I reveal my feelings, I consciously intend to do so
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E16. I often talk about myself
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E17. I usually talk about myself for long periods of time

- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E18. When I am self-disclosing, I am consciously aware of what I am revealing
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E19. I do not often talk about myself
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E20. When I reveal my feelings, it is usually brief
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E21. I often reveal more undesirable than desirable things about myself
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E22. When I reveal my feelings, emotions, and experiences, they are always accurate self-perceptions
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E23. When I am discussing myself, I do not do it for long
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E24. I usually disclose positive things about myself
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E25. I normally reveal “bad” feelings I have about myself
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E26. Once I get started, my self-disclosures last a long time
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E27. I feel that sometimes I do not control the personal or intimate things that I disclose
- STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE
- E28. Once I get started, I intimately and fully reveal myself

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

E29. I cannot reveal myself when I want to because I do not know myself thoroughly enough

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

E30. I am not often confident that my expressions of my own feelings, emotions, and experiences are true reflections of myself

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

E31. I always feel completely sincere when I reveal my own feelings and experiences

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONGLY AGREE

Section VI.

The following is a list of things that some people look for or want out of life. Please study the list carefully and then rate each thing on how important it is in your daily life, where 1= very unimportant and 9 = very important. Then circle the most important goal.

F1. Sense of belonging
VERY UNIMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY IMPORTANT

F2. Excitement
VERY UNIMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY IMPORTANT

F3. Warm relationships with others
VERY UNIMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY IMPORTANT

F4. Self-fulfillment
VERY UNIMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY IMPORTANT

F5. Being well-respected
VERY UNIMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY IMPORTANT

F6. Fun and enjoyment of life
VERY UNIMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY IMPORTANT

F7. Security
VERY UNIMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY IMPORTANT

F8. Self-respect
VERY UNIMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY IMPORTANT

F9. A sense of accomplishment

VERY UNIMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 VERY IMPORTANT

Section VII.

Instructions: Please answer the following questions as accurately as possible. Please do not leave any question blank.

G1. Which type of worship service do you attend most often? (please check only one)

Contemporary____ Traditional_____

G2. Which worship service do you prefer?

Contemporary____ Traditional_____ No Preference_____

G3. How long have you been attending this church?

Less than one year_____

1-5 Years_____

6-10 Years_____

11-15 Years_____

16-20 Years_____

Over 20 Years_____

G4. How long have you been a Lutheran?

Less than one year_____

1-5 Years_____

6-10 Years_____

11-15 Years_____

16-20 Years_____

Over 20 Years_____

G5. Please check the ethnicity that best describes you

Black/African American_____

White/Caucasian_____

Hispanic American_____

Native American_____

Asian American_____

Arab American_____

Other (Please Specify)_____

G6. Indicate the highest level of education completed (please check only one)

Some high school_____

High school_____

Some college _____
College (2 year) _____
College (4 year) _____
Graduate Degree _____

G7. Please circle the number that best describes your income bracket:

- 1) \$0-\$10,000
- 2) \$10,001-\$20,000
- 3) \$20,001-\$30,000
- 4) \$30,001-\$40,000
- 5) \$40,001-\$50,000
- 6) \$50,001-\$60,000
- 7) \$60,001-\$70,000
- 8) \$70,001-\$80,000
- 9) \$80,001-\$90,000
- 10) \$90,001-\$100,000
- 11) \$100,001 or more

G8. Age: _____

G9. Please check whether you are male or female: Male _____ Female _____

G10. Please indicate your marital status

Married _____
Separated _____
Divorced _____
Widowed _____
Never Married _____

G11. How many children do you have? _____

G12. How many live at home? _____

G13. How many attend church with you on a typical Sunday? _____

