SPIRITUAL, BUT NOT RELIGIOUS: INSIGHTS FROM AN ONLINE PANEL

Kumar Rao *,[1] **Dr.Dwayne Ball** **
Dr.Ron Hampton **

* *Knowledge Networks Inc.*
** *Department of Marketing, University of Nebraska at Lincoln*

Abstract: Recent studies have suggested that a growing number of Americans identify themselves as *'Spiritual, but not religious'*. The socio-demographic portrait of this group of unchurched Americans, which has been nicely described by many authors (see, Fuller (2001) and Roof (1993)) is a one-point perspective of this group. Another perspective, which focuses on the role of spirituality on consumer behavior, however has received limited empirical research. In this article, we investigate the relationship between people's self-identified religious/spiritual identity and self-reported consumer behavior using profile data collected from an online panel. In addition to presenting quantitative evidence of marketplace behavior and perceptions of those who are religious and/or spiritual, this article draws implications about consumer spirituality and concludes with recommendations for future research.

Keywords: Consumer Behavior, Spirituality

1. INTRODUCTION

The current religious ecosystem in the U.S., witnessed in a time of onslaught by modernity, has revealed a changing nexus of Americans and their religious and spiritual identities. Noticeably so for some who describe themselves as "spiritual" rather than "religious". For this group of unchurched Americans, the word *spiritual* is a basis of unity, invoked positively as a basis of self-identity, where as the word *religious* is used often as a counter-identity for clarifying who they are not (Roof, 1993). Forsaking formal religious organizations, this group of spiritual seekers have instead embraced an individualized spirituality that is often not very well grounded in any historic religious tradition and exposed to a 'salad bar' of assorted teachings and techniques (Roof, 1993). If seeking a private realm of personal experience of the transcendence, God, higher power, or eternal is a prime goal in these people's lives, what effects, if any, does the spiritual pursuit have on their behavior in the marketplace? How do these effects compare with those who are religious i.e. connected with the public realm of membership in religious institutions and adherence to religious doctrines? We hope to make a start on answering these questions.

When it comes to exploring the concept of spirituality's effect on consumer behavior, research has received limited perspective or interest (Rao *et al.*, 2006). There is little theoretical connection between studies of religion and spirituality and studies of consumer behavior (Ball *et al.*, 2002). Although the topic of spirituality has been dis-

[1] Kumar Rao is a graduate student of Survey Research and Methodology program in UNL and Survey Director, Profile Group, Knowledge Networks Inc. E-mail: krao@knowledgenetworks.com

cussed copiously in religion and psychology literature [2], few studies have focussed on this topic in the marketing literature (see, Bailey and Sood (1993); Hirschman (1990); MacCannnell (2002)). But none of them have investigated the role of spirituality, in particular spiritual identity, on consumer behavior. In this research, we investigate the relationship between people's self-identified religious/spiritual identity and self-reported consumer behavior.

In the sections that follow, we review the literature on *Spiritual but not religious (SBNR)* group in an effort to provide a socio-demographic portrait of this group to our readers. Next, we describe a study designed to investigate the relationship between spiritual identity and consumer behavior. Finally, we discuss the findings from the study and implications of our findings for marketing theory, marketing practice, and further research.

2. SPIRITUAL, BUT NOT RELIGIOUS

The phrase 'spiritual but not religious' means different things to different people. But for highly active seekers, or people for whom spiritual or metaphysical concerns are a driving force, this phrase is a means of saying who they are and are not (Roof, 1993). Does this self-perception bespeak their opinion towards religious institutions and personal experience of the transcendence? Apparently so, these seekers often find established religious institutions stifling and many of them go as far as to view organized religion as the major enemy of authentic spirituality (Fuller, 2001). They view their lives as spiritual journeys, hoping to make new discoveries and gain new insights on an almost daily basis (Fuller, 2001). Furthermore, they tend to experiment with New age or Eastern practices, are not church-going, and see themselves as spiritual but not religious (Marler and Hadaway, 2002). Despite their unchurched status, they are much more concerned with spiritual development than the vast majority of churchgoers (Fuller, 2001). Fuller also finds that these individuals are more likely than other Americans to have a college education, to belong to a white-collar profession, to have parents who attended church less frequently, and to be more independent in the sense of having weaker social relationships.

While the above described portrait of the SBNR group is interesting, but what is it that also interests some of us about this group whose members identify themselves as spiritual only? Furthermore, is SBNR a real phenomenon or a mere way of thinking by religious separatists or marginals who identify themselves as spiritual for something that they are 'not religious' or 'less religious' about? These are challenging and pertinent questions whose answers may lie beneath the surface of evidence that tend to suggest that Americans are becoming more spiritual and less religious.

Many authors, including Marler and Hadaway (2002) and Pargament (1999), have attempted to explain Americans' increased attention to "spirituality" and the diminished cultural presence of traditional religious institutions. We wonder if the increased attention has anything to do with the reality that people define *being spiritual* and *being religious* in a myriad number of ways. In fact, as many authors including (Marler and Hadaway, 2002) have uncovered, most Americans see themselves as both (spiritual and religious). However, what is also evident from a number of other studies such as Roof (2000), Scott (2001), and Zinnbauer *et al.* (1997) is that there appear to be a substantial group of individuals, labelled as "Seekers", who identify themselves as spiritual, but not religious. Even in our previous qualitative research (Rao *et al.* (2006)), we found respondents reporting that they are spiritual only. But, the question is what do SBNR individuals mean by spirituality?

Their definitions, as authorities on spirituality (such as Emmons (1999), Roof (2000) and Marcoen (1994)) have generally noted, have personal and certain institutional components [3]. The common element in these definitions, however, is that one must believe in the existence of a non-material spirit world (containing a transcendent force or entity, ancestor spirits, a life-force in common amongst living things, ultimate reality as opposed to illusion, etc.), and must believe that this spirit world is or can be connected to the individual, with the possibility of benefit to the individual. They adopt many ways of making such a connection: prayer, reading, meditation, intense or repetitive physical activity, music, and so forth. Given all that we know about the SBNR group, it seems fair to conclude that it is a phenomenon and not a result of sporadic outbursts from non-religious outlaws.

What would also be interesting to know about the SBNR group and that has certainly motivated us in doing this research, is to imagine and explore how the 'spiritual' and 'consumption' spheres in the members' lives interplay since consumption of any product in general, as we know, is a lifetime activity. What happens when a particular plane of these two spheres crisscross against each

[2] E.g. Paloutzian and Ellison (1982); Idler (1987); Marcoen (1994); Regnerus *et al.* (1998); Wuthnow (1998).

[3] Spiritual-only respondents in our study (Rao *et al.*, 2006) mentioned using candles and incense sticks during their spiritual prayers.

other? In other words, we wonder if there are any individual effects of identifying as SBNR on purchasing, marketplace activities, and attitudes toward the market place? Specifically, we attempt to investigate how the SBNR group is different from other religious or spiritual groups [4] across certain product or service categories. After all we know that those pursuing an open-ended religious or spiritual "quest" seem to rely not on doctrine in making some of their purchase and consumption decisions, but rather on a projection of the effects of their consumer behavior into the well-being of others (Rao *et al.*, 2006). It is our position that, SBNR individuals alter or curtail certain consumption lifestyles or string of activities, that are either response to or against a perception of the sacred (be it God, or the eternal, or any other transcendental entity), in order to achieve the underlying goal of their spiritual pursuit. Furthermore, they are more likely to integrate the well-being of others in purchase and consumption decisions than any other spiritual and/or religious groups. A caveat merits mention at this juncture and that is we have limited our research in this study to investigate the effects of people's self-identified religious/spiritual identity and self-reported consumer behavior. Research on what triggers such an effect is even though out of the scope of this study, but it is one of the research avenues we are planning to pursue in our future studies.

3. METHODS

3.1 Sample

The data used in this study came from a self-administered online survey that was assigned to a random sample of individuals selected from the Knowledge Networks (KN) online panel. The sample was selected using probability proportional to size sampling from the KN panel. The sample universe for this study is all U.S. residents 18 and older. A comparative snapshot of demographic estimates of the sample and those from Current Population Survey (CPS), Census 2000 is provided in Table 7. As one can see from this table, the sample estimates matches closely with the national estimates from Census 2000, thereby indicating that the sample is representative of 18 and older U.S. population. The survey received 1,342 completes at 73% rate of completion.

[4] Groups whose members identify themselves as spiritual and religious, religious only, and neither spiritual nor religious.

3.2 Measures

The independent measure for this study is a single question [5] that asked respondents to "Choose one of the four statements that best defines your Religiousness and Spirituality". The response options (emphasis was added as indicated) were:

(1) I am Spiritual **and** Religious
(2) I am Spiritual **but not** Religious
(3) I am Religious **but not** Spiritual
(4) I am **neither** Spiritual **nor** Religious.

The table below shows the distribution of the responses to this question. Note that one case was dropped for refusal.

Table 1. Spiritual and Religious Groups

Groups	n	%
Spiritual and Religious (SANDR)	678	50.6
Spiritual but not Religious (SBNR)	258	19.2
Religious but not Spiritual (RBNS)	169	12.6
Neither Spiritual nor Religious (NSR)	236	17.6
Total	1,341	100

Interestingly, the above group percentages are quite different from the ones reported by Zinnbauer *et al.* (1997). In their study, the percentages of SANDR, SBNR, RBNS, and NSR reported were 74, 19, 4 and 3 respectively. We believe the reason for the difference has to do with the sample. In Zinnbauer *et al.* (1997)'s study, the survey participants were from two states, Pennsylvania and Ohio, and were drawn from church-related organizations. Our's is a more representative sample of the 18 and over population in the U.S.

One of the dependent measures in this study was a agreement with the statement "*Sometimes, I will pay substantially more money for a product that I know doesn't hurt the environment, rather than buy a much cheaper product that might harm the environment.*" The question was measured on a 7-point rating scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Two additional measures, which were not part of the survey, were also used in this study. These measures were part of KN's repository of profile data [6]. Insights obtained from previous similar studies (Rao *et al.* (2006) and Ball and Hampton (2006)), helped us in selecting these dependent measures for this study. The measures from profile data were:

[5] The question is similar to the one used by Zinnbauer *et al.* (1997)

[6] Please refer to page 6 for an overview.

- PURREPRO (Purchased a product specifically because it was made from recycled materials?)
- ENVISELF (Would you describe yourself as an environmentalist?)
- Attitudes towards hi-tech devices and technology in general (measured on a 5-point rating scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree").

The exact wording of the profile questions and their response choices are given in page 6.

4. RESULTS

Are SBNR group members more likely than other group members to pay substantially more money for a environmentally friendly product than a non-friendly product, at a cheaper price? To answer this question, a one-way univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) with post-hoc Scheffe tests was conducted to assess group differences. A significant ($F(3) = 5.2$, $p < .05$) relationship was observed. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviation results of the analysis [7]. The means in the table indicate the extent to which respondents would agree to buy a more expensive environmentally friendly product rather than a cheaper non-friendly product. Members of the SBNR group have the highest mean value compared to other groups. Following this analysis, Scheffe post hoc tests of significance were conducted to determine which groups were significantly different from one another. Results showed that RBNS group was significantly different from SBNR and SANDR groups ($p < .05$) and not significantly different from NSR group .

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Analysis of Variance Testing

Groups	n	Mean	SD
SANDR	678	4.12	1.7
SBNR	258	**4.22**	1.8
RBNS	169	3.67	1.62
NSR	235	3.82	1.81
Total	1,340	4.03	1.7

Next, the overall relationship between group membership, PURREPRO, and ENVISELF was analyzed. Group membership was significantly related with PURREPRO ($\chi^2(3) = 12.99$, $p < .05$) and ENVISELF ($\chi^2(3) = 11.53$, $p < .05$). Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of the analysis. As we can see from this table, the SBNR group has the highest percentage of buyers not only compared to other groups, but also among environmentalists within each group.

[7] Note that 1 case was removed for missing data.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics

Groups	n	PURREPRO(A) Yes(%)	ENVISELF(B) Yes(%)	A and B (%)
SANDR	665	21.1	68	26.8
SBNR	254	**28**	**71.2**	**34.8**
RBNS	167	13.2	60.5	20.8
NSR	234	21.4	59	29

N=1320; 21 cases were removed for missing data.

We followed the above analysis with an investigation of the effect of covariate relationships. According to Fuller (2001), SBNR individuals are more likely than other Americans to have a college education. Even in our study, SBNR group had the highest percentage of individuals with a Associate degree and above, compared to other spiritual and religious groups (see Table 8). To investigate whether education has a role in the group differences in PURREPRO and ENVISELF, we performed the previously carried out chi-square tests after controlling for education. Results revealed that for lower education (Some college, no degree and below), group membership was not related to PURREPRO ($\chi^2(3) = 3.59$, $p > .05$). But, for higher education (Associate degree and above), it was related to PURREPRO ($\chi^2(3) = 16.10$, $p < .001$). On the contrary, education was found to have no role in the relationship between group membership and ENVISELF.

In a nut-shell, all the above-mentioned results seem to suggest that SBNR consumers are *greener* than consumers in other groups. At the very least, the results seem to indicate that there is a desire among SBNR consumers towards purchasing products which are perceived as being environmentally friendly. However, we recognize that environmentalism is just one facet of consumerism. Therefore, we extended our investigation beyond the realm of environmentalism by analyzing group differences in attitudes towards hi-tech devices and technology in general.

Table 4 shows the mean significant ($p < .05$) values of ratings across all four groups. Overall, SBNR individuals appear to be more technology savvy than individuals in other groups as inferred from high mean values for items 1 and 3 and low mean value for item 3. They also appear to be smart shoppers than individuals in other groups as inferred from the high mean values for items 5 and 6. Members of the RBNS group are most brand conscious than individuals in other groups.

In order to achieve a more parsimonious summary of the relationships, the 8 items rating scale was factor analyzed and factor scores were subjected to a one-way ANOVA test to detect group differences. Three factors emerged accounting for 57% of the variance explained. Table 5 shows

Table 4. Mean values of ratings across groups

	Statements	SANDR	SBNR	RBNS	NSR
1.	Technology is a necessity	3.44	**3.54**	3.22	3.27
2.	I don't see the benefits of technology	**2.94**	1.93	2.32	2.16
3.	I am interested in learning about new technology	3.15	**3.33**	2.91	3.07
4.	I typically purchase a high-tech device with an extended warranty	**2.7**	2.63	2.53	2.39
5.	I search online auctions for better deals on high-tech devices	2.02	**2.8**	1.71	1.99
6.	I will refrain from buying new high-tech devices until I conduct enough research that I am comfortable with my decision	3.56	**3.73**	3.38	3.38
7.	I purchase a high-tech device mostly for increased efficiency	1.17	**1.27**	1.13	1.18
8.	Brand name is most important to me, regardless of the price	2.44	2.24	**2.55**	2.32

loadings for the three factors. Only items with loadings greater than 0.5 are shown. There were three orthogonal (i.e., non-correlated) factors with eigenvalues greater than one. They can be regarded descriptively as technology savvy, smart, and cautious.

We then analyzed the group differences in factor scores. Table 6 summarizes the factor scores for the four groups. The SBNR group have the highest mean scores for factor 1 and factor 2. Interestingly, post-hoc tests for factor 1 scores revealed that SBNR differed from RBNS group so much so that the mean scores of these two groups appear as ends of a bipolar continuum. On the other hand, for factor 2, the SBNR group was found to be different from RBNS and NSR groups. Overall, the spiritual-only group considers technology more important to life, seeks better deals, and is less inclined to need the security or warranties and brand names.

Table 5. Factor Scores for technology items

Items[a]	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	0.77		
Item 2	-0.78		
Item 3	0.63		
Item 5		0.68	
Item 6		0.77	
Item 4			0.75
Item 8			0.76
Variance explained (%)	22.5	18.1	16.2

[a]The item numbers correspond to the statement numbers in Table 4.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We only investigated a few aspects of consumer behavior. The interpretation of these results, is, of course, limited by the fact that they are derived from cross-sectional panel data, and that there may be interesting dependent variables that we did not measure. However, within these limitations, an expected pattern nonetheless appears.

Table 6. Standardized Factor Scores for Spiritual and Religious groups

Factor	SANDR		SBNR		RBNS		NSR		Analysis	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	p
Factor 1(Tech Savvy)[a]	-0.004	0.96	0.20	0.96	-0.21	0.99	-0.06	1.09	5.81	$< .05$
Factor 2(Tech Smart)[b]	0.026	0.99	0.17	1.05	-0.23	0.86	-0.09	1.07	5.96	$< .001$
Factor 3(Tech Cautious)	0.07	0.99	-0.13	1.06	0.059	0.94	-0.12	0.96	3.54	$< .05$

[a]Each group differed from the other three groups(post hoc Scheffe test, $p < .05$). The SBNR and RBNS groups were found to be different from each other.

[b]Each group differed from the other three groups(post hoc Scheffe test, $p < .05$). The SBNR group was different from RBNS and NSR groups.

First of all, consistent with the notion that spirituality implies the striving for a connectedness with the spiritual essence of God, other people, or all of life, we find that those persons who are spiritual are more likely to claim environmentalism as a motivator and to claim to act upon that motivation, by three separate measures. Further, those who claim to be spiritual but not religious seem to be slightly more environmentalist than those who are spiritual and religious. We speculate that in making purchase and consumption decisions, people who believe or feel themselves to be connected spiritually to others will be more likely to consider the effects of their actions on others, and behave so as to cause less harm. Those who are guided to their spirituality by religion (spiritual and religious) may be a bit less environmentally conscious than the non-doctrinal spiritual consumers, because major Western religions do not emphasize environmentalism per se, although it can be inferred from spiritual feelings. Spiritual but not religious consumers may be more concerned with their relationship with all of life and less concerned with their relationship with a deity, and thus more prone to environmentalism. Those who are religious but not spiritual may be following doctrine more closely, without the spiritual sense of connectedness to others, and therefore are perhaps much less prone to environmentalism.

In terms of non-environmental attitudes and behaviors, the spiritual but not religious consumers are much more tech savvy and tech smart, and less concerned with warranties and brand names than the other groups. We would expect the spiritual but not religious folks, who are more willing to eschew doctrine, and assemble a personal spiritual philosophy from what they can find, to be more adventurous and less traditional in their attitudes toward technology, which is consistent with independent thinking and a drive to assemble one's life on one's own. The spiritual quest would hardly seem to be of a piece with the quest for good technology; yet there seem to be some empirical relationships.

The effect sizes here are not huge, but the consistency of the effects across the four groups is suggestive. Spirituality and religion do seem to play a role in otherwise mundane consumer behaviors. People who are spiritual have, by definition, a theme in their lives of spiritual connectedness to others which seems to play out in some of their consumption decisions. In addition, those who are not religious seem to have more of a theme of assembling their own lives from scratch, so to speak - a kind of "bricolage" - than those who are religious, and this seems to extend into the consumer sphere. We would suggest that these themes: more connectedness among the spiritual, and more life-assembly amongst the non-religious, may be played out in many more areas of consumer behavior, and that future research along these lines would be interesting and useful.

6. NOTES

6.1 Dependent Measures

The following are the profile data based dependent measures' actual survey questions and their response options.

PURREPRO:

Many people also work to improve the environment. In the past 12 months, have you purchased a product specifically because it was made from recycled materials?

- Yes
- No

ENVISELF:

Would you describe yourself as an environmentalist?

- Yes
- No

Attitudes about Technology:

We'd like to learn about your attitudes about technology. Different people have different beliefs about the importance of technology and the necessity of different devices. There are no right or wrong answers. We'd simply like to know your opinions on technology.

Please rate each statement according to how much you agree or disagree with it. 1 = "Strongly Disagree"; 5 = "Strongly Agree"

- Technology is a necessity.
- I don't see the benefits of technology.
- I am interested in learning about new technology.
- I typically purchase a high-tech device with an extended warranty.
- I search online auctions for better deals on high-tech devices.
- I will refrain from buying new high-tech devices until I conduct enough research that I am comfortable with my decision.
- I purchase a high-tech device mostly for increased efficiency.
- Brand name is most important to me, regardless of the price.

6.2 Overview of Profile Surveys:

In addition to collecting information directly for its customers, Knowledge Networks (KN) gathers a wide array of information through profile surveys about its Panel Members on an on-going basis. Profile surveys gather extensive amount of data about the personal and household characteristics, activities, purchase, and consumption habits of KN's Panel Members. This information is organized into a comprehensive Panel Member profile. The most important benefit of profile information for KN's customers is that it allows for direct targeting of both small and large populations of interest. Examples of targeted survey sampling are numerous: pet owners with income over $75,000; computer owners with a high-speed Internet connection in the home; people who intend to purchase a mobile telephone in the next three months; those who voted in the last general election; teenagers who use MP3 players to listen to digitized music. By creatively combining profile variables, thousands of rare groups can be surveyed without incurring the high cost of screening the general population.

REFERENCES

Bailey, J. M. and J. Sood (1993). The effects of religious affiliation on consumer behavior: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Managerial Issues*.

Ball, D. and R Hampton (2006). Spiritual quest and its effects on american consumer behavior. *Unpublished manuscript*.

Ball, D., R. Hampton, A. Chronis and M. Bunker (2002). Evidence for the effect of spiritual development on consumer behavior. Summer AMA Educator's Conference.

Emmons, R.A. (1999). *The Psychology of Ultimate Concern*. Guilford Press.

Fuller, R. C. (2001). *Spiritual but not Religious*. Oxford University Press. Newy York.

Hirschman, E. (1990). Point of view: Sacred, secular, and mediating consumption imagery in television commercials. *Journal of Advertising Research*.

Idler, E.L. (1987). Religious involvement and the health of the elderly: Some hypotheses and an initial test. *Social Forces* **66**, 226–238.

MacCannnell, D. (2002). The ego factor in tourism. *Journal of Consumer Research* **29**(1), 146–151.

Marcoen, A. (1994). Spirituality and personal well-being in old age. *Aging and Society* **14**(Part 4), 521–536.

Marler, P.L. and C.K. Hadaway (2002). "being religious" or "being spiritual" in america: A zero-sum proposition?. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* **41**(2), 289–300.

Paloutzian, R.F. and C.W. Ellison (1982). *Loneliness, spiritual well-being, and the quality of life*. in l. peplau and d. perlman ed.. Wiley. New York.

Pargament, K.I. (1999). The psychology of religion and spirituality? yes and no. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* **9**, 3–16.

Rao, K., D. Ball and R. Hampton (2006). Modes of religious and spiritual orientation and their relationships to consumer behavior. American Association of Public Opinion Research. Montreal, Canada.

Regnerus, M.D., C. Smith and D. Sikkink (1998). Who gives to the poor? the influence of religious tradition and political location on the personal generosity of americans toward to poor. *Journal for the Scientific Studyof Religion* **37**, 481–494.

Roof, W.C. (1993). *A Generation of Seekers: The Spiritual Journeys of the Baby Boom Generation*. HarperSanfrancisco.

Roof, W.C. (2000). *Spiritual Marketplace: Baby boomers and the remaking of American religion*. Princeton University Press.

Scott, R.O. (2001). Are you religious or are you spiritual: A look in the mirror. *Spirituality and Health Spring* pp. 26–28.

Wuthnow, R. (1998). *After Heaven: Spirituality in America since the 1950s*. University of California Press. Berkely,CA.

Zinnbauer, B.K., K. Pargament, B. Cole, M. Rye, E. Butter, T. Belavich, K. Hipp, A. Scott and J. Kadar (1997). Religion and spirituality: Unfuzzying the fuzzy. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* **36**, 549–564.

		KN Sample (N=1,342)	Adult U.S. Population (June 2005 CPS data)
Gender	Male	48.2%	48.20%
	Female	51.8%	51.80%
Age	18-24	8.10%	13.00%
	25-34	16.40%	18.00%
	35-44	19.20%	19.80%
	45-54	18.70%	19.40%
	55-64	18.30%	13.80%
	65 or over	19.30%	16.10%
Race	White Only	82.90%	81.80%
	Black Only	9.90%	11.60%
	American Indian, Alaskan Native Only	1.0%	0.80%
	Asian Only	3.0%	4.40%
	Hawaiian or Pacific Islander Only	0.20%	0.20%
	2+ Races	3.0%	1.30%
Hispanic Ethnicity	Hispanic	10.50%	12.70%
	Non-Hispanic	89.50%	87.30%
Employment Status	In the Labor Force	58.70%	67.90%
	Working full-time	*44.20%*	*57.40%*
	Working part-time	*14.50%*	*10.50%*
	Not in the Labor Force	41.30%	32.10%
Marital Status	Married	59.90%	58.60%
	Not married	40.10%	41.40%
Level of Education	Less than High School Diploma	8.80%	15.80%
	High School Diploma or Equivalent	35.70%	31.80%
	Some College	23.40%	18.90%
	Associate Degree	8.20%	8.10%
	Bachelor's Degree or Beyond	23.90%	25.40%
Household Income	Under $10,000	8.0%	7.00%
	$10,000-$24,999	18.50%	17.10%
	$25,000-$49,999	32.40%	27.80%
	$50,000-$74,999	21.60%	20.20%
	$75,000 or more	19.60%	27.90%
Census Region	Northeast	17.30%	18.90%
	Midwest	22.4%	22.40%
	South	37.7%	36.00%
	West	22.6%	22.70%

Table 7. Demographic Comparison of KN sample estimates against CPS

		SANDR (n=678)	SBNR (n=258)	RBNS (n=169)	NSR (n=236)
Gender	Male	46%	44.60%	50.9%	56.4%
	Female	54%	55.4%	49.1%	43.6%
Age	18-24	6.5%	9.3%	8.9%	10.6%
	25-34	16.8%	15.9%	10.7%	19.9%
	35-44	17.7%	22.9%	21.3%	18.2%
	45-54	18.9%	19.0%	17.2%	19.1%
	55-64	19.6%	19.0%	13.0%	17.4%
	65 or over	20.5%	14.0%	29.0%	14.8%
Race	White Only	81.8%	81.7%	83.5%	86.5%
	Black Only	12.5%	8.7%	7.0%	5.7%
	American Indian, Alaskan Native Only	0.9%	0.4%	2.5%	0.9%
	Asian Only	1.1%	4.6%	5.7%	4.8%
	Hawaiian or Pacific Islander Only	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
	2+ Races	3.4%	4.6%	1.3%	1.7%
Hispanic Ethnicity	Non-Hispanic	91.6%	88.0%	87.0%	87.7%
	Hispanic	8.4%	12.0%	13.0%	12.3%
Employment Status	In the Labor Force	57.5%	61.6%	52.7%	63.1%
	Working full-time	*42.3%*	*45.7%*	*42.0%*	*49.6%*
	Working part-time	*15.2%*	*15.9%*	*10.7%*	*13.5%*
	Not in the Labor Force	42.5%	38.4%	47.3%	36.9%
Marital Status	Married	62.7%	52.3%	66.3%	55.5%
	Not married	37.3%	47.7%	33.7%	44.5%
Level of Education	Less than High School Diploma	8.3%	8.9%	11.8%	8.1%
	High School Diploma or Equivalent	34.8%	27.1%	44.4%	41.5%
	Some College, no degree	24.2%	23.6%	19.5%	23.7%
	Associate Degree	8.3%	9.7%	8.9%	5.9%
	Bachelor's Degree or Beyond	24.5%	30.6%	15.4%	20.8%
Household Income	Under $10,000	7.2%	10.9%	6.5%	8.1%
	$10,000-$24,999	21.2%	17.1%	14.2%	15.3%
	$25,000-$49,999	33.5%	27.1%	35.5%	32.6%
	$50,000-$74,999	19.2%	22.9%	27.2%	22.9%
	$75,000 or more	18.9%	22.1%	16.6%	21.2%
Census Region	Northeast	14.2%	16.3%	19.5	25.8%
	Midwest	24.5%	17.1%	25.4%	20.3%
	South	42.3%	37.2%	32.0%	28.8%
	West	19.0%	29.5%	23.1%	25.0%

Table 8. Demographic Comparison of all Spiritual and Religious Groups