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Despite the marked decline in membership for most Protestant denominations in the United States, the Seventh-day Adventist Church continues to report growth at rates higher than its peers. Previous case studies and surveys have found that immigrants make up an increasing percentage of the American Adventist churches’ membership. However, no extensive statistical analysis has been conducted to investigate how changing patterns of immigration into the United States have influenced the Church’s growth or how the Adventist Church’s extensive international activity may be affecting its growth in the U.S. over a long stretch of time. For my research, I used linear fixed effects regression on an integrated data set of census immigration statistics and Adventist membership statistics between the years of 1900 and 2010. The number of Adventist members, churches, schools, and hospitals, served as the indicators for a strong or weak Adventist presence. The results suggest that the Adventist Church has a higher membership growth rate in areas of the U.S. that receive more immigrants from countries with a strong Adventist presence. As Protestant denominations face decline, they may benefit from a strong international presence to stabilize their growth through immigration, rather than relying solely on domestic evangelism.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In 2011, The National Council of Churches published its yearbook that presents the membership numbers for Christian churches in the United States and Canada. Of the top 25 largest Christian churches listed, nine of the ‘mainline’ denominations, such as the Presbyterians and Methodists, reported membership losses. The yearbook reported only six groups that were growing: the Assemblies of God, Church of God, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Seventh-day Adventists, Mormons, and Catholics (see Figure 1 for examples). Why are some of these Christian groups declining while others are growing? The gradual decline of the mainline denominations, those that have their roots in the colonial period and historically have influenced a large portion of American life, has received a great deal of scholarly attention and many church leaders are becoming increasingly concerned about the shrinking of their congregations (Finke and Stark 2005; Hadaway and Marler 2006).
Figure 1  Growth of selected church bodies, data extracted from the National Council of Churches (2011)

Scholars have accounted for a broad number of factors that may be responsible for church growth and decline including differences in birth rates, evangelism techniques, the attractiveness of various ideologies, charismatic leadership, as well as the society and culture of the time period. Another factor that is often discussed is the contribution of immigration to church growth and religious diversity. It is common knowledge that the worldwide presence of Roman Catholicism is responsible for the increasing number of Catholic immigrants to the United States, most recently with those coming from Latin America. Because of this influx, American Catholicism maintains a steady increase despite mounting evidence that many of its members are converting to Protestant denominations or becoming non-affiliated (Stoll 1990; Sullivan 2000a, 2000b; Sherkat 2001; Balmer 2003, Espinosa 2007; McAlister and Richman 2009; Skirbekk, Kaufmann and Goujon 2010; Lippy and Tranby 2013). This
thesis will not be focusing on Catholicism, however. Instead, I am interested in the role that immigration plays in the growth of Seventh-day Adventism in the United States.

The most distinctive characteristics of the Seventh-day Adventist Church (hereafter referred to as SDA or Adventist) is its strong emphasis on keeping the seventh-day Sabbath, following dietary restrictions such as vegetarianism, promoting Adventist-owned educational institution attendance, and its dedication to evangelizing in preparation for the soon second coming of Christ. The Church has a wide geographic distribution of members and institutions and has seen a great deal of success in the developing world. As of June, 2011 there were over 17.2 million Seventh-day Adventist members represented in 209 different countries. In 2010, it owned and operated 7,806 educational institutions with over 1.5 million enrolled students, as well as hundreds of health facilities that served over 15 million patients; its 63 publishing houses produced literature in 377 different languages and dialects. The Adventist Development and Relief Agency, or ADRA, also utilized $280 million to fund disaster aid and development projects in 131 countries (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists 2011, 2013a). As depicted in Figures 2, 3, and 4, the Adventist Church’s membership and institutions stretch across the globe, but it is particularly strong in developing areas such as Africa, Latin America, and Asia.
Figure 2  The distribution of Adventist membership in 2010. Total membership was approximately 16.9 million. Data extracted from Adventist Statistics Website (General Conference 2013b).
Figure 3  The number of Adventist medical institutions in 2010 by country. These include hospitals, sanitariums, clinics, and dispensaries. Map made by author, data extracted from Adventist yearbooks (General Conference 2013c)

Figure 4  The number of Adventist educational institutions in 2010 by country. These include secondary, tertiary, seminary, and training schools. Map made by author, data extracted from Adventist yearbooks (General Conference 2013c)
In 1965, the Hart-Cellar Act eliminated immigration restrictions for the number of immigrants from regions like Latin America, Africa and Asia, and since then the number of immigrants coming to the U.S. from developing countries has far outnumbered those from Europe or other developed nations. As the number and proportion of immigrants from those groups grew, “It was inevitable that Adventists were among them, for Adventists were well represented among the population of many of the countries from which they were drawn” (Lawson 1998b). Part of this thesis will be investigating how the wide membership distribution and establishment of Adventist institutions abroad may be influencing the growth of the American Adventist churches through the immigration of its foreign members during different time periods. I will also explore how general trends in immigration to the United States may influence American Adventist growth because of the potential conversion of non-Adventist immigrants after they arrive.

Past research has already suggested that the American Adventist church is becoming increasingly dominated by immigrant groups, particularly those from developing nations. Lawson (1998b) conducted a case study in New York City where he compared the ethnic composition of the Adventist churches in 1945 and 1996. He found that in 1945 the membership was split between 40% African Americans and 60% whites, but by 1996 those same two groups accounted for less than 15% of the membership while Caribbean members accounted for well over 50% (see Figure 5). While we expect that New York City would have a higher immigrant population than average, only 23.1% of the 1990 NYC metropolitan population was foreign-born compared to over 85% of the Adventist membership who identified as immigrants. A more recent telephone survey (Sahlin and Richardson 2008) found that 31% of
Adventist members living in the United States and Canada claimed to be immigrant; comparatively, the percent of the foreign-born population in the US and Canada at the time were 12% and 18% respectively. According to these studies, Adventism in North America is disproportionately immigrant in its composition, and “The greatest growth appears to be among immigrant communities from nations where the percentage of Adventists in the general population is greater than the percentage in the U.S. and Canada” (Sahlin and Richardson 2008:10).

Figure 5  Percent of the total 1996 New York City Adventist membership according to claimed ethnicity or place of origin (numbers extracted from Lawson 1998b).
My research question is related to the conclusions made in the previous Adventist studies: how might the presence and strength of the Adventist Church overseas be linked to its growth in the United States? Much of the present literature that investigates the relationship between immigration and the American Adventist Church captures only moments in time or for a specific place, via surveys or case studies. I am interested in seeing how the trajectory of Adventism’s American growth is related to its international activities for over a century of time, and during what time periods the Church has experienced the most growth due to immigration from developed or developing countries. The establishment of so many schools and hospitals in the developing world is actually a profit-draining practice for the American church members; the general public, children, and converts are the primary beneficiaries (Bull 1992). An important question for the Church is this: does a style of long-term international membership investment ever return to the United States?

To investigate this question, I have collected data from official church statistics on U.S. and foreign membership as well as the number of educational and health institutions present in international regions from 1900 to 2010 and reorganized the international data into ‘Developed’ or ‘Developing’ categories. I integrated those data with the United State’s Census Bureau’s immigration statistics for each state over the same time period. The results of my fixed effects regressions provide a broader sense of whether U.S. regions that are experiencing Adventist growth are also receiving high levels of immigrants from countries where there is a strong Adventist presence. I found that Adventist growth in the United States overall is related to a general increase in immigrants between 1900 and 2010. Growth is also associated with an increase in immigrants from developed countries before 1965, but it is even more so related to an
increase in immigrants from developing countries after 1965. While trends in the number of international churches and members also seem to relate to growth in the American Adventist Church, the contribution of the Church’s international institutions is mixed and unclear.
Chapter 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

In the following chapter, I will cover in greater detail the scholarly literature that tries to give explanations for trends in Christianity’s growth and decline in the United States. I will also outline the history, development, and growth of the Adventist church both domestically and internationally, and apply theoretical ideas to understand what contextual and institutional factors have made it attractive to such a wide geographic setting and the immigrants who live in the United States. The relationship between immigration and American Christianity, both in terms of the functions that religion serves immigrants and how immigrants are changing the composition and nature of American Christianity, will be the focus of the third section. Based on what I present here, I will close this chapter with predictions for what we may expect from my analyses.

History and Growth of Seventh-day Adventism

Domestic Growth

Seventh-day Adventism was born out of the Millenarian movement of the 1800s, which began when William Miller interpreted a Biblical passage to make multiple predictions concerning the second coming of Christ. He and his followers spread the message about the soon second coming to the people of New England, and thousands gave up their belongings and broke social ties in order to prepare for the end of the world. His last prediction, set for October 22, 1844 passed with no divine
appearance, and is now referred to as the Great Disappointment. Most of Miller’s followers either formed new groups with different interpretations of the prophecy or joined other Protestant denominations. Several of the groups that continued to believe in Christ’s soon return referred to themselves as ‘Adventists’, and in 1845 three of the more moderate ‘Adventist’ groups gathered at a conference. The now SDA church was actually excluded from the conference on the grounds that it was too extremist. The early SDAs set themselves apart by standing by the belief that 1844 marked the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, that the seventh-day Sabbath should be strictly observed, and also that a certain woman named Ellen White was a prophet inspired by God (Theobald 1985; Anderson 1986; Dick 1986).

Ellen White claimed to have received several visions from God starting in 1844, in which she was directed on matters ranging from the role of the Sabbath in end-time events to the dangers of tobacco. Throughout the 1850s, she and her husband, James White, became leaders among Sabbath-keeping Adventists and urged them to move towards formal organization. During that time period, the group’s doctrines began to take form and the unpopular ‘shut-door’ belief was dropped. The ‘shut-door’ belief claimed that the probation period for sinners to repent had closed in 1844 and that no new believers would be saved. The abandonment of this belief, in combination with the start of evangelistic tent meetings in 1854, helped to attract new members. In 1863, the Sabbath-keeping Adventists held their first general conference in Battle Creek, Michigan, and formally named themselves the Seventh-day Adventists (Theobald 1985; Anderson 1986; Dick 1986).

1863 was also the year in which Ellen White received the ‘health message’ vision and began to publish papers advocating for a simple vegetarian diet and the use
of hydrotherapy and natural remedies. The 1800s was a time of general health reform in the United States, and as fads came and went, SDA leaders needed professionals to legitimize their message. The Whites decided to finance the medical education of John H Kellogg, now known as the co-inventor of Corn Flakes, who had lived with and worked for the Whites when he was young. Kellogg returned from his education in 1878 and took charge of the Church’s first sanitarium, which was built in Battle Creek, Michigan (Theobald 1985; Vandevere 1986). The health orientation of the Church was successful and the 1900s saw the beginning of the use of cooking schools, vegetarian restaurants, and sanitariums to attract new believers; the Battle Creek sanitarium served to expose thousands of visitors to Adventist teachings. Kellogg also worked to provide welfare and medical services to Chicago citizens throughout the 1890s, and he established the Medical Missionary and Benevolent Association in 1893 (Schwarz 1986).

During the 1870s, Ellen White also began stressing the importance of a holistic Christian education in a rural setting, where children could be taught practical trades like agriculture and be closer to God by living in nature (Theobald 1985). The first higher education institutions established by the church were Battle Creek College in Michigan in 1874, Headsburg College in Virginia and South Lancaster Academy in Massachusetts in 1882 (Vandevere 1986). According to Bull and Lockart (1989), church schools helped to solidify the certainty of children’s baptismal rates, and those who attend one are more likely to stay in the church when they are older. Bull (1992) notes that it is interesting to see how a religious group that believes in the soon coming of Christ and subsequent destruction of all institutions would be willing to put so much effort into building a great number of hospitals and schools. Bull says that the
establishment of separate schools and hospitals that promoted their own ideologies were a part of the concern felt by Adventists towards “the gradual perfection of a Sabbath-keeping remnant who at the Second Advent will move from earth to heaven for the duration of the millennium” (1992:106).

From its origins in the New England Millenarian movement to the establishment of its base institutions in Battle Creek, Michigan, the SDA Church began making significant moves to expand into other parts of the country. “Following largely the patterns of western settlement into the great Plains, California, and the Northwest, Seventh-day Adventism expanded geographically by appealing to people uprooted from home, family, and church” (Vandevere 1986:66). James White urged believers to focus on the West as opposed to the East, and he expected frontiersmen to be more receptive to their ministries (Anderson 1986). Many of the early Adventist evangelists not only worked in charity but also helped in farm work; such a “rural focus seemed to yield satisfactory returns in the form of a rapidly increasing membership well into the second half of the 19th century” (Theobald 1985:120). By the late 1870s, there was a new Adventist publishing house and rural health center based in California (Vandevere 1986).

The benefits of this western and rural orientation were particularly evident in the Church’s success with immigrant groups who were settling in the Midwest and starting their own farms. First to convert were the Dutch, who worked within their own immigrant networks to begin translating publications for other immigrants. The first Danish SDA church was established in 1868 in Minnesota, followed by a Norwegian church in 1871 in Chicago. A German immigrant, who lived in Iowa and converted in 1878, also began giving a German lecture series to German-Russian
Mennonite immigrants in South Dakota. Many of the Church’s conferences responded to these early successes by training foreign-language ministers. By the 1870s, Adventist periodicals were published in Dutch, Swedish, French, and German (Vandevere 1986). In 1905, The North American Foreign Department was developed for the specific purpose of working with immigrants in the United States. The establishment of a Scandinavian seminary in Minnesota, German seminary in Missouri, and Swedish seminary in Illinois served as the first hubs for these efforts (Land 1986).

While SDAs made good progress in rural areas and among immigrants in the West, after the turn of the century Ellen White began calling for increased attention to evangelizing urban centers and the southern United States, which required changes in evangelistic tactics (Schwarz 1986; Theobald 1985). In Chicago, where Kellogg was involved in providing social services to the poorer urban populations, a mission training school was established in 1884 to prepare missionaries for door-to-door canvassing (Schwarz 1986). Theological motives for mission work had shifted from a primary focus on apocalyptic warnings to a selfless work towards the salvation of others (Vandevere 1986). Instead of relying solely on Biblical literature to introduce Adventist teachings, evangelists would provide a lecture styled program that focused on secular issues, such as healthful cooking or stop-smoking classes, before introducing attendees to Biblical teachings (Theobald 1985; Schwarz 1986).

Adventists made slow progress in the southern states, however, partly because they were viewed as abolitionist carpet baggers (Vandevere 1986). Due to these tensions, Ellen White advised the temporary racial segregation of Adventism in the south and in 1944 the African American ‘regional conferences’ were created (Lawson 1998b).
These regional conferences allowed black members to hold positions of authority within the church and are largely comprised of African American members; they continue to exist to this day (Reynolds 1984; Greene 2009).

Between the years of 1890 and 2010, Adventism in the United States has seen very steady growth from 25,000 to just over 1 million members (see Figure 6). The success of the Church in rural and western communities worked in tandem with its urban health services and dynamic evangelistic efforts to appeal to a broad range of ethnicities in different geographic settings. For map illustrations of the distribution of Adventism in the United States please refer to Appendix A.

**Figure 6**  Membership growth of Adventism in the United States from 1890-2010. Data extracted from Adventist statistics website (General Conference 2013b).
International Growth

After the Great Disappointment, the early Adventists continued to believe that Christ could return at any moment. For a while, that ever-present apocalyptic preoccupation prevented them from being interested in international mission work (Lawson and Cragun 2012). While they were certainly concerned with spreading their message to as many people as quickly as possible, they were content with the idea that they could minister to ‘all nations’ by appealing to the great number of immigrant groups that resided in the United States (Vandevere 1986; Bull and Lockhart 1989). It wasn’t until the 1870s that the Adventist message matured to the point that it would consider international outreach. Interestingly, immigrant converts ended up being the ones who were responsible for the first international evangelism efforts, making them highly valuable for overseas Church growth even at such an early stage (Vandevere 1986).

The first outside continent to be touched by Adventism was Europe. “European immigrants who had learned Adventism in America took the message back to the old country and soon pulled the denomination into overseas mission activity” (Vandevere 1986:68). A Polish Catholic priest named Michael B Czechowski had converted to Adventism in 1857 and later decided to travel to Switzerland, without any Church authority guiding his mission. He came in contact with Anabaptist Europeans who were receptive to Adventist teachings, and he established a print shop in Basel and even began preaching in Rumania. The first official mission worker was sent out in 1874, again to Switzerland, and in 1877 one of the early Dutch immigrant converts was also sent to Denmark and later to other parts of Scandinavia. Companies and churches continued to be set up in Germany, France, and Italy soon after. (Vandevere 1986; Lawson and Cragun 2012).
While the majority of immigrant converts in the U.S. at the time had been from Europe, the Church began to set its sights on areas that might be even more receptive to its message. “Language schools were opened to attract Chinese and Japanese youth in particular. Adventists were eager to convert people of these nationalities so that they might be sent to initiate work in their own homelands” (Schwarz 1986:110). One Japanese immigrant convert helped a former Headsburg College president establish an English school in Tokyo, where they happened to convert a Korean who started a group of SDAs in his homeland even before official missionaries were sent to Korea in 1904. This trend continued, and a Greek immigrant convert also returned to his home in Constantinople in 1889 and began holding SDA services (Schwarz 1986). Non-immigrant missionaries were also sent out, first to Australia in 1884 and then to Hong Kong in 1888 (Vandervere 1986). The Church even built a ship to send to the Pacific Islands, where Pitcairn Island converted in 1886 and remains the only place with a 100% Adventist population (Schwarz 1986). As far as American mission outreach trends were concerned, the 1890s were the peak for many proselytizing groups (Bull and Lockhart 1989). Argentina, Jamaica, Finland, India, Japan, Iceland, Egypt, and South Africa were all entered by Adventist missionaries in the 1890s (Vanderveere 1986). By 1900, the Adventist Church had members on every continent except Antarctica, with 20% of its membership outside of the United States (Lawson and Cragun 2012).

The beginning of the 20th century was met with some changes in the administrative structure of the Church, which helped to reorganize and take international mission work to the next level. In 1901 the General Conference, the top governing body of the Church, was reorganized so that its leadership was placed “not
in the hands of a single president but in an enlarged General Conference executive committee of twenty-five members” (Schwarz 1986:129). By breaking up responsibilities within the Church, missions could become more efficient and resources were streamlined. The conference president at the time, Arthur Daniells, had already dedicated a large portion of his life to working for the Church in Australia and New Zealand. “Under Daniells the church shifted from its nineteenth-century emphasis on North America to its twentieth-century worldwide emphasis on the basis of Christ’s gospel commission to go into all the world” (Land 1986:140). The year after Daniell’s election, the Church sent out 60 missionaries as opposed to the 1-2 a year it was accustomed to beforehand (Bull and Lockhart 1989). Another change which affected international growth occurred nearly 80 years later when President Neal Wilson began a decade long membership drive starting in 1979 called the “1000 days of reaping”. In it, he emphasized numerical growth over the socialization of new members and the typical Adventist baptismal process, which had previously been 2 years, was shortened to only 3 weeks (Bull and Lockhart 1989; Lawson 1995). This change led to an increase in converts, but may also have lowered retention rates.

As they continued to conduct more and more missions in different regions, “Adventists soon discovered that methods used to build up the church must necessarily vary so as to be intimately connected with the culture and progress level of the people” (Schwarz 1986:118). While literate nations could respond to publications immediately, illiterate ones needed to have schools established so that they could learn to read religious literature. Church missionaries found that an emphasis on establishing educational institutions was welcomed in colonial governments (Lawson and Cragun 2012). In fact, the SDA Church was able to establish many positive
relationships with a long list of foreign governments, enabling it to expand with approval of the state. In 1894, the South African government even gave the SDA church 12,000 acres in Matabeleland (Schwarz 1989). The founding of its development and relief agency, ADRA, in 1956 also doubled as an “arm of American Foreign Policy” (Lawson 1995:360).

An important facet to uninterrupted international growth was how Church leaders were able to build relationships with the authoritarian governments of Eastern Europe and the Developing World. Adventists there sought liberties such as the freedom to observe the Sabbath, and favors such as the accreditation of schools, which in turn gave legitimacy to the regimes. In Eastern Europe, “although their membership stood at only 4,700 members in a total population of 38 million, they were allowed to publish so freely that during the last seven years of the Communist regime the amount of Ellen White’s material published was exceeded only by the Bible and the works of Lenin” (Lawson 1995:361). SDAs were also willing to make compromises in Sabbath keeping and non-combatant stances during war times in Germany and the USSR and were able to keep their institutions open (Lawson and Cragun 2012).

While the establishment of schools in the United States became a good way to keep youth in the Church, it served a different purpose in the developing world “where the Adventist mission school may provide the best, and perhaps the only, available form of education and thus act as an introduction to the church itself” (Bull and Lockhart 1989:126). The initial introduction of schools and hospitals gave Adventism a strong foothold in undeveloped countries that had not yet begun an economic transition (Lawson and Cragun 2012). In Africa, “The colonial mission church served as one of the avenues through which colonized Africans achieved social status and as
a key route by which they could gain respectability by graduating from mission
schools and/or becoming a church member” (Daniels 2007:52). For some regions, the
adoption of the Adventist message was directly linked to economic success. In Papua
New Guinea, Adventists were seen as wealthy and by converting, citizens could make
the transition from pig farming to capitalist business. Most Adventist converts there
switched from Catholicism, and those who remained Catholic made efforts to adopt
Adventist practices such as avoiding pork and alcohol (Lawson 1998a; Jebens 2011).
When a shift from a primarily subsistence agricultural economy to money economy
was precipitated by population growth in Peru, Adventist citizens were better educated
and able to find better jobs on the coast when compared to their non-Adventist peers
(Lawson 1998a). As countries began to develop, Adventist schools also provided
citizens the possibility for upward mobility that prepared them for migration to the
United States, particularly for those who sought employment within the Church. “In
India, where university graduates often find it impossible to secure positions which
utilize their qualifications, members who enroll in the Adventists’ Spicer College
accrue special advantages, for all graduates from there are offered church
employment... many of them use their qualifications and church contacts as a means of
securing entry to the US: more than half of the college’s graduates in recent years have
migrated” (Lawson 1998a:660).

While initially the Adventist Church was slow to enter the international
evangelism scene, they made steady progress first in countries where immigrant
converts had their homelands, and later by deliberate expansion using evangelistic
tactics unique to the target region (see Figure 7). The conscious establishment of
educational institutions and positive government relationships aided in giving them a
wide audience, but they especially appealed to low-income and developing nations; by 1983, “half the world membership lived in Africa or Latin America” (Bull and Lockhart 1989:119). The importance of these institutions in spring boarding the upward mobility and familiarizing citizens of developing nations with Adventism cannot be overstated, and I will expand on this point in the rest of the chapter. For map illustrations of international growth of the Adventist Church, please see Appendix B.

![Membership growth of Adventism outside of the United States from 1900-2010. Data extracted from Adventist statistics website (General Conference 2013b).](image)

**Figure 7** Membership growth of Adventism outside of the United States from 1900-2010. Data extracted from Adventist statistics website (General Conference 2013b).

**Theories on Church Growth in the United States**

There is often an understandable confusion among the general public in distinguishing Seventh-day Adventists from other groups like the Jehovah’s Witnesses and Mormons. Many scholars study those three together because they are all religious groups that were born out of the American Christian tradition in the 19th century, have
very unique beliefs and strict practices that distinguish them from other Christian groups, and aggressively conduct evangelistic mission work (Bull 1988; Lawson 1995). The Association of Religion Data Archives places Jehovah’s Witnesses, the Church of God, and Seventh-day Adventists under the ‘Adventist’ grouping and subsequently under the Evangelical Protestant family, which means they “emphasize a personal relationship with Christ, the inspiration of the Bible, and the importance of sharing faith” (2013). Stark and Bainbridge (1985) characterize Adventist groups as Christian sects, describing them as different enough in theology and religious practice that there is the potential for high tension between it and its parent religion. While Stark and Bainbridge (1985:133) say that “most sects do not continue to grow indefinitely”, Iannaccone (1994) identifies SDAs, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and Mormons as the three sects in the United States that have continued to grow.

Finke and Stark (2005) argue that mainline denominations have gone into decline because of how the nature of religious freedom in the U.S. allows for the easy creation of sects that can appeal to different types of people, instead of offering only a few monopolizing religions. In its political independence, the religious landscape of the United States became one similar to a free market, where new groups constantly competed with each other for adherents by appealing to various demographics and employing dynamic evangelistic tactics. According to Hadaway and Marler (2006), mainline denominations sustained themselves up until the 1960s through immigration and procreation, but their lack of zeal could not compete with the charisma of Evangelical groups. Kelley (1986) documented that the more liberal mainline denominations declined at a much faster rate than their more conservative peers. He argued that more conservative churches had higher levels of commitment among
members because they asked their members to adhere to a strict lifestyle. According to Iannaccone, stricter denominations are stronger because they reduce the free riding problem by screening out members who would lack commitment and instead “stimulates participation among those who remain” (1994:1180). The benefits of group participation and solidarity must outweigh the costs of stigma, self-sacrifice, social isolation and limited worldly pleasures in order to retain members. He argues that “the optimal amount of strictness will depend on the socioeconomic characteristics of the members” (Iannaccone 1994:1201).

Adventist theology is notably strict, and has “created separating behavioral standards such as Sabbath observance, dietary and entertainment restrictions, and heavy demands on the time of members, while its educational and medical institutions, which were founded in what were initially rural areas, drew many members to live, work, and go to school in shared isolation” (Lawson 1995:367). Cragun and Lawson (2010) found that Adventism has been the most successful in countries that are in the process of economic development, while it has had very little growth in the poorest and richest nations. The reason for this, they argued, was that the poorest countries’ citizens relied on close-knit social ties for security. Those countries that were going through economic transition, however, found security in strict religions because of the breakdown in traditional social ties, while the most developed nations had achieved more secular sources for their security and were not interested in strict religious solidarity.

Out of its 17.2 million members, only about 1 million Adventists live in the United States (General Conference 2011b). This is an interesting distribution for an American-born religious group, and it shows a greater international skew than the
Mormons and Jehovah’s Witnesses, who are also quite strict and similarly motivated by an apocalyptic urgency to spread their gospels. According to Lawson and Cragun (2012), there are only 8 countries with 200,000 or more Mormon members, 11 countries with 150,000 or more Jehovah’s Witnesses publishers, but Adventists have 29 countries with 200,000 or more members. While over 51% of Mormons and 36% of Jehovah’s Witnesses live in what are considered to be developed countries, only 9.5% of SDAs reside in developed nations. Lawson and Cragun argue that this is in part because the early establishment of health and educational institutions was welcomed in poor and developing countries. Jehovah’s Witnesses do not build such institutions and historically, Mormons have not focused on evangelizing to poorer African and Caribbean groups until recently. Interestingly, they found that the growth of all three groups in developing countries is slowing, but that the stronger SDA presence in the poorer countries has resulted in a less significant slowing of Adventist growth. They predicted that Adventists will continue to see growth in developing nations until those countries begin going through a ‘secular transition’ and prefer to use non-religious sources for security (Cragun and Lawson 2010).

The social and geographic contexts that surround the SDA Church have changed through time, and the Church has responded to those changes in order to compete for the attention of new groups of people and continue to grow. Its emphasis on a strict theology, health, and education are a few of the institutional factors that may have contributed to its growth, while the receptivity of various social groups and foreign nations to the Adventist message has framed some of the contextual factors of growth.
Immigration and Christianity in the United States

As we have seen, immigrant groups have played an important role in the growth of Adventism, first in the early success of its westward expansion in the United States and later by their willingness to return home and spread the Adventist message abroad. Within the contexts of the American religious landscape in general, immigrant populations have a profound impact on religious life in the United States. In the words of Skirbekk et al, “Immigration is the demographic engine of religious change, and tends to increase the religious diversity of a country and challenge dominant denominations” (2010:294). Religion too, serves immigrant communities by helping them make a transition into American life or better handle the migration process. In this section I will discuss the role of Christianity, with a special focus on Evangelical and alternative or conservative Christian groups in the lives of U.S. immigrants, and how their behavior and presence influences the future of the religious landscape in the United States.

Trends and Immigrant Religious Behavior

The United States has a long history of regulating the number and type of different immigrant groups. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the Immigration Act of 1924, and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, all worked to severely limit the number of immigrants from countries other than Northern or Western Europe (Smith 1995; Martin and Midgley 1999). For this thesis, I am most interested in the effects of the 1965 Hart Cellar Act, which withdrew many of the immigration quotas that restricted the number of immigrants from certain regions, resulting in a surge in immigration and marked changes in its ethnic composition. While in 1960 the clear majority of immigrants were from Europe, Latin America now makes up the majority
of immigration with a large percentage also coming from Asia (See Figures 8 and 9). Immigration from Africa is on the rise as well, with twice as many migrants in 2001 than 1989, where those who can afford to emigrate are generally wealthier, urbanites, and tend to “be better educated than American blacks” (Okome 2002:13; Olupona 2007). Within the context of Christian traditions, while “Evangelical migrations in the nineteenth century came from northern Europe, especially Scandinavia and the Netherlands”, in the late 20th century, evangelical Christians were more likely to come from Latin America, Africa, India and South East Asia (Balmer 2003:54).

Figure 8  Number of Legal Immigrants to the US: 1820-2011 (Migration Policy Institute 2012a)
Some immigrants who entered the U.S. do so already affiliated with a worldwide Christian denomination, often as a direct result of international mission work. “Western denominations with missions in Africa are also represented among immigrant churches, including the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of the Seventh-day Adventist, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, and the United Methodist Church” (Daniels 2007:49) and “the majority of the Haitian Protestant churches in New York are offshoots of congregations found in Haiti by American missions” (McAlister and Richman 2009:343). Indeed, many of the new
immigrants arrive as Christians, while others retain their own religion or are converted or start attending Christian churches only after they arrive. In particular, while only a minority of Koreans who remain in their homeland are Christian, Korean immigrants are “disproportionately well educated, urban, middle class, and Christian” (Kwon 2000:111, Jasso et al 2003). “This largely Protestant phenomenon in part reflects the growth and spread of Protestant Christianity in Korea, but it is also clear that many men and women have affiliated with churches only after their arrival in the United States” (Pierce, Spickard, and Yoo 2009:121). A similar trend was found in Australia, where a far higher proportion of Korean immigrants attended church on a weekly basis when compared to those in their homeland (Han 1994).

Changes in the religious involvement of immigrants after migration cannot be generalized based on the Korean population, however. Akresh (2011) used the 2003 New Immigrant Survey to see what effect migration had on the religious attendance of various immigrant groups. She measured the immigrants’ religious attendance before and after migration, and found that Mexico, South and Central America, and African immigrants responded with the highest levels of attendance prior to migration. While average attendance dropped across all groups following migration, “each additional year in the US increases the likelihood of attending in each frequency category by between 2 and 5 per cent” (Akresh 2011:653). Attendance after migration, therefore, seems to be lower on average when compared to the attendance in the home country, but would increase the longer that the immigrant person stayed in the U.S. Similar findings occurred with Taylor, Chatters, Mattis and Joe (2010), who used the National Survey of American Life to investigate the religious involvement of Caribbean Blacks across denominations and ethnic backgrounds. Those who immigrated “6-10 years ago
attend services more frequently than Caribbean Blacks who were born in the U.S.”,
while the more recent immigrants were less likely to be official members (134). They
also found, however, that Pentecostal and Adventist Caribbean Blacks had greater
involvement than their Baptist peers. Reasons for the delay in increased attendance
could be the time it takes to find a home church, or that new immigrants are too
focused on finding employment to prioritize church attendance.

Knowing about the involvement and composition of the membership within a
denomination is important when considering matters of representation in its governing
structure and maintaining unity within a diverse group. The Roman Catholic Church is
an easy example, where its membership has become incredibly diverse and yet only
the most recent Pope election has resulted in a non-European leader, which has led to
questions about what other sorts of precedents he will set either by changing beliefs or
practices during his time as Pope (Clarke 2013; Goodstein 2013; Halloran 2013;
Padgett 2013; Wangsness 2013). The Catholic Church is of course far older than
Seventh-day Adventism, and its seat of power is based in Vatican City as opposed to
the ethnic melting pot of the United States where the SDA Church is based. The top of
Adventist leadership, the General Conference President, has also been an office
historically held by a white male, with 14 of the 17 past presidents being American
while the other three came from Australia or Norway (General Conference of Seventh-
day Adventists 2013a). When it comes to changes in shared beliefs in Adventism,
there has been recent conflict over instituting the ordination of women (Lawson 1999).
Lawson (1998a:89) notes that “Adventism is more legalistic in the West Indies and
especially in Latin America”, where an even stricter and more traditional lifestyle is
emphasized among adherents; many of the votes against women’s ordination in the
U.S. have come from immigrant members. Lawson also contends, however, that the difference between immigrant and American groups will eventually become lessened: “the flow of immigrants has resulted in a temporary slowing of the movement from sect toward denomination at the local level where immigrants are concentrated, but that the process of immigrant assimilation ensures that the dominant trajectory will continue” (83). While the 1990 General Conference Session ended with a 3:1 voting margin against ordination of women and a 2:1 margin in 1995, 2012 has seen the breaking off of two American Union Conferences in support of women’s ordination without unified Church agreement (Banks 2012; Peabody 2012; Rowe and Peasley 2012).

**Role of Christianity in Immigrant Life**

While some immigrants may join denominational churches based on transnational ties within a specific denomination, many others are non-denominational and are created by immigrants on the foundation of a shared ethnicity. Pierce et al (2009) found that religion is very important for establishing social networks and preserving ethnicity among Korean immigrants. “In the absence of residential concentration, the church provides the major vehicle that enables Korean immigrants to maintain their ethnic identity by overcoming their isolation from one another” (Kwon 2000:116). One Houston-based Chinese Protestant church maintains a balance between Christian and Chinese identities, and by emphasizing the Christian side it “eases tensions between Chinese and American identities” (Fenggang 2000:98). However, it also operates a Chinese school with two distinct goals in mind: “Passing on Chinese language and culture, and attracting non-Christians for proselytization” (Fenggang 2000:99). These large, nondenominational ethnic churches emphasize
evangelism, particularly to immigrants from their own countries, thereby expanding upon foreign mission work by converting immigrants to Christianity within the United States as well.

Since Christianity is the dominant religion in the United States, a Christian identity can be a vehicle for Americanization or integration into Western society; items that immigrants at times may want to strive for or in other cases even want to avoid. Up until 1920, some Japanese immigrants would use their Christian identity to foster assimilation. The Immigration Act of 1924, which placed limitations on the number of Asian immigrants, enraged many Japanese Americans and as they became more upwardly mobile and secure in their middle class status, some promoted Japanese nationalism instead of an American identity (Pierce et al 2009). In China, where Christianity had historically been associated with Western Imperialism and conversion synonymous to betraying Chinese tradition, the perception of Christianity has more recently shifted in favor of conversion. Negativity surrounding the Communist regime and the attractiveness of modern Western society has resulted in an increased openness to Christianity, particularly among Chinese immigrants coming to the United States. Fenggang (1998) argues, therefore, that the most important factors for Chinese conversion are the social and cultural changes going on in China, as opposed to becoming ‘American’ or for economic prosperity.

A common theme in identifying the function of religion for immigrants is its role in providing social networks and material or spiritual support for those going through the migration process (Herberg 1950; Handlin 1951; Barton 1975; Smith 1978; Fenggang 2000; Sullivan 2000a; Okome 2002; Foner and Alba 2008; Akresh 2011). This is an especially relevant argument in the discussion on why Latin
American immigrants choose to convert to Protestantism following immigration. For Latin Americans, Roman Catholicism is associated with the old order and poverty, while Evangelicalism emphasizes egalitarianism and upward mobility in spirituality; “The attractions of Evangelicalism for Latinos and Latinas seem only to increase as they immigrate to North America” (Blamer 2003:57). Many studies have spoken to the loss of Catholic immigrant membership due to joining Protestant and Evangelical churches because they often provide better support (Balmer 2003; McAlister and Richman 2009; Skirbekk et al 2010). Sullivan (2000a, 2000b) compared a large Catholic church and a conservative Protestant church in the same California town; both churches had a high percentage of immigrant members or attendees. While the Catholic church made only minimal effort to cater to the needs of its immigrant and elderly population, the close knit Protestant church had good social networks from its denominational headquarters in Mexico and members gave informal support to immigrants. The Catholic church, however, was still able to maintain high attendance because of its willingness “to support and even house the celebration of traditional domestic religious practices” (Sullivan 2000a:140).

Drawing on church resources is also important for immigrants who are coming out of countries with high levels of instability. For Christian African immigrants, some immigrating pastors set up their own churches to service refugees or other immigrants and “with the resources of the religious communities that have adopted them, their integration into American society takes on a less traumatic character” (Okome 2002; Olupona 2007:29). And according to Taylor et al (2010), Haiti’s political upheaval makes immigrants more likely to draw on church networks for support as well. Fenggang (1998:238) says that for non-Christians, “The conversion experiences of
people from third world countries in political and social turmoil differ from those described in the existing literature”. Again, he argues that Chinese immigrants do not use the church to fulfill their material or cultural needs, but rather for the psychological and spiritual support that other community groups cannot satisfy. Their deep sense of homelessness following their migration inspires them to seek permanence in the promise of Christian eternity. Stricter Christian groups are particularly attractive because the inerrancy of the Bible provides certainty for Chinese immigrants who have left a tumultuous world and must adjust to life in the U.S. (Fenggang 1998).

Churches provide material, ethnic, psychological and social network support for immigrants who are facing challenges in their migration process. In Lawson’s New York City case study, he related the high proportion of immigrant Adventist members to “The extent to which the Adventist Church in New York, and especially the members of each ethnic group, expend effort to contact, welcome, and help fellow members arriving as immigrants” (Lawson 1998b:346). Depending on what contextual factors are most important for each group of immigrants, they may become likely to convert to Protestant or Evangelical groups. While Chinese immigrants have recently become open to Christianity, particularly attracted to conservative ideologies, African immigrants or those from war-torn nations look to familiar institutions to make a smooth transition into stable society. Also related to the growth of the New York churches was “The extent to which Adventism is a presence in these countries – its size and public image there; that is, the degree to which the immigrants identify with Adventism or know about it” (Lawson 1998b:346). Providing services to migrant
populations, both in the United States and abroad, appears to have a positive effect on the growth of American Protestant groups.

**Empirical Expectations**

Immigration has and will continue to play a large part in changing the religious composition of the United States. Skirbekk et al (2010) projected the religious landscape of the U.S. to the year 2043 using the General Social Survey and accounting for trends in fertility, immigration, denominational switching, and secularization. They found that the decline of the mainline Christian groups will continue and fundamentalist sects will increase in absolute numbers but also decline as a proportion of the population; secularization will claim a higher proportion of the white population than fundamentalists, while Catholicism and other immigrant religions such as Islam and Hinduism will continue to grow alongside immigration trends. Evangelical groups and immigrants are known to have higher birthrates and liberal Christian and non-Hispanic Catholics have lower birthrates than the average; fundamentalists, in which Adventists are categorized, are only at replacement levels (Hadaway and Marler 2006; Skirbekk et al 2010). Fundamentalist Protestants account for only 5% of immigrants, and there is also a graying of the population occurring within these stricter denominations; for American Adventists the median age is 51 (Sahlin and Richardson 2008; Skirbekk et al 2010). With steady or declining birthrates and a loss of members to secularization, the future of Protestant denominations in the U.S. does not bode well for continued growth.

The evangelistic role of denominations that make an effort to support and proselytize incoming immigrants can be used as a powerful tool in spurring the growth of Protestant Christian groups in the United States. Among the factors identified by
Lawson to explain the reasons for increased immigrant populations in the New York City churches, “The effort expended by the Adventist Church and its members to evangelize new immigrants who are not Adventists” ranked highly (Lawson 1998b:347). While the degree to which American Adventist churches emphasize evangelism is also related to higher growth rates (Dudley 1983), an Adventist survey found that most came to the Church through friendship networks, as opposed to aggressive evangelism measures. Half of those interviewed said that they were not raised as an Adventist, and only 10% said they came to the faith because of public evangelism; 31% said informal friendship evangelism was the reason for their conversion decision (Sahlin and Richardson 2008).

Christian groups who wish to continue to grow within the United States may find it valuable to appeal to the immigrant population, either to those who have already migrated or potential immigrants who live abroad. The evolving international evangelism practices of the SDA Church have emphasized the establishment of schools and medical facilities, institutions that have appealed to citizens of the developing world. These institutions have served as vehicles of conversion or in creating familiarity with the Adventist faith among potential immigrants. The wide distribution of its membership in countries undergoing economic transition and upward mobilization increases the chances that some proportion of those who choose to immigrate to the United States are Adventist or have a knowledge of the Adventist presence in their home country. We must also consider the role of providing support to immigrants in the United States as a boost to conversion rates; the Adventist Church’s strict theology may be attractive to those who need an additional source of security, as well as the general social networking and material resources provided to its members.
Immigrant congregations that have already established themselves in the U.S. also serve as support and evangelism hubs to other immigrants, and are important in heightening the conversion rates of those migrant populations.

Given the trend for immigrants to find Protestant denominations attractive for providing support and security, especially within evangelical or stricter denominations, I would expect to see growth of the American Adventist Church in regions that have a high proportion of immigrants. Since immigrants are especially drawn to denominations with which they are already familiar, I would expect a stronger relationship with regions receiving immigrants from countries where there is a strong Adventist presence, in terms of membership and the prevalence of its institutions. Because Adventism has experienced success in developing countries by establishing vehicles of mobilization that enable migration, I expect to see growth in U.S. regions that have a high proportion of immigrants from developing nations. The distribution of Adventism has changed over time, from a European oriented outreach to a more recent concentration in developing nations; I expect, therefore, that there will be a difference in what type of immigration influence American Church growth depending on the time period. Given also that the composition of immigrant populations has also changed since the Hart Cellar Act passed, the relationship between immigration from developing countries and American growth should only be significant after 1965. Similarly, there should be a stronger relationship between European immigration and American Church growth before 1965.
Chapter 3

DATA, VARIABLES, AND METHODS

Data

Collection

The data used to complete this project came from the United States Census Bureau, the Minnesota Population Center, and the Adventist Church’s official statistics website. I collected data that concerned the growth of Adventism and its institutions as well as the proportion of immigrants coming to U.S. states from different countries. My aim was to create a dataset where I could compare American Adventist growth with changes in immigration trends, with a particular focus on immigrants coming from countries with a strong Adventist presence. First, I needed to know how many immigrants were present in each U.S. state, as well as what country they came from before arriving to America. From the U.S. Census Bureau, I collected the total population for each state and also the number of foreign born persons present in each state (Gibson and Jung 2006; United States Census Bureau 1952, 2011, 2012).

The Minnesota Population Center website provides the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, or IPUMS, which contain samples of the American population using censuses from 1850-2000 and the American Community Surveys from 2000-2011 (Ruggles, Alxander, Genadek, Goeken, Schroeder, and Sobek 2010; Minnesota Population Center 2013). From this source, I extracted the micro samples that indicated the birthplace of the immigrant population by country. I only used samples
from 1900-2010 at ten year intervals, in accordance with when the census is taken; these IPUMS samples were either 1 or 5 percent subsamples of the total census data. Then, I expanded the IPUMS estimates to the U.S. Census’ total proportion of the foreign born population in each state. At the end of this process, I was able to identify how many immigrants were present in each state, and also estimate what proportion of those immigrants came from each country.

In order to measure the changing strength of the Adventist Church both internationally and in the United States, I used the number of members, churches, and health and educational institutions as measures for a strong or weak Adventist presence. The Adventist Church has the majority of its statistics available to the public online. This not only includes select financial documents, but also individual Excel spreadsheets that have the numbers of members and churches present in each of its governing bodies. I downloaded these Excel files for every ten years from 1900-2010, doing so for Church governing bodies as close to the state and country level as possible (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists 2013b). The number of health and educational institutions were not available in Excel form, however, and instead I had to use the yearly Church Yearbooks, which contain a complete list of institutions and what country they are located in. These yearbooks were PDF files and I had to manually count each institution and record its location (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists 2013c). For health institutions I included the number hospitals, sanitariums, dispensaries and clinics. For educational institutions I included the number of secondary, tertiary, and training and seminary schools. There was no yearbook available for the year 1900, so I was unable to record the number of institutions for that year. Since I am interested in how international activity affects
domestic growth, I did not record the number of health or educational institutions in the United States. At the end of this collection I had the end membership and number of churches for governing bodies in the U.S. and abroad, as well as the number of international institutions.

Organization

Before I could apply any analysis to compare immigration and Church growth in different regions, I needed to integrate my multiple sources into one dataset. This became a lengthy process because Adventist and political boundaries have not always been along the same lines, therefore I had to reorganize the data before they could be integrated and analyzed. The governing bodies of the Church are arranged hierarchically, and their territories sometimes do follow political boundaries, ranging from small geographic regions to several countries. The General Conference comprises the entire Church body, with its headquarters based in Silver Spring, Maryland; it is at the top of decision-making processes and is where the President works (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists 2013a). Beneath the General Conference are the Divisions. As of 2010 there were 13 Divisions, each made up of several countries (see Figure 10). The next government structure is the Union; these are composed of multiple local conferences or missions and may be made of one or more countries or provinces (see Figure 11). The smallest government level is the local conference or mission, which are typically a single province or geographic region within a country.
Figure 10  The 13 Adventist Divisions as of 2010 (General Conference 2013c)

Figure 11  Unions-level map, as of 2010. Map created by author using Adventist yearbooks (General Conference 2013c). Some countries contain more than one Union that is not shown, such as in Canada.
Since the Church data was not consistently available by individual country or state, I had to make boundary compromises between the immigration data and Church data. First, I considered how this would apply to international Church data and the birthplaces of immigrants. The U.S. Census has defined groups of countries to comprise international categories that describe the source regions of immigrants (Gibson and Jung 2006). The IPUMS data I collected also contained detailed birthplace codes according to the region or country of origin claimed by the foreign born population (Ruggles et al 2010). Instead of using individual countries to identify where immigrants were born or for describing the international Adventist presence over a century of shifting boundaries, I decided to use the broad Census international categories as units of analysis. I made only minor changes to the categories, such as grouping Greenland with Northern Europe instead of North America and omitting Bermuda, for reasons stated later. I recoded the IPUMS data concerning the birthplace of the foreign born, as well as all of the international Adventist data, into these new categories.

Once the data were placed in their respective international categories, I further consolidated them into a ‘Developed’ and ‘Developing’ dichotomy. This allowed for a simple set of results that would also take into account the relationship between Adventist membership distribution and a country’s development status. The definition of ‘Developed’ and ‘Developing’ countries is a socially constructed measure that changes throughout time. The United Nations website states that:

“In common practice, Japan in Asia, Canada and the United States in northern America, Australia and New Zealand in Oceania, and Europe are considered "developed" regions or areas. In international trade statistics, the Southern African Customs Union is also treated as a developed region and Israel as a developed country; countries emerging
from the former Yugoslavia are treated as developing countries; and countries of eastern Europe and of the Commonwealth of Independent States (code 172) in Europe are not included under either developed or developing regions” (United Nations Statistics Division 2013).

I took these common measures under consideration and created a distinction based on what would suit each international category best for the entire 1900-2010 time period. My re-categorization is shown in Figure 12 and the list of countries in each category can be found in Appendix C.
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**Figure 12** International Census Categories separated according to ‘developed’ and ‘developing’. Map created by author.

The local conferences in the United States are often comprised of multiple states, and in other cases they may split states along county lines or urban centers. Because of this, my American Adventist data were not available on a state by state basis like the immigration data were, and so I had to consolidate them into larger regions; instead of 50 states as units of analysis, I ended up with 29 or 30 U.S.
conference regions (see Figure 13). Over time, as the Church expanded and reorganized itself, the conference boundaries changed; I had to make several adjustments to correct for these changes while also maintaining enough consistency to allow for reliable statistical comparisons. The state groupings made minimal name or county changes in the years from 1940 to 2010, with bigger changes occurring before then, such as Louisiana switching from a grouping with Missouri in 1930 to a grouping with Arkansas in 1940. For an in depth description of these changes throughout time, please refer to Appendix D.

A few data omissions should be mentioned at this point. Puerto Rico’s Church and immigration data were not included because I am primarily concerned with measuring membership and immigration changes in the 50 U.S. States; Puerto Rico’s
citizens are also not considered to be members of the foreign born population (Gibson and Jung 2006). Bermuda is unique because its membership is included within one of the local U.S. Adventist Conferences, even though it is not part of the U.S. While Bermuda does have an Adventist school, that particular institution was not included in the international Adventist data because its membership was grouped with the United States where the number of schools and hospitals were not used as variables. I do not foresee any limitations placed on the interpretations of my results because of these omissions.

Data Reliability and Analysis Limitations

Ronald Lawson, a scholar who has worked with Adventist statistics many times, has spoken towards the reliability of the Church’s records (Lawson 1995, 1998a, 1998b, 1999, Cragun and Lawson 2010; Lawson and Cragun 2012). Overall, he states that the statistics are generally reliable, but that there are also certain regional variations in record-keeping. For instance, Caribbean and Latin American churches are quicker to disfellowship their members while the number of people leaving the Church in Africa goes severely undercounted (Lawson 1995, 1999). Korean members are slow to transfer membership from their homeland, and while Hispanics are known to keep the most up-to-date records, the Caucasian records tend to keep missing members on the books far longer than other groups (Lawson 1998b). Another event to bear in mind is the membership audits that took place in 2000, after which Brazil and the Philippines lost 300,000 members (Lechleitner 2010). Higher or lower membership numbers than reality may either inflate or understate the significance of the results relevant for those areas, and so it is important to keep this in mind when interpreting the results.
The nature of the collected data, however, may place certain limits on the interpretive power of my analysis. Using immigration data from the U.S. Census means that the estimations of the proportion and birthplace of the foreign born population are based on legal immigrants, which leaves undocumented immigrants unaccounted for. Another point to consider is that there are two types of American Adventist local conferences: regional and non-regional. The regional conferences were created in 1944 to ease racial tensions between members in the eastern United States and so historically most of the members of the regional conferences have been African American while most of the non-regional conferences members have been white (Reynolds 1984; Lawson 1998; Greene 2009). The two conference types do not cover the same scale of geographic areas, however, and due to the time constraints of this project, I was unable to integrate the regional conferences into my dataset. While anecdotal evidence suggests that some immigrant groups are more likely to join non-regional churches instead of regional churches and vice versa, it is important to keep this exclusion in mind when interpreting the results. It is my plan that the regional conferences will be included in the dataset and analyses at a later date.

**Variables**

I am interested in seeing how immigration is related to the growth of Adventism in the United States, particularly for those immigrant groups coming from international categories with a high Adventist presence. In order to investigate the various aspects of that idea, I used several independent variables; the first two concern the immigrant population within each U.S. region. The proportion of the foreign born of the total population in every U.S. region will help us to see the overall effect of immigration on growth in the Adventist Church. Using the IPUMS data, I was also
able to determine the proportion of the foreign born population from ‘Developed’ or ‘Developing’ international categories, which allows for us to know if there are a higher proportion of immigrants in a particular U.S. region. Additionally, the total population for each U.S. region was controlled for so that population growth, in and by itself, would not bias the results.

The next four independent variables were used to measure the international activity of the Adventist Church. The number of churches and members in each international census category, as well as the number of medical institutions and educational institutions gave differing ways of measuring the effect of the international activity of the Adventist Church. Each of these four independent variables was multiplied by the relative proportion of the foreign born population in that U.S. conference region from that international census category. Doing this weighted the effect of the Church’s international presence and activities to be relative to the immigrant population from that particular international category within a U.S. conference region.

For the dependent variables, I used the number of churches, the number of members, and members as a proportion of the overall population in each U.S. region; these served to give a sense of how immigration and international activity influenced the growth of Adventism in America.

**Methods**

I now have at my disposal an integrated dataset of domestic Church growth, international Church activity, and the foreign born population’s birthplace and current residence within the United States. In order to discover relationships between the international activity and domestic Church growth via a connection to immigration, I
will need to use a series of analyses. Firstly, I am interested in looking at the changes within U.S. conference regions over a long span of time, while also identifying the variations between conference regions; knowing these relationships will help show which categories are contributing to the most growth in U.S. conference regions. In order to do this, I decided to use fixed effects regression models.

The fixed effects is useful when analyzing the impact of variables that vary over time within a country or state; it is a method specifically “designed to study the causes of changes within a person [or entity]” (Kohler and Kreuter 2009:245). Fixed effects models assume that there will be some characteristic about the country/state that directly affects the dependent variable (domestic Church growth); in this case this characteristic would be the growth of the total population. Only after controlling for overall population growth in each U.S. conference region will we be able to see how immigration from an international category may influence domestic Church growth. In order to capture the impact of shifting source regions for the foreign born population before and after the 1965 Hart Cellar Act, the regressions were conducted in two time periods: first for 1900-1960, and then from 1970-2010.
In this chapter I will describe the findings from the fixed effects regression model. The following three tables represent the effects of the independent variables on each of the three dependent variables. For every unit increase in the independent variable, there was a corresponding change in the dependent variable. As described in the previous chapter, the independent variables that represent the international presence of the Adventist Church (members, churches, health and educational institutions) have been weighted by the proportion of the foreign born population from their corresponding category in the conference region. For those same variables, the total population and proportion of the foreign-born population in a U.S. conference region served as controls. The results for the entire 1900-2010 time period are shown in the first column for each independent variable, while those for the 1900-1960 and 1970-2010 time periods are listed in the second column. An asterisk by the number indicates a significant result and the R-Squared rows at the bottom measure the goodness of fit.

First I will describe the effects of the independent variables on the number of Adventist churches in a conference region, as shown in Table 1. When considering the influence of the proportion of the foreign-born population in each U.S. conference region between 1900 and 2010, a one percent increase in the proportion of the foreign-born is related to a 0.7% increase in the number of American Adventist churches within a conference region. Between 1900 and 1960, a one percent increase in the
proportion of the foreign-born population correlates with a 0.7% increase in the number of churches in a U.S. conference region; however, there was no significant relationship for 1970-2010. When the birth place of the foreign-born population is split between developed and undeveloped international categories, the results are slightly different. Between 1970 and 2010, the number of American Adventist churches increases by 7% for every one percent increase in immigrants from the developing world, but there is no significance associated with the 1900-1960 time period. A one percent increase in the proportion of immigrants from developed categories correlates with a 19% increase in American churches within a conference region for the entire 1900-2010 time period.

The establishment of foreign churches is significant only for those in developed categories. The establishment of one foreign church in developed categories between 1900 and 2010 correlates with a 0.007% increase in the number of American churches, and for 1900-1960 each new foreign church in developed categories correlates with a 0.008% increase in American church; there is no relationship for 1970-2010. The effect of foreign membership growth on the number of American churches is only significant for developing countries between 1970 and 2010; the addition of one foreign member correlates with a 0.000004% increase in the number of American churches. An increase of one health institutions in developed countries is significant for the 1900-2010 time period, correlating with a 0.03% increase in the number of American churches. There is no significant relationship between the establishment of international educational institutions and the number of American Adventist churches.
### Table 1  
Fixed Effects Regressions of the Number of American Adventist Churches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables:</th>
<th>Foreign Born Pop., as Prop. of the Total Pop.</th>
<th>Foreign Born Pop., as a Prop. of the Foreign Born Pop.</th>
<th># Foreign Churches, Weighted</th>
<th># Foreign Members, Weighted</th>
<th># Foreign Educational Institutions, Weighted</th>
<th># Foreign Health Institutions, Weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>0.000 ***</td>
<td>0.000 ***</td>
<td>0.000 ***</td>
<td>0.000 ***</td>
<td>0.000 ***</td>
<td>0.000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born Population</td>
<td>0.748 **</td>
<td>1.257 ***</td>
<td>1.056 ***</td>
<td>1.283 ***</td>
<td>1.129 ***</td>
<td>0.949 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1960</td>
<td>0.733 **</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.028 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-2010</td>
<td>-0.845</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1960</td>
<td>-7.389</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.028 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-2010</td>
<td>-7.085 *</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1960</td>
<td>-7.389</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.028 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-2010</td>
<td>-7.085 *</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>13.724 ***</td>
<td>11.254 ***</td>
<td>7.619 ***</td>
<td>5.797</td>
<td>12.217 ***</td>
<td>11.385 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Observations</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Groups</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Next, I will describe the influence of the independent variables on changes in the number of Adventist members in the United States, as shown in Table 2. Increases in the total proportion of the foreign-born population in each U.S. conference region were significant for 1900-2010, during that time a one percent increase in the foreign-born correlates with an additional 290 American Adventist members. Between 1900 and 1960, one percent increases in the total foreign-born population correlates with 293 more American members while there is no significant relationship for 1970-2010.

After considering the source categories of the immigrants, a one percent increase in the proportion of the foreign-born population from developing categories is only significant for the 1970-2010 time period, when it correlates with the addition of 4,390 American members. During 1900-2010, a one percent increase in the foreign-born from developed countries correlates with an increase of 4,762 American members, but for 1970-2010 an increase in immigrants from developed categories goes along with a 4,638 decrease in American members.

An increase in the number of foreign churches is only significant for the developing category over the 1900-2010 time period; the addition of one new foreign church correlates with 1.4 additional American members. For the establishment of educational institutions in the developing category, each new institution correlates with 8 additional American members for the 1900-2010 time period. In the developed category, the establishment of an education institution correlated with a decrease of 216 American members for 1900-2010, and a decrease of 210 American members between 1900 and 1960; there was no significant relationship for 1970-2010. Similarly, the establishment of an additional health institution in the developing category correlates with an increase of 20 American members. Yet, for every health
institution added in the developed category, there were 228 fewer American Adventist members for 1900-2010 and 251 fewer for the 1900-1960 time period. Change in the number of foreign members, however, do not seem to be significantly related to the number of American members.
Table 2  
Fixed Effects Regressions of the Number of American Adventist Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables:</th>
<th>Foreign Born Pop., as Prop. of the Total Pop.</th>
<th>Foreign Born Pop., as a Prop. of the Foreign Born Pop.</th>
<th># Foreign Churches, Weighted</th>
<th># Foreign Members, Weighted</th>
<th># Foreign Educational Institutions, Weighted</th>
<th># Foreign Health Institutions, Weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>0.004 ***</td>
<td>0.004 ***</td>
<td>0.004 ***</td>
<td>0.004 ***</td>
<td>0.004 ***</td>
<td>0.004 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>290.147 ***</td>
<td>292.542 ***</td>
<td>366.014 ***</td>
<td>391.029 ***</td>
<td>265.868</td>
<td>294.432 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110.215</td>
<td>11.0215</td>
<td>300.000</td>
<td>300.000</td>
<td>200.000</td>
<td>200.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3135.403</td>
<td>1816.087</td>
<td>7.532 *</td>
<td>20.167 ***</td>
<td>30.661</td>
<td>8.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4389.923 *</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>8.184</td>
<td>-14.798</td>
<td>-228.062 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-4638.220 *</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-209.733 *</td>
<td>-251.248 ***</td>
<td>27.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-16232.440 ***</td>
<td>-15916.220 ***</td>
<td>-16391.630 ***</td>
<td>-17078.890 ***</td>
<td>-18513.290 ***</td>
<td>-16980.180 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>347</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Observations</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
The last set of findings focuses on how the independent variables influence the number of Adventist members as a proportion of the total population in a U.S. conference region. This particular set of results has the most relationships, numbering 15, but they appear to be very small. However, these small effects are only because Adventists make up a very small proportion of the population in each region, and so even small increases are relevant. A one percent increase in the total proportion of the foreign-born population correlates with a 0.005% increase in the proportion of American Adventist members as a proportion of the population, but this relationship exists only for the 1970-2010 time period. There is no relationship with increases in the proportion of immigrants from the developed international category, but a one percent increase among those from developing countries correlates with a 0.09% increase in the proportion of Adventist members for 1900-2010 and a 0.08% increase for the 1970-2010 time period.

Increases in the number of foreign churches are significant for both the developed and developing categories. When a foreign church was added to a developing category from 1900-2010, the proportion of Adventists in a U.S. conference region rose by 0.000002%, and for 1900-1960 it rose by 0.000007%; there was no significant association with the 1970-2010 time period. Among developed nations, the addition of a foreign church also correlates with a 0.00005% increase in the proportion of Adventists in U.S. conference regions between 1900 and 2010, and a 0.00004% increase for the 1900-1960 time period. Within the developing category, the establishment of an educational institution correlates with a 0.0002% increase in the proportion of Adventist members from 1900 to 2010, and a 0.001% increase in proportion for 1900-1960. The establishment of an educational institution in a
developed international category, however, was significant only for the 1970-2010 time period, when it correlates with a 0.003% increase in the proportion of the Adventist population in a conference region. The addition of a health institution in developing international categories correlates with a 0.0002% increase in the proportion of Adventists for 1900-2010. A new health institution in a developed category is only significant for the 1970-2010 time period, during which it correlates with a 0.002% increase in the proportion of Adventists members in a U.S. conference region.
### Table 3  
Fixed Effects Regression of the Number of American Adventist Members, as a Proportion of the Total Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables:</th>
<th>Foreign Born Pop., as Prop. of the Total Pop.</th>
<th>Foreign Born Pop., as a Prop. of the Foreign Born Pop.</th>
<th># Foreign Churches, Weighted</th>
<th># Foreign Members, Weighted</th>
<th># Foreign Educational Institutions, Weighted</th>
<th># Foreign Health Institutions, Weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>0.000 *** 0.000 ***</td>
<td>0.000 *** 0.000 ***</td>
<td>0.000 *** 0.000 ***</td>
<td>0.000 *** 0.000 ***</td>
<td>0.000 *** 0.000 ***</td>
<td>0.000 *** 0.000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born Population</td>
<td>-0.002 -0.002</td>
<td>0.005 *</td>
<td>-0.002 ** -0.001</td>
<td>-0.001 -0.001</td>
<td>-0.001 0.000</td>
<td>-0.001 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1960</td>
<td>0.094 *</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-2010</td>
<td>0.084 *</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Categories</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1960</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-2010</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Categories</td>
<td>0.127 *** 0.141 ***</td>
<td>0.061 ***</td>
<td>0.070 ***</td>
<td>0.091 ***</td>
<td>0.083 ***</td>
<td>0.107 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1960</td>
<td>0.102 ***</td>
<td>0.086 ***</td>
<td>0.073 ** **</td>
<td>0.050 0.061</td>
<td>0.099 0.077</td>
<td>0.099 0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-2010</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.145 0.159</td>
<td>0.150 0.168</td>
<td>0.490 0.497</td>
<td>0.479 0.481</td>
<td>0.173 0.185</td>
<td>0.171 0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Observations</td>
<td>347 347</td>
<td>347 347</td>
<td>347 347</td>
<td>347 347</td>
<td>347 347</td>
<td>347 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Groups</td>
<td>29 29</td>
<td>29 29</td>
<td>29 29</td>
<td>29 29</td>
<td>29 29</td>
<td>29 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.014 0.012</td>
<td>0.011 0.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

I will now discuss how the results support or run contrary to the initial expectations that I stated at the end of Chapter 2. My primary expectation was that more immigrants in a U.S. conference region would be positively related to Church growth. There were several positive relationships between the total proportion of the foreign-born population and the growth of Adventism in the United States. Growing total proportions of the foreign born in a conference region had a positive relationship with the number of American SDA churches and members for the 1900-2010 and 1900-1960 time periods. An increase in the proportion of immigrants had a slightly different effect on the proportion of Adventist members however; instead of being a positive influence in the earlier part of the century, it was only significant for the 1970-2010 time period. So while increases in the foreign-born population seem to be related to church and membership growth for the entire time period, its increase after 1970 is related to Adventist membership growth that exceeds a static percent of the overall population in a U.S. conference region.

I also expected to find that higher numbers of immigrants from developing regions would be especially related to American church growth for the 1970-2010 time period. This was supported in the results for all three variables. Increases in the foreign-born population who came from developing countries had a significant positive relationship on the number of American SDA churches and members, but only for the 1970-2010 time period. There was also a positive relationship between
increases in immigrants from developing nations and an increase in the proportion of Adventists of the total population in a U.S. conference region. Not only was this relationship significant for 1970-2010, but it had an even stronger relationship for the entire 1900-2010 time period. This suggests that an increase in immigrants from developing countries may be contributing to the American Adventist Church’s growth, especially since 1970.

I also expected that higher numbers of immigrants from developed countries would be most related to Church growth from 1900 to 1960; this expectation was not directly supported by my results, but an overall positive relationship with Church growth is present. While there was a positive relationship between growth in the number of Adventist churches and members and the proportion of immigrants from developed nations for the 1900-2010 time period, the introduction of the two time periods did not yield a more significant positive relationship for 1900-1960. Instead, we do see that a decrease in immigrants from developed countries after 1970 was actually related to an increase in U.S. Adventist membership. All of this suggests that while in the long run the American Adventist church may have benefitted from the immigration of people from developed nations, there doesn’t seem to be a more significant relationship for the 1900-1960 time period when immigration from Europe made up a larger proportion of the U.S. population.

As described in Chapter 3, I used four different measures for determining the strength of Adventism’s international presence: churches, members, and health and educational institutions. I expected that increases in the Church’s international influence would be related to the growth of the American Adventist Church because of the potential immigration of its foreign members. In accordance with changes in
immigration trends before and after the Hart Cellar Act of 1965, I also expected that a strong Adventist presence in developed countries would lead to American Church growth in the 1900-1960 time period while a strong presence in developing countries would be related to American Church growth for 1970-2010. The results vary in their support; while the number of foreign members and churches generally supports my expectations, the establishment of health and educational institutions were more surprising because they did not match my expectations for the different time periods and development categories.

Increases in the number of foreign members from developed and developing countries were related to a growth in Adventist members as a proportion of the total population in a U.S. conference region for the entire 1900-2010 time period. With the introduction of the time split, we see that an increase in the foreign membership in developing countries during 1970-2010 also had a positive relationship with the growth of the number of American churches. The establishment of international churches seemed to have a positive relationship with growth in the proportion of Adventists to the total population in a U.S. conference region. These relationships were true for immigrants coming from both developed and developing countries, and had significance for the 1900-2010 and 1900-1960 time periods. Increases in the number of foreign churches in developing countries were related to membership growth in the U.S. for 1900-2010, and an increase in the number of foreign churches from developed nations was related to growth in the number of American churches during the same time period. While overall, an increasing number of foreign members and churches seems to have a positive effect on Church growth in the United States, only two of the relationships followed my expectations for the different time periods.
The establishment of health and educational institutions had comparable effects between themselves on the American Adventist Church’s growth, but these effects were not entirely in line with my expectations. Increases in the number of health institutions in developing countries were related to growth in the number of Adventist churches in the U.S. as well as American membership numbers and proportion to the total population for the entire 1900-2010 time period. Among developing countries, educational institutions in developing countries do have a relationship with the growth of the proportion of Adventists and the number of American members, although there is no relationship with the number of American churches. Contrary to my expectations, however, the number of educational institutions in developing countries is not significant for the 1970-2010 time period, but only for the 1900-1960 time period. Institutions from developing regions were, therefore, generally related to growth of Adventism in the United States, although the positive relationship with the 1900-1960 time period goes against immigration trends.

What is most interesting is the influence that these institutions have on the American Church’s growth when they are established in nations that are already developed. Increases in the number of these institutions in developed countries do have a positive relationship with the proportion of the Adventist population in a conference region, but only for the 1970-2010 time period. I had expected that the institutions in developed countries would have a stronger relationship with 1900-1960, but this does not appear to be the case. The establishment of either type of institution in a developed category, however, is not related to the growth of the number of American Adventist churches at all. As the number of these institutions in a developed
category decreases, we find that there is a significant increase in the number of American Adventist members, both for the 1900-2010 and 1900-1960 time periods.

The establishment of international health and educational institutions in developed categories seems to be associated with the American Church’s growth while such a relationship is less likely for institutions established in developed nations. The negative relationship between developed countries’ institutions and American growth is particularly puzzling, especially since it is also significant for the 1900-1960 time period. One reason for this could be that in developing countries Adventists schools and hospitals were some of the only places that provided healthcare or modes of upward mobility, while nations that were already developed were not as reliant on their services, thereby reducing the role that an Adventist institution had in the migration process.

And yet, there are other unexpected occurrences such as the lingering significant relationship between institutions in developed categories and the growth of Adventism as a proportion of the population in the latter part of the century and how educational institutions in developing nations are related to the growth of American membership before the 1965 immigration act was passed. It is difficult to fully explain these apparent contradictions without other studies to compare them with. It is important to keep in mind that change in the number of institutions is different than the change in foreign churches and members. While foreign membership numbers have seen varying levels of positive growth rates over time in every international category, the number of institutions is prone to more fluctuation depending on the contextual factors of their geographic location. While the placement of schools may suffer from political strife or disaster within a country or region, the number of clinics
may increase for the same reasons. By grouping countries as developed and undeveloped, I am only able to account for some measure of social and economic progress, therefore ignoring additional contextual factors that may influence my results at the country or regional level. In order to understand these dynamics further, the analysis would have to be conducted on each international category to better account for more regional differences.

**Conclusion**

After my analysis of an integrated Adventist and U.S. immigration dataset, I can conclude that there indeed is a positive relationship between the growth of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the United States and immigration, and that certain measures of the Church’s international activity also contribute to that relationship. The Church’s early success with European immigrant farmers in the United States led to its entry into European countries, and shifts in ideology and evangelism techniques increasingly emphasized the provision of health and education services, which allowed the Church to expand into developing nations. The Adventist Church’s spreading international influence happens to have coincided with the immigration trends in the United States, with a stronger presence in developed countries before the passing of the Hart Cellar Act in 1965, and an increasing proportion of its membership in developed countries after 1965. The results from my analysis support that statement and show that the American Church’s growth is related to immigration from already developed nations before 1965 and even more strongly related to immigration from developing nations after 1965. Since the Adventist Church is actively involved in promoting the upward mobility of citizens in developing countries through the establishment of its educational institutions, it is inherently involved in the
immigration process and in familiarizing potential immigrants with its name. It is surprising then, that my results have not revealed a stronger connection between the Church’s international institutions and its American Growth, and institutions in developed regions seem to actually have a negative relationship with the growth of the Church in the United States.

It is important for me to note that while these results are promising in their general support of my thesis, they may not be capturing the entire picture. By dividing the immigration and foreign membership by ‘Developed’ and ‘Developing’ categories, I am only able to account for broad economic differences in the source regions of immigrants. A more specific analysis of each international category would provide me with the ability to examine each relationship within the contexts of the category’s historical, political, and cultural changes. There is also a strong possibility that by excluding the black Adventist Regional Conferences from my analysis, I may be missing out on either supportive or contradictory significant relationships; I hope to rectify this lack in the future. While my results only provide generalized relationships that average over all of the U.S. conference regions, there may be some value in conducting additional analysis to make comparisons between these regions. Implementing these extra measures and experimenting with different units of analysis would provide a more holistic view of the relationship between the growth of the Adventist Church in the United States and immigration, and perhaps provide a better understanding of how international evangelistic efforts can serve to bolster the growth of declining Protestant denominations.
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Appendix A

MAPS OF DOMESTIC CHURCH GROWTH 1890, 1950, AND 2010

The following maps depict the number of Adventist members in the U.S. conference regions described in chapter three and Appendix D. They were made using ArcMap 10 software and the number of members was extracted from the Adventist statistics website.

Figure 14 Adventist Membership in the United States in 1890.
Figure 15  Adventist membership in the United States in 1950.

Figure 16  Adventist membership in the United States in 2010
Appendix B

MAPS OF WORLDWIDE MEMBERSHIP GROWTH 1890, 1950, AND 2010

The following maps depict the number of Adventist members in the international categories defined in chapter three and Appendix C. They were also made using ArcMap 10 software and the number of members was extracted from the Adventist statistics website.

Figure 17    Worldwide Adventist membership in 1890
Figure 18  Worldwide Adventist membership in 1950

Figure 19  Worldwide Adventist membership in 2010
Appendix C

LIST OF COUNTRIES IN EACH INTERNATIONAL CATEGORY

The following list of countries are organized into the international categories discussed in Chapter 3. Each category is labeled either ‘Developed’ or ‘Developing’, and the detailed country codes that I used for my analysis are included in the third column.

Table 4   International categories and their corresponding countries and codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Name</th>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th>Country Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia and New Zealand Sub-region (Developed)</td>
<td>Australia, New Zealand, Norfolk Island</td>
<td>70010-70020, 71011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Developed)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>15000-15081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean (Developing)</td>
<td>Anguilla, Antigua &amp; Barbuda, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Haiti</td>
<td>25000, 26000-26095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Jamaica, Martinique, Montserrat, Netherlands Antilles, St Kitts-Nevis, St Lucia, St Vincent &amp; the Grenadines, St. Barthelemy, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks &amp; Caicos Islands, West Indies</td>
<td>21000-21090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central America - excluding Mexico (Developing)</strong></td>
<td>Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Africa (Developing)</strong></td>
<td>British Indian Territory, Burundi, Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ethiopia, Europa Island, Glorioso Islands, Juan de Nova Island, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mayotte, Mozambique, Reunion, Rwanda</td>
<td>60040-60065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Data Block</td>
<td>Country/Region</td>
<td>Population Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Asia</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tromelin Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Asia (Developing)</td>
<td>50000-50900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Europe (Developing)</td>
<td>43000, 45100-45213, 45360-45800, 45900-46530, 46548-46590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Africa (Developing)</td>
<td>Angola, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, The Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire), Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Sao Tome &amp; Principe</td>
<td>60070-60080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Africa (Developing)</td>
<td>Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia, Western Sahara</td>
<td>60010-60019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Europe (Developed)</td>
<td>United Kingdom, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden</td>
<td>16040, 40000-41900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania (Developing)</td>
<td>Fiji, New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu (New Hebrides), Caroline Islands, Kiribati, Marianna Island, Marshall Islands, Palau, Micronesia, Federated States, Cook Islands</td>
<td>71000, 71090, 70010-70020, 71010, 71012-71019, 71021, 71032-71034, 71039-71049, 71022-71029, 71036-71038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America (Developing)</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Asia (Developing)</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>Subregion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern Asia</td>
<td>Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan</td>
<td>(Developing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brunei, Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar/Burma, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland</td>
<td>(Developed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gibraltar, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal, San Marino, Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Africa</td>
<td>Benin, Burkina, Faso</td>
<td>(Developing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subregion codes:
- South Eastern Asia: 51000-51910, 52130
- Southern Africa: 60090-60096
- Southern Europe: 16060, 43200-44000
- Western Africa: 16020, 16050, 60020-60038
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Asia (Developing)</th>
<th>Armenia</th>
<th>Azerbaijan</th>
<th>Bahrain</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
<th>Kuwait</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Oman</th>
<th>Qatar</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
<th>Syria</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>United Arab Emirates</th>
<th>Yemen</th>
<th>46540-46542, 53000-54900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe (Developed)</td>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42000-42900, 43100, 45000-45080, 45300-45353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

DESCRIPTION OF U.S. CONFERENCE REGION CHANGES

The following table lists the names of the conferences that make up each U.S. conference region in 2010, as well as the corresponding states in their territories. After the table there are several lists which describe boundary changes between conferences for each decade.

Table 5  U.S. Conference Regions in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Names</th>
<th>States in Conference Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater New York Conference,</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Conference</td>
<td>Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern New England Conference</td>
<td>Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern New England Conference</td>
<td>Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny East Conference,</td>
<td>Delaware, New Jersey, Maryland, Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Washington D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny West Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake Conference,</td>
<td>Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Conference,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Conference</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Conference</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Conference</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Conference</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Conference</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>States or Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Region Conference</td>
<td>Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Conference</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Conference</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central States Conference, Southwest Region Conference</td>
<td>Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Conference</td>
<td>North Dakota, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa-Missouri Conference</td>
<td>Iowa, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas-Nebraska Conference</td>
<td>Kansas, Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Conference</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain Conference</td>
<td>Colorado, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Conference</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Conference</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Conference</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Conference</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada-Utah Conference</td>
<td>Nevada, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central California Conference, Northern California Conference, Southeastern California Conference, Southern California Conference</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Conference</td>
<td>North Carolina, South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-Cumberland Conference, Kentucky-Tennessee Conference</td>
<td>Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes from 2010 to 1990:

- No significant changes

Changes from 1990 to 1980:

- Dakota conference is split into North and South Dakota Conferences
- Kansas-Nebraska conference is split into Kansas and Nebraska Conferences
- Gulf States conference is called Alabama-Mississippi Conference
- Rocky Mountain Conference split into Colorado and Wyoming Conferences
- Southeastern (black conference) no longer exists

**Changes from 1980 to 1970:**
- Mountain View Conference is called West Virginia
- Iowa-Missouri Conference is split into Iowa and Missouri
- Oklahoma Conference suddenly includes Lipscomb County in Texas
- Texico Conference no longer contains Lipscomb County

**Changes from 1970 to 1960:**
- Pennsylvania Conference is split into East and West Pennsylvania
- Allegheny East and West (Black conferences) are consolidated into Allegheny Conference

**Changes from 1960 to 1950:**
- Chesapeake Conference has some county changes (within same states)

**Changes from 1950 to 1940:**
- The Black conferences no longer exist
  - Northeastern, Allegheny, Lake Region, Central States, South Atlantic, and Southwest Region Conferences
- Arkansas-Louisiana no longer contain city of Texarkana in Texas

**Changes from 1940 to 1930:**
- Illinois Conference keeps its name, but the territory is split with Chicago, Northern Conference
- Indiana Conference is subtracted its seven northernmost counties
- Michigan Conference is split between East and West Michigan
- West Michigan contains remaining Indiana counties (Elkhart, LaGrange, LaPorte, St. Joseph, Steuben, and Porter)
• Colorado Conference keeps its name, but the territory is split with the Inter-Mountain Conference

• The Inter-Mountain Conference also contains 7 counties from Utah; also contains San Juan County from New Mexico (was already owned by Colorado)

• Oregon Conference keeps its name, but the territory is split with Southern Oregon

• Nevada-Utah Conference is split between Nevada and Utah conferences (still contains some California territory -- already deemed a negligible loss of population)

• Some county changes within Californian and Carolina conferences (minor)

• Georgia-Cumberland Conference is split between Cumberland and Georgia

• Arkansas-Louisiana is split between Arkansas and Louisiana-Mississippi

• Kentucky-Tennessee Conference is split between Kentucky and Tennessee River Conferences

• Texas Conferences is split between North and South Texas conferences

Changes from 1930 to 1920:

• Washington Conference is called Western Washington

• New York Conference is split between Eastern and Western New York

• Northern New England only contains Vermont and New Hampshire; no longer has Maine

• Southern New England only contains Connecticut and Rhode Island; no longer contains Massachusetts

• Maine and Massachusetts have their own conferences

• Potomac Conference is split into District of Columbia and Virginia conferences, which also take some territory from Chesapeake (all adds up to the same)

• Michigan conferences are further split for North Michigan Conference

• Wisconsin Conference is split into North and South Wisconsin
• North Wisconsin contains 9 Michigan counties from its upper peninsula
• Idaho Conference is called Southern Idaho
• Oregon conferences are further divided to include Western Oregon Conference
• Hawaii Conference no longer exists
• Louisiana-Mississippi Conference is split into Louisiana and Mississippi conferences
• Oklahoma conference seemingly no longer contains Lipscomb County from Texas

Changes from 1920 to 1910:
• Illinois is rearranged; no more Chicago Conference, just Northern and Southern Illinois Conferences
• Indiana appears to be whole (not missing seven counties)
• Michigan conferences only contain Michigan
• North and South Wisconsin are consolidated into Wisconsin Conferences, but it does not contain any Michigan conferences
• South Dakota Conference does not contain the ‘Black Hills’
• Missouri Conference split between North and Southern Missouri
• Nebraska is less 10 of its western counties, lost to: Wyoming Conference
• Colorado is split according to the Continental Divide, Western Colorado Conference is present
• Southern Oregon Conference disappears...
• California Conference now contains Nevada
• Northern and Southeastern California Conferences no longer exist
• Carolina Conference is split between North and South Carolina
• North and South Texas Conferences are restructured into Texas and West Texas Conferences
- Texico Conference is called New Mexico Conference and only contains El Paso County in Texas (as opposed to more in the future)
- Southern Union (Black Conference) makes a brief appearance
- Kansas Conference split into West and East Kansas Conferences

Changes from 1910 to 1900:
- New England Conference comprises New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut
- Northern/Southern New England conferences are no more (consolidated)
- Atlantic and New York conferences are put together (New York and New Jersey)
- Greater New York and Western New York conferences no longer exist
- Atlantic Conference (New Jersey) includes NYC
- Vermont is a separate conference
- Kansas is a separate conference
- Nebraska and Wyoming are together (was Kansas and Nebraska)
- Colorado and New Mexico are together (was Colorado and Wyoming)
- Texas is by itself