

Introduction

Abortion is a very controversial topic for conversation today—in the 21st century—where it has achieved mainstream visibility in the political sphere. The controversy often revolves around opposing claims of rights and polarized feelings of support for the baby's right to life and thus opposition to abortion or support for the choice of the woman carrying the baby and thus support for abortion. More than a medical option (though not a consistently legal medical option across the States), abortion is an issue involving widespread disagreement over its appropriate level of legislation. Pro-life activists often argue that because it involves the question of life, abortion is a moral issue. In 2004, many voters admitted this issue was singularly used to direct their choice for President of the United States. These voters were subsequently classified as moral voters.

So this begs the question: how far is morality interconnected with abortion? Are these two concepts causally related? In my study, I will be examining whether or not religious attitudes affect personal feelings on abortion. My research question is: Are religious people more likely to be against abortion than non-religious people. My hypothesis is that religious people are more against abortion (pro-life) than non-religious people. I believe religious people view abortion as a cruel and negative thing because they think it is taking the life of a baby whereas non-religious people tend to think of abortion not in terms of the life of the baby but in terms of the mother carrying the baby. They believe abortion is a necessary freedom of choice.

Research Design

I am interested in how individual opinions of abortion are affected by religious views, so my unit of analysis will be individuals. The two concepts I am studying are religiosity and feelings on abortion. Religious people are my main interest group, so non-religious people are my comparison group. My independent variable is the level of religiosity of my unit (individuals) studied, and feelings on abortion is my dependent variable. My ideal study population would be a representative population of all United States citizens, with a wide distribution of gender, age, class, region, and race. My actual study population is University of Michigan students because they are who I have access to speak with.

To best collect my data for these variables, I chose to use semi-structured individual interviews by approaching individuals in different locations on campus and asking their feelings on abortion and how religious they are. I measured religiosity by asking different questions I thought indicated the level of how religious people are. I measured feelings on abortion by asking their overall view on it and then narrowing to specific circumstances if necessary. I chose this type of interview instead of a structured paper questionnaire because I decided I wanted to involve the respondents more. I wanted them to be able to expand on the extent of their abortion views and religiosity, without being confined to answer sets created by me. Indeed, an advantage of this method is that they *could* give more explanation so that I could understand their position better than I would have from a survey question. Abortion can be a complicated topic, so it is important to clarify with people the type of abortion they are envisioning and the circumstances they believe are appropriate for it to be legal. Having an open-ended question format also allowed them to demonstrate the salience of the issues in their minds. When they introduced a topic on their own, I could trust it was on the top of their mind whereas if they had circled it as a

survey question option, they would not necessarily have cared about it without my drawing attention to it. Disadvantages of this method revolve around the sample. Conducting interviews is time consuming, so I had a small sample size which was also biased from my selection (see below). Another disadvantage came from the coding involved in creating quantitative analysis. Recognizing which parts of their open ended responses classified under my categories was a subjective act that could not always be completely uniform.

Sample

My initial plan was to have a sample size of 40 by talking to 5 people in each of 8 locations, however, only 5 locations ended up being successful, so I finished with a sample size of 25. I wanted to draw a sample of students from a wide range of academic backgrounds (because academic study often leans in a political direction) and social identities (because they impact your lens on the world), so I tried to collect data from areas of campus where different academic concentrators would be and in common university areas where a broad mix of students would be. The Union MUG and the Ugli proved to be the most successful for finding respondents. I eventually found enough outside the fishbowl, but I was held up by being told by an employee that I was not allowed to approach people inside. I wanted to talk to people in Beanster's in the League because the Jewish population is known to hang out there (so this would get different faiths for my study) and Espresso Royale on State St because more art and music students hang out there, but when I visited each of these places, everyone was studying, and I did not have the heart to try and interrupt them. Instead, I talked to people eating at the League food court because I had had success at the other common university locations because I approached people who were eating (or reading *The Michigan Daily*). I successfully talked to

students (hopefully science majors) in the Chem building foyer, but I chose not to talk to anyone in the Business school lobby (as originally planned) because I realized the students were mostly MBA students whose age would not match my other respondents'. My last attempt was to talk to people at East Quad (which is known for having a different student population due to the Residential College residing there), but no one was outside because of the cold weather and no one was inside in the lounge (I assume because of finals).

Besides the location factor, I tried to get a sample mixed by gender and race—which I was successful in obtaining. However, my sample could have been limited (beyond the lack of academic variety discussed above) by my hand selection. I did not talk to anyone I knew because I did not want their knowledge of my positions to color their response. I did not talk to anyone around someone else because I did not want another person's presence to impact their response. While I tried to control bias by establishing a comfortable interviewing environment, my sample was limited because most people were around others—for study purposes or just socializing. The people in my sample size are those who were out in the public during my collection time, were by themselves and looking open to disruption, were hand selected by me, and who agreed to participate. (I had a few people tell me they did not have time to answer questions or did not want to.)

Besides the drawbacks of my sample, I must note that my study population is far from representing the general US population. I got a racially diverse population, but my small sample size made it impossible to get representatives from each gender in every race. Most respondents were between the ages of 18 and 22. Most respondents came from the middle class or above because you have to have money to come to an institution of secondary education, especially the

University of Michigan (which has a tuition similar to that of private schools), and even more so if you have to pay out-of-state tuition. 60% of University students are from the state of Michigan, so my respondent population was skewed with more people from the state of Michigan, a Midwest state, than other states. Because the Midwest is known to be more conservative (especially on moral issues), the sample could have made people more likely to be against abortion, but the University of Michigan is known as a more liberal school, so political leaning might have been balanced, though I cannot say my study represents the beliefs of the majority of the US population.

Ethical Issues

My informed consent statement was: “By consenting, you have read the information above and consent to participate in the study.” My project was confidential versus anonymous because I identified each respondent with a number so that his or her responses could be traced back for an individual analysis if necessary. It remained ethical because I never asked for any personal identification. My study posed no risks except potential personal emotional struggle if respondents had experienced hardship surrounding abortion or religion. One respondent did appear very uneasy when I asked him questions as he took full minutes in between his responses. Other respondents admitted that their current religious affiliation was something they had been struggling with since coming to college. My study could have been more harmful if given to vulnerable subjects such as pregnant women since the subject matter directly relates to them.

Data Collection Instrument

I devised an Interview Guide (see appendix) to assist when I individually talked to my respondents for about five minutes each. My operational definition of abortion was: the medical

surgery to stop a pregnancy. (This means that self-imposed abortion or attempt to miscarriage is not what I operated from, but was noted if brought up by respondents.) My operational definition of religion was: the belief in supernatural powers in the creation of the universe or influence over destiny. (This means that spirituality was not being considered, yet noted if respondents interpret “religion” that way.) My purpose was to simply discover respondents’ feelings on my two concepts and their personal demographic identifications.

I first asked the general, “How do you feel about abortion?”. Some respondents appeared confused or asked if I meant “pro-life or pro-choice.” In each situation, I replied, “Just your general view.” I hoped to see if respondents would note specific situations where the legality of abortion should be assured or circumstances when abortion should definitely be illegal. I left space on my form to record if they noted these things on their own initially. If they did not, I asked if they thought there were specific circumstances for legality or illegality. If they appeared confused, I suggested that some people had said rape.

I used the same procedure for measuring their religiosity: asking how religious they are then narrowing to specifics (attendance at religious services/independent religious study/faith) to get a greater understanding if they were not initially specific. I sometimes clarified with “so you would say you are somewhat religious” to make sure that how I would classify them later was acceptable to them. Because I asked their religiosity directly after I asked their views on abortion, I designated room on my form to note if respondents made justifications about their paradoxical identifications between the concepts. Only a few respondents did. Finally, I asked for their self-identification in the following categories: year in school, gender, age, socioeconomic status, race, and region where they are from. Some respondents were confused

because they thought I was asking, “You’re in school?” at first. Others said they struggle in designating where they fall along racial or regional lines. I directed: “however you self-identify.” An interesting observation if that most respondents thought gender was assumed and gave me a weird look when I asked for their identification (even though sociological theory says that gender should not be assumed because it is socially constructed).

In conducting my interviews, I tried to appear as unbiased as possible. When respondents were talking, I would look down at the paper where I was transcribing to avoid judgment being shown on my face. I maintained a friendly, approachable tone no matter what their responses were. As noted above, I tried to approach respondents in non-threatening environments (when they were alone/not busy) so that they could be as open and truthful as possible. I had created my guide to be semi-structured, but it was interesting because respondents gave fairly structured responses as if they were waiting for me to run down a list of questions. Perhaps this is due to a natural assumption of a structured format when asked to participate in an interview. Consequently, I did not gather a deep understanding of why they held their views on abortion.

Problems/Surprises in the Field

My study is limited due to the characteristics of the sample (see above) and the religious identification of respondents. A problem is that I was not consistent in how I asked for specification on legality/illegality issues during the first few interviews. Next time I would be sure to have a set next question in response to their answers. As far as sample, next time I would want to include Jewish and Muslim people, as well as any other different religion to see if other faiths confounded the results. My results are not necessarily reliable because different results might be obtained from talking to people of different faiths—or simply different individuals. I

do, however, believe that my results are valid (though not generalizable to my ideal population) because of the environment of comfort I established in my data collection. Some respondents noted how abortion is an ethical issue surrounded by controversy and disagreement. One guy would not commit to his views until I frankly asked him to. Some respondents admitted that they are not what they would consider “true Christians.” The order of my questions, with religiosity after views on abortion, might have caused self-questioning of religious commitment more so than if not asked to commit to a stance on a moral issue. This potentially amounted to respondents feeling the need to give disclaimers, but I still believe honesty was involved overall.

Results

My dependent variable (feelings on abortion) was measured by “abortionlevel.” Most respondents (16) felt its legality should depend on the situation, while 1 person thought it should never be legal and 8 felt it should always be legal.

abortionlevel					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Should never be legal	1	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Depends on the situation	16	64.0	64.0	68.0
	Should always be legal	8	32.0	32.0	100.0
	Total	25	100.0	100.0	

The “otherexception” variable also measured the dependent variable by showing a scale of exceptions for when abortion should be legal, from most negative feelings toward abortion to

most positive feelings. It was helpful because respondents were more spread out in their answers:

otherexception

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Abortion should always be illegal	1	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Exceptions exist but specifics not mentioned	3	12.0	12.0	16.0
	Mentioned only rape as legitimate exception	7	28.0	28.0	44.0
	Mentioned other legal exception besides rape	8	32.0	32.0	76.0
	Abortion should always be legal	6	24.0	24.0	100.0
	Total	25	100.0	100.0	

The “religionlevel” variable measured my independent variable (religiosity) through a scale of responses that were self-identified and/or interpreted by me, the interviewer. 48% of respondents were somewhat religious while 40% were not at all religious:

religionlevel

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	10	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Somewhat	12	48.0	48.0	88.0
	Interviewer identified as very religious	2	8.0	8.0	96.0
	Respondent identified as very religious	1	4.0	4.0	100.0
	Total	25	100.0	100.0	

The confounding variable was age. I later recoded responses to compare “under 20” to “20 or older” to create an approximately even sample for subgroup comparison:

age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-19	12	48.0	48.0	48.0
	20-21	9	36.0	36.0	84.0
	22+	4	16.0	16.0	100.0
	Total	25	100.0	100.0	

To best compare the relationship between the independent and dependant variables, they were recoded into new variables and compared through crosstabs and correlations. The variable “new abortion measure” was created from an “otherexception” recode of “strict on exceptions” versus “liberal on exceptions.” The “religionlevel” variable was recoded so that “not religious” was compared to any identification of religion: “religious in some sense.” (see codebook in appendix)

New abortion measure * Religion recode Crosstabulation

			Religion recode		Total
			Not religious	Religious in some sense	
New abortion measure	Strict on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count % within Religion recode	4 40.0%	7 46.7%	11 44.0%
	Liberal on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count % within Religion recode	6 60.0%	8 53.3%	14 56.0%
Total		Count % within Religion recode	10 100.0%	15 100.0%	25 100.0%

The crosstab shows that the majority of religious people (53%) and the majority of not religious people (60%) were both more liberal on abortion. My hypothesis was that more religious people would be more against abortion than non-religious people, and this is shown to some extent (47% v. 40%), but the relations of the independent and dependant variables had only a weak correlation at $-.066$. My hypothesis was proven correct, but only slightly and not to a significant amount:

Correlations

		New abortion measure	Religion recode
New abortion measure	Pearson Correlation	1	$-.066$
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.755
	N	25	25
Religion recode	Pearson Correlation	$-.066$	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.755	
	N	25	25

I also measured the effect of confounders. By layering the “abortion measure” v “religion recode” table with “younger v older” (the age variable recoded), I found that abortion views differed on whether respondents were under 20 or older:

New abortion measure * Religion recode * Younger v older Crosstabulation

Younger v older				Religion recode		Total
				Not religious	Religious in some sense	
Under 20	New abortion measure	Strict on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count	1	5	6
			% within Religion recode	25.0%	62.5%	50.0%
		Liberal on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count	3	3	6
			% within Religion recode	75.0%	37.5%	50.0%
	Total	Count	4	8	12	
		% within Religion recode	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
20 or older	New abortion measure	Strict on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count	3	2	5
			% within Religion recode	50.0%	28.6%	38.5%
		Liberal on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count	3	5	8
			% within Religion recode	50.0%	71.4%	61.5%
	Total	Count	6	7	13	
		% within Religion recode	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

75% of the “not religious” respondents who were under 20 had liberal views on abortion, while only 50% of the “20 or older” did. Of the religious respondents, 62.5% of those under 20 held stricter views on abortion while only 28.6% of the older religious people did. This shows that the aggregate relationship between religiosity and views on abortion differs when you single out age. My overall findings showed that religious people had slightly more negative views toward abortion whereas here, only the younger religious people had more negative views toward abortion. The difference was due to age, not religiosity.

Conclusions

My study population is limited because the demographics of students at the University of Michigan do not relate to the demographics of the country as a whole, because my sample was

not representative of all religious views, and because my sample was small in size. My results do show a support for my hypothesis, but only slightly. More religious people were against abortion than were non-religious people, but only through a weak correlation. Age was also shown to be confounding. To better generalize these results, I would have to interview more people with more varied social identities. I wish I had been uniform in asking their specifics for the extent of legality from the start. If I were going to do more research on this topic (besides having a larger and more representative sample size), I would like to explore political party identification as another possible confounding variable.

Appendix

- A. Blank Interview Guide
- B. Data codebook
- C. Informed Consent Form
- D. Additional statistical analysis printouts

Appendix A: SOC 310 Interview Guide

Place of observation: Union MUG Ugli first floor Outside fishbowl East Quad
 Chem building foyer Beanster's Espresso on State B-school lobby
 Respondent #: _____

1. How do you feel about abortion? (abortion = medical surgery to stop a pregnancy)

(If not voluntarily mentioned, probe on extent: rape, incest, length of time pregnant, legality of surgery, choice of mother, choice of father, etc.)

2. How religious are you? (religion = the belief in supernatural powers in the creation of the universe if influence over destiny)

(If not voluntarily mentioned, probe on extent: attendance at services, ownership of religious literature, readership of religious literature, participation in religious study groups, type of religion)

3. Other comments given by respondent that were not directed by interviewer? (ex. justification of religious position)

4. Self-identification of these categories ("however you identify it"):

Year in School: _____ Gender: _____
 Age: _____ SES: _____ Race: _____
 Region where from: _____

Appendix B: Data Codebook

All categories created based on responses. Options would potentially not be exhaustive for a different study population.

A. Variable Name: id
= Respondent #

B. Variable Name: abortionlevel
Summarized respondent thought on how she/he feels about abortion
0 = Should never be legal
1 = Depends on the situation
2 = Should always be legal

C. Variable Name: prochoice
When respondent mentioned abortion should be legal, she/he specifically mentioned “pro-choice” or believing in the “woman’s right to choose”?
0 = Abortion should not be legal
1 = Legal but no choice mention
2 = Mentioned prochoice

D. Variable Name: responsibility
When giving feelings on abortion or situations when should be legal/illegal, “responsibility” was mentioned?
Blank = Never came up
0 = Mentioned in negative sense: parents must take “responsibility” for their baby
1 = Suggested “responsibility” of society/laws to take care of baby

E. Variable Name: rape
Should abortion be legal when pregnancy occurred after a rape?
Blank = Never came up
0 = Not an okay exception
1 = Respondent said okay exception when suggestion posed
2 = Respondent said abortion should definitely be legal after a rape
3 = Should be legal because all abortion should be legal

F. Variable Name: youngmother
When giving feelings on abortion or situations when should be legal/illegal, mother’s/parents’ young age was mentioned?
Blank = Never came up
0 = Mentioned in negative sense: parents must take responsibility for their baby
1 = Mentioned as legitimate legal exception for abortion

G. Variable Name: littlemoney
When giving feelings on abortion or situations when should be legal/illegal, low economic status of parents was mentioned?

Blank = Never came up

0 = Mentioned in negative sense: parents must take responsibility for their baby

1 = Mentioned as legitimate legal exception for abortion

H. Variable Name: promiscuity

When giving feelings on abortion or situations when should be legal/illegal, promiscuity/irresponsibly having too much sex/lack of contraception was mentioned?

Blank = Never came up

0 = Mentioned in negative sense: parents must take responsibility for their baby

1 = Mentioned as legitimate legal exception for abortion (parents not meant to have baby, so shouldn't)

I. Variable Name: otherexception

When giving feelings on abortion or situations when should be legal/illegal, a legal exception was mentioned?

0 = Should be no exceptions; abortion should always be illegal

1 = Exceptions exist, but no specific ones were mentioned

2 = Mentioned only rape as legitimate legal exception for abortion

3 = Mentioned other legal exception besides rape [could be double up on question from earlier]

4 = Should always be legal

J. Variable Name: religionlevel

Summarized respondent thought on level of religiosity

1 = Not at all

2 = Somewhat

3 = Interviewer identified as very religious

4 = Respondent identified as very religious

K. Variable Name: specificpractice

0 = Not religious

1 = None mentioned

2 = Independent religious study

3 = Attended service with family but not here at school

4 = Attends service here at school

5 = Does more than one of the above

L. Variable Name: faith

Blank = Not given

0 = Not religious

1 = Other

2 = Buddhist

3 = Christian

4 = Catholic

M-R are based on self-identified categories. When they had confusion, I said “however you identify” or “however you interpret it”

M. Variable Name: yearinschool

- 1 = First Year
- 2 = Sophomore
- 3 = Junior
- 4 = Senior

N. Variable Name: gender

- 1 = female
- 2 = male

O. Variable Name: age

- 1 = 18-19
- 2 = 20-21
- 3 = 22+

P. Variable Name: ses

Socioeconomic status. When they did not understand that, I suggested “class,” “income,” or “family income”. If said “middle/upper,” they are coded under “upper.”

- 1 = Lower middle class
- 2 = Middle middle class
- 3 = Upper middle class

Q. Variable name: race

(Combined categories to have fewer options for frequencies)

- 1 = white/Caucasian/European
- 2 = black/African-American
- 3 = Hispanic
- 4 = Asian (Asian, Chinese, Korean, Japanese)
- 5 = Indian (Indian, South Asian)
- 6 = Filipino
- 7 = More than one race

R. Variable Name: region

- 1 = Michigan
- 2 = Other US
- 3 = Outside the US

S. Variable Name: exception recode = new abortion measure

To compare: highly against abortion v. more in favor of abortion

- 0 = Strict on exceptions when abortion should be legal
- 1 = Liberal on exceptions when abortion should be legal

Recode keys: 0→0, 1→0, 2→0, 3→1, 4→1

T. Variable Name: religion recode

To compare religiosity in extreme terms

1 = Not religious

2 = Religious in some sense

Recode keys: 1→1, 2→2, 3→2, 4→2

U. Variable Name: age recode

To see if age is confounding.

1 = Under 20

2 = 20 or older

Recode keys: 1→1, 2→2, 3→2

V. Variable Name: racerecode

To compare the dominant race versus those they subordinate.

1 = White people

2 = All people of color

Recode keys: 1→1, 2→2, 3-7→2

Appendix C: Informed Consent Form

Description of the activity

- This is a class project for Sociology 310: Research Methods measuring views on abortion.

Description of human subject involvement

- I would like to talk with you and ask you a few questions. It will take about 6-8 minutes.
- Answering the questions will not pose any risks to you as an individual - the questions are about topics that arise in everyday life.

Benefits

- There is no benefit to you for participating in my study, but I would appreciate your time.

Confidentiality of records/data

- All of your answers will be kept completely confidential.
- I will present the data by analyzing all of the responses together, so you don't have to worry about individual identification.

Voluntary Participation

- Your participation is completely **voluntary**.
- You may decide to stop participating at any time.
- You may skip or refuse to answer any question.

If you have questions or concerns, please e-mail xxx@xxx.

Consent

By consenting, you have read the information above and consent to participate in the study.

Appendix D: Additional Statistical Printouts

Frequencies

Statistics

	abortionlevel	prochoice	religionlevel	otherexce ption	yearinschool	gender	age	ses	race	region
N	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Valid	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	1.28	1.28	1.76	2.60	2.32	1.52	1.68	2.20	2.76	1.88
Std. Deviation	.542	.542	.779	1.118	1.180	.510	.748	.577	1.943	.781
Minimum	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	2	2	4	4	4	2	3	3	7	3

prochoice

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Abortion should never be legal	1	4.0	4.0	4.0
Legal but no choice mention	16	64.0	64.0	68.0
Mentioned choice	8	32.0	32.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

yearinschool

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
First year	9	36.0	36.0	36.0
Sophomore	4	16.0	16.0	52.0
Junior	7	28.0	28.0	80.0
Senior	5	20.0	20.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Female	12	48.0	48.0	48.0
Male	13	52.0	52.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

race

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
White	11	44.0	44.0	44.0
Black	3	12.0	12.0	56.0
Hispanic	1	4.0	4.0	60.0
Asian	4	16.0	16.0	76.0
Indian	4	16.0	16.0	92.0
Filipino	1	4.0	4.0	96.0
More than one race	1	4.0	4.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

ses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Lower middle class	2	8.0	8.0	8.0
	Middle middle class	16	64.0	64.0	72.0
	Upper middle class	7	28.0	28.0	100.0
	Total	25	100.0	100.0	

region

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Michigan	9	36.0	36.0	36.0
	Other US	10	40.0	40.0	76.0
	Outside the US	6	24.0	24.0	100.0
	Total	25	100.0	100.0	

Statistics

		abortionlevel	prochoice	religionlevel	otherexce ption	yearinschool	gender	age	ses	race	region
N	Valid	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mode		1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2

Crosstabs**abortionlevel * religionlevel Crosstabulation**

			religionlevel				Total
					Interviewer identified as very religious	Respondent identified as very religious	
			Not at all	Somewhat			
abortionlevel	Should never be legal	Count	0	1	0	0	1
		% within abortionlevel	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within religionlevel	.0%	8.3%	.0%	.0%	4.0%
	Depends on the situation	Count	6	8	2	0	16
		% within abortionlevel	37.5%	50.0%	12.5%	.0%	100.0%
		% within religionlevel	60.0%	66.7%	100.0%	.0%	64.0%
	Should always be legal	Count	4	3	0	1	8
		% within abortionlevel	50.0%	37.5%	.0%	12.5%	100.0%
		% within religionlevel	40.0%	25.0%	.0%	100.0%	32.0%
Total	Count	10	12	2	1	25	
	% within abortionlevel	40.0%	48.0%	8.0%	4.0%	100.0%	
	% within religionlevel	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

abortionlevel * Religion recode Crosstabulation

			Religion recode		Total
			Not religious	Religious in some sense	
abortionlevel	Should never be legal	Count	0	1	1
		% within Religion recode	.0%	6.7%	4.0%
	Depends on the situation	Count	6	10	16
		% within Religion recode	60.0%	66.7%	64.0%
	Should always be legal	Count	4	4	8
		% within Religion recode	40.0%	26.7%	32.0%
Total		Count	10	15	25
		% within Religion recode	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

abortionlevel * religionlevel Crosstabulation

			religionlevel				
					Interviewer identified as very religious	Respondent identified as very religious	
			Not at all	Somewhat			Total
abortionlevel	Should never be legal	Count	0	1	0	0	1
		% within religionlevel	.0%	8.3%	.0%	.0%	4.0%
	Depends on the situation	Count	6	8	2	0	16
		% within religionlevel	60.0%	66.7%	100.0%	.0%	64.0%
	Should always be legal	Count	4	3	0	1	8
		% within religionlevel	40.0%	25.0%	.0%	100.0%	32.0%
Total	Count	10	12	2	1	25	
	% within religionlevel	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

New abortion measure * Religion recode * White v people of color Crosstabulation

				Religion recode		Total
				Not religious	Religious in some sense	
White v people of color						
White people	New abortion measure	Strict on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count	2	2	4
			% within Religion recode	40.0%	33.3%	36.4%
		Liberal on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count	3	4	7
			% within Religion recode	60.0%	66.7%	63.6%
Total		Count	5	6	11	
		% within Religion recode	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
People of color	New abortion measure	Strict on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count	2	5	7
			% within Religion recode	40.0%	55.6%	50.0%
		Liberal on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count	3	4	7
			% within Religion recode	60.0%	44.4%	50.0%
Total		Count	5	9	14	
		% within Religion recode	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

New abortion measure * specificpractice Crosstabulation

			specificpractice					Total
			Not religious	Independent religious study	Attended service with family but not here	Attends service here	Does more than one of the above	
New abortion measure	Strict on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count	4	1	3	1	2	11
		% within specificpractice	40.0%	50.0%	60.0%	25.0%	50.0%	44.0%
	Liberal on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count	6	1	2	3	2	14
		% within specificpractice	60.0%	50.0%	40.0%	75.0%	50.0%	56.0%
Total		Count	10	2	5	4	4	25
		% within specificpractice	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

New abortion measure * faith Crosstabulation

			faith					Total
			Not religious	Other	Buddhist	Christian	Catholic	
New abortion measure	Strict on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count % within faith	3 37.5%	1 33.3%	0 .0%	1 50.0%	4 57.1%	9 40.9%
	Liberal on exceptions when abortion should be legal	Count % within faith	5 62.5%	2 66.7%	2 100.0%	1 50.0%	3 42.9%	13 59.1%
Total			Count % within faith	8 100.0%	3 100.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%	7 100.0%
				22 100.0%				

rape * Religion recode Crosstabulation

			Religion recode		Total
			Not religious	Religious in some sense	
rape	Not an okay exception	Count % within Religion recode	0 .0%	1 7.7%	1 5.0%
	Respondent said okay exception when suggestion posed	Count % within Religion recode	0 .0%	6 46.2%	6 30.0%
	Should definitely be legal after rape	Count % within Religion recode	4 57.1%	3 23.1%	7 35.0%
	All abortion is legal	Count % within Religion recode	3 42.9%	3 23.1%	6 30.0%
	Total	Count % within Religion recode	7 100.0%	13 100.0%	20 100.0%

Correlations

Correlations

		otherexce ption	religionlevel
otherexception	Pearson Correlation	1	.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.892
	N	25	25
religionlevel	Pearson Correlation	.029	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.892	
	N	25	25

Correlations

		abortionlevel	religionlevel
abortionlevel	Pearson Correlation	1	-.032
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.881
	N	25	25
religionlevel	Pearson Correlation	-.032	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.881	
	N	25	25