

North American Seventh-day Adventist Attitudes toward Torture and Military Combat Duty

Research Proposal

By

Jeff Boyd

December 29, 2009

Running Head: ADVENTIST ATTITUDES TOWARD TORTURE

North American Seventh-day Adventist Attitudes toward Torture and Military Combat Duty

Jeff Boyd

Andrews University

North American Seventh-day Adventist Attitudes toward Torture and Military Combat Duty

While Jesus taught love, even love of enemies, religiously active Christians in North America support torture more than their less religious neighbors and fellow citizens. Because the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) Church has traditionally shunned violent activities such as military combat duty and has instead promoted life-enhancing ideals such as the “health message” and Sabbath rest, the question arises whether church member attitudes toward torture are similar to or variant from the general Christian populace. Little is known about Adventists’ attitudes on this specific human rights issue. Does increased frequency of church attendance correlate positively with support for torture as it does for Christians in general, or are Adventists an anomalous denomination? Additionally, do characteristics such as gender, education level, and perceptions of God have a consistent interrelationship with attitudes toward torture? These are the questions which will be explored in this study.

Review of Literature

This review is divided into three primary sections. First, the legality of torture and its global context are briefly considered. Next, attitudes of North Americans toward torture are reviewed, including specific demographic sub-groups defined by gender, political affiliation and other characteristics. Most significantly, attitudes of Christians toward torture are analyzed. Finally, North American Seventh-day Adventist demographics and attitudes toward various human rights issues are addressed.

Torture—Definition and Global Context

Horne (2009) points out that torture has been difficult to adequately define in the legal arena. Because of the challenges inherent in operationally defining torture, the description

codified in the U.N. Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (Convention against Torture, UNCAT or CAT) is overly cumbersome.

It states:

[A]ny act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing him for an act he or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or coercing him or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to lawful sanctions. (“UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment,” 1987, p. 1)

In addition to the prohibitions outlined in UNCAT, torture is also banned by other international agreements such as the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Geneva Conventions (Articles 3 and 4), and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Bennoune, 2008; Ip, 2009; Ratner, 2008; Richards & Anderson, 2007). Legal statutes in the United States (e.g., Torture Victim Protection Act of 1991, US Torture Victims Protection Act of 1992, US War Crimes Act of 1996, Detainee Treatment Act of 2005, and Military Commissions Act of 2006) further protect the rights of detained individuals (Carson, 2008; Dominick, 2008; Mariana, 2008; Richards & Anderson, 2007).

While the “law in this area is clear: torture and various other forms of mistreatment are illegal,” public opinion is not so unequivocal (Ip, 2009, p. 36). The BBC reported on a survey

conducted in 25 countries which found 59% of respondents were against all torture, whereas “some 29 percent think that governments should be allowed to use torture in some cases” (Marcus, 2006, p. 19). Even though this study of 27,000 individuals around the world demonstrates that the majority of people are in fact against torture, a sizeable minority disagrees. Furthermore, in the real world beyond public opinion, “Amnesty International documented instances of torture and other cruel, degrading, or inhuman forms of treatment in 81 countries in 2007” (Hoffmeyer, 2008, p. 206).

North American Attitudes toward Torture

The attack on the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001, forced both the national government and citizens alike to face the ethical ramifications of fighting a “war on terror,” specifically regarding the use of counterterrorism methods such as torturing captured suspected terrorists. As U.S. government lawyers began to discuss the legalities of questionable interrogation techniques (e.g., waterboarding, stress positions, loud and constant music, etc.), the American people wrestled with these issues in culturally accessible venues such as the television shows *Battlestar Galactica* and *24* (Horne, 2009; Ip, 2009).

A number of opinion polls by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press (2009) between July 2004 and April 2009 revealed quite consistent attitudes toward the use of “torture to gain important information from suspected terrorists” (p. 1). A snapshot of results from April 2009 show that people believe torture is appropriate in this situation *often* (15%), *sometimes* (34%), *rarely* (22%), *never* (25%) and *don’t know* (4%).

This Pew Research Center question qualified the information being sought as *important*—“torture to gain *important* information.” Haider-Markel and Vieux (2008) study the significance of this qualifying adjective by presenting the basic question in four different

contexts or situations, where there is (a) a modest chance or (b) a strong chance that the suspect has information about either (c) a member of a group or (d) about an attack. This allowed Haider-Markel and Vieux to quantify the power of the context to shape attitudes toward torture. For example, scenarios that involved a *strong chance* of gaining information about an *attack* solicited higher support for torture for a number of the fifteen specific techniques surveyed as compared to scenarios where there was a *modest chance* that a suspect had information about a *member* of a terrorist group. However, the degree of attitude change was not equal toward each of the fifteen techniques being surveyed. For example, women's attitudes against especially harsh techniques such as sexual humiliation did not increase with more extreme scenarios, indicating these techniques are disapproved of regardless of the situation. Overall, this study demonstrates the power of phraseology or contextual frames in determining public attitudes toward torture, as well as the usefulness of evaluating various interrogation techniques rather than referencing the single term *torture*.

In a small meta-analysis that looked at 30 opinion polls in the United States between January 2001 and January 2009, Rejali and Gronke (2009) found that 56.14% of the approximately 30,000 respondents were opposed to the use of torture, while 39.43% supported it. Reviewing the discrepancies between polls, Rejali and Gronke conclude, "Apparently the more vaguely one words a question regarding coerced physical interrogation, the more approval one receives" (p. 8).

Richards and Anderson (2007) moved beyond a single attitude measure by soliciting opinions on 18 interrogation techniques. Respondents classified the techniques as either "acceptable in some cases" or "unacceptable in all cases" (p. 31). Of the 18 techniques, only five were deemed acceptable by more than half of participants—not allowing the suspect to sit or lie

down (64%), not allowing the suspect to sleep (60%), hooding the suspect for long periods of time (59%), humiliating the subject via degrading language (59%), and louse noise for long periods of time (55%). By contrast, the two most highly opposed techniques were sexually humiliating the suspect (89% disapproval) and sexually assaulting the subject (98% disapproval). Similarly, Rejali and Gronke (2009) report on two polls—PIPA/Knowledge Networks and ABC News/Washington Post—where sexual humiliation was the most opposed technique, 89% and 84% respectively.

Predictors of Attitudes toward Torture

In addition to gaining insights regarding views of specific forms of torture, researchers have also looked at characteristics of individuals who oppose or support torture, such as gender, age, political ideology, past violent experiences and other qualities. Regarding gender, The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press (2009) found that 51% of men and 47% of women “believe that the use of torture is at least sometimes justified.” This modest gender difference was more pronounced in a study by Crowson and DeBacker (2008), which found that women exhibited less support for the restriction of human rights and civil liberties than men. Furthermore, when reviewing 15 interrogation techniques in four different contexts, Haider-Markel and Vieux found that women opposed harsh techniques more strongly than men (2008). They also report that “women are consistently more likely to oppose violence in the media, violent punishment for wrongdoing, and the violence of war” (p. 8).

When considering opinions between people of various ages, the Pew Research Center (“Public Remains Divided over Use of Torture,” 2009) found differences to be “relatively small; however, a greater percentage of those 65 and older (33%) than those younger than 65 (23%) say torture should never be used” (p. 2). In a review of 15 different questionable methodologies,

Haider-Markel and Vieux (2008) discovered that “Older respondents were somewhat more likely to oppose several interrogation techniques, including withholding food or water, punching or kicking, and threatening with dogs” (p. 16).

Attitudes toward torture have also been correlated with education levels. Haider-Markel and Vieux (2008) found that “more educated respondents were more likely to oppose hooding detainees, punching or kicking, and electric shock. Educated respondents were also more likely to support the use of positive incentives” (p. 16). Similarly, “Those with a high school diploma or less education are somewhat more likely to say torture can be justified compared with those with at least some college” (“The Pew Forum,” 2009b, p. 1).

Regarding other demographics, it has been found that “Whites are slightly more likely than blacks to say that torture can be justified, and southerners are more likely to take this view compared with people in other regions” (“The Pew Forum,” 2009b, p. 1).

Crowson and DeBacker (2008) note that willingness to restrict rights and liberties has also been positively correlated with (a) the personal need for information to be clear, structured and simple, (b) experiential information processing that is rapid and nonverbal, (c) epistemological beliefs about the nature of knowledge wherein truth is passively received, (d) right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), and (e) political and religious conservatism. In their own research, Crowson and DeBacker found “men and individuals scoring high on authoritarianism and belief in simple knowledge were likely to support rights and liberties restrictions” (p. 305).

Trust has also been correlated with torture attitudes. A pattern of trust in Americans and a distrust of people in general is positively correlated with support for torture. Conversely, Americans who have a general trust in humanity but a lack of trust in Americans are less supportive of torture (Binning, 2007).

The relationship between political ideology and attitudes regarding torture has also been explored. According to the Pew Research Center (2009), Republicans tend to support torture more than Democrats. Sixty-four percent of Republicans were in favor of torturing suspected terrorists in order to gain important information either *often* or *sometimes*, compared to 36% of Democrats. Conversely, 35% of Republicans supported torture *rarely* or *never*, whereas nearly twice as many Democrats held these beliefs (60%). The most frequent Republican response was *sometimes* (49%) and for Democrats it was *never* (38%).

Similarly, though to a greater extreme, Richards and Anderson (2007) find that “a majority, 66%, of Republicans view the act of torture as acceptable in some cases, while a majority of Democrats, 77%, view it as never acceptable” (p. 38). As noted above, Crowson and DeBacker (2008) also found a positive correlation between acceptance of restricted human rights on the one hand and political and religious conservatism on the other. When studying attitudes toward 15 interrogation methods, “Republicans were more likely to support all harsh techniques, except electric shock” (Haider-Markel & Vieux, 2008, pp. 16, 23). In fact, “being Republican is the single most important predictor of attitudes toward torture” (p. 28).

A further line of investigation considers past experience with and exposure to violent situation. When comparing past violent experiences (either as victim or perpetrator) with current attitudes toward torture, Richards and Anderson (2007) found no significant relationships involving rape, assault, hazing or animal cruelty. However, they “found a very strong relationship between one’s attitudes towards the spanking of children, and one’s attitudes towards torture such that persons who believe spanking to be an appropriate punishment for a child were also very likely to be acceptant of torture” (p. 50).

The final area of Richards and Anderson's research looked at past *witnessing* of violence and current attitudes. They report that people who "witnessed violence as a child were shown to be more torture-averse than others who had not witnessed violence as a child" (p. 52).

Religion and Torture

An additional variable that has been studied in relation to torture, and one that is central to the present study, is religion. In 2006 the Pew Research Center released data from a nationwide survey of more than 2,000 adults which found that Catholics support torture more than protestant and secular populations (Carney, 2006). Fifty-six percent of Catholic participants felt torture of suspected terrorists is either *sometimes* or *often* justified, which is seven points higher than for both white Protestants and white evangelicals. Those most opposed to torture were secular responders; only 35% felt torture is *sometimes* or *often* justified. This group also had the highest percentage of *never* being in favor of torture (41%). By contrast, of the Catholic participants "only 26 percent said [torture] is 'never' justified, which is the official teaching of the church" (p. 1).

Two years later another Pew Research Center study focused on Southern evangelicals, finding this group to support torture more than evangelicals in the 2006 study, 57 percent and 49 percent respectively, as well as more than the total public (Banks, 2008). This study also looked at respondents' ethical thought processes and found that they relied on life experiences and common sense more than on Christian teachings or beliefs when forming opinions about torture, 44 percent and 28 percent respectively. The percentage asserting that torture is *never* or *rarely* justified jumped from 38 percent to 52 percent when the question was rephrased to reflect the golden rule—"The U.S. government should not use methods against our enemies that we would

not want used on American soldiers” (p. 1). This is consistent with Haider-Markel and Vieux’s (2008) findings that how the torture question is presented significantly alters responses.

In 2009 the Pew Research Center divided Christians into three groups according to frequency of church attendance and analyzed the torture opinions of each group (“The Pew Forum,” 2009a). Higher frequency of church attendance was positively correlated with more permissive views on torture. Justifying torture *sometimes* or *often* rose from 42 percent for those who seldom or never attend church to 51 percent for those attending monthly or a few times a year and to 54 percent for people attending at least weekly. Four sub-groups of Christians were also analyzed. Support for torture *sometimes* or *often* was lowest among unaffiliated believers (40%), next were white mainline Protestants (46%), then White non-Hispanic Catholics (51%), and finally White evangelical Protestants (62%). Despite these clear trends, political “party and ideology are much better predictors of views on torture than are religion and most other demographic factors” (“The Pew Forum,” 2009b, p. 1).

Researchers at the Baylor Institute for Studies of Religion have pursued a more in-depth analysis of Christian belief and practice in the United States by using a survey with nearly 400 items covering a broad spectrum of religious beliefs and practices (“Losing My Religion? No, Says Baylor Religion Survey,” 2006). Rather than divide Christians along denominational lines, the Baylor survey determines participants’ view of God—Authoritarian, Benevolent, Critical or Distant—based on beliefs regarding how *engaged* and how *angry* God is.

Baylor researchers found that “the type of God people believe in can predict their political and moral attitudes more so than just looking at their religious tradition” (“Losing My Religion? No, Says Baylor Religion Survey,” 2006, n.p.). For example, people “who believe in an Authoritarian God (Type A) are nearly twice as likely (23.4%) to believe that abortion is

always wrong” as compared to the American public (12.2%) (Bader et al., 2006, p. 31). Other correlation patterns between God-concepts and political/social issues are found on issues such as gay marriage, pornography, the death penalty, distribution of wealth and environmental concern.

Two political issues were correlated with the four views of God—(a) increased military spending and (b) increased government authority to fight terror. Attitudes on torture were not specifically addressed. Support for these two issues varied significantly for each category—Authoritarian (63% and 76%), Benevolent (55% and 63%), Critical (46% and 64%), and Distant (34% and 40%) (“America by the Numbers: What We Believe,” 2006). While these relationships are informative, the researchers did not directly address the question of torture. By combining Baylor’s 26 questions that define one’s perception of God with an assessment tool to determine attitudes toward torture, the present study will not only expand the understanding of Seventh-day Adventist opinions on torture, but will also shed new light on the relationship between views of torture and the four God-concepts.

Adventists Attitudes to Violence and Human Rights

Little is known about Seventh-day Adventist members’ beliefs on torture. Are Adventists similar to Catholics and southern evangelicals who support torture more strongly than the general public? Is frequency of church attendance associated with increased approval of torture as was found for other Christians? These are the primary questions the present study seeks to answer. This portion of the literature review will outline what is known about SDA attitudes toward war, violence and a range of social justice or human rights issues.

Adventist historian and educator, Doug Morgan, states emphatically that “the Seventh-day Adventist Church began as a peace church” (2007, p. 43). Similar to Quakers and Mennonites, early Adventist members refused to participate as combatants in the Civil War

despite their ethical and passionate support for saving the Union and defeating slavery. In 1865 two members were even disfellowshipped for enlisting in the war (Brock, 1991). From this sectarian, pacifist beginning, it might follow that Adventist views on violence and torture are quite different from dominant Christian views; however, Adventist military involvement has increased to the point that in 2006 there were some 7,500 combatants enlisted in the U.S. military (Lechleitner, 2006). Consequently, it is difficult to use this historical attitude to predict what SDA views may be. In addition to analyzing attitudes toward torture, this study will also assess current Adventist opinions toward combat duty.

In the area of political ideology, a factor that has been shown to be highly correlated with attitudes about torture, the early Adventist church insisted that as an organization it “must avoid party politics” (Morgan, 2001, p. 30). More recently, Roger Dudley, an Adventist theologian and researcher who has spent years studying the political views of North American church members, concluded that “Adventists identify highly with the Republican party” (Byrd, 2009). For example, a survey Dudley conducted in 2004 found that 44 percent of Adventists voters supported Bush while only 16 percent favored John Kerry.

Leading up to the November 2008 presidential election, Dudley surveyed over 1,000 students at six North American Adventist universities. He found that approximately 28 percent planned to vote for McCain and 38 percent supported Obama despite the fact that “more students consider themselves Republican than Democrat” (Byrd, 2009). If the correlation between political affiliation and support for torture holds true within Adventism, we may expect to find more support for torture among Adventists than the general public unless there are other more powerful mediating factors.

In 1992, Valuegenesis, a research project analyzing the beliefs and practices of Adventist young people, was launched across North America. This study revealed a number of insights that relate to the current study on torture. First, Adventist young people report high levels of religiosity; they are “nearly twice as likely to emphasize the importance of religious faith as are those in mainline Protestantism” (Dudley & Gillespie, 1992, p. 21). This indicates that Adventists may be qualitatively different from other Christians, meaning trends and correlations previously highlighted may not hold true for Adventist populations. Second, strong attitudes toward racial and gender equality lead the researchers to conclude that “Adventist youth have developed keen powers of moral judgment and a sense of social justice” (p. 28). How this “sense of justice” is translated into thought on torture is uncertain. Third, considering the area of social justice and politics more broadly, only 31 percent of respondents said they “try to apply [their] faith to political and social issues” (p. 62). This low percentage could possibly lead to greater support of torture. Fourth, while there was support for social justice, most participant time and energy was spent on acts of local volunteerism. Altruistic activities (i.e., acts of service) were quite common; for example, “helping people who are poor, hungry, sick, or unable to care for themselves” (52%), “helping friends or neighbors” (86%), “promoting social equality” (36%), and making their “own town or city a better place to live” (44%) (p. 134). Even higher than most of these reports of service were attitudes to social justice—83 percent agreed that “young people should be taught how to help make society more kind and just,” and 63 percent said they “would favor a good plan to help the poor, even if it cost [them] money” (p. 137).

These and other findings from the Valuegenesis project led Dudley (1992) to conclude, “We need to help young people to realize that a vibrant, mature faith not only prepares for a world to come but also assumes a responsibility for making this one better” (p. 280). How well

the church has done this, and how this worldview influences attitudes toward torture is unclear. This may depend on whether the supposed safety derived from torturing suspected terrorists is believed to constitute a better world or a morally comprised world.

Seventh-day Adventists have also supported pro-life issues and activities such as healthy lifestyles, medical missions, disaster relief, international development, peacemaking and quality education (McGill, 2009; Morgan, 2005, 2001; Plantak, 1998). However, I was unable to find documentation of links between these topics and attitudes on torture, so they have little predictive value for the current study.

From the preceding review, it can be seen that much research has focused on attitudes toward culture, including specific groups such as Catholics and southern Protestants. Moreover, numerous variables have been studied in conjunction with torture to ascertain the relationships between these variables. However, I was unable to locate any research regarding Adventist views on torture. Furthermore, views of God have not been studied in relation to torture, which means the proposed study should shed light on both of these important questions.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to investigate the attitudes of adult North American Seventh-day Adventist Church members toward torture and military combat duty. The information gained from this study will be useful to church pastors, educators and administrators because it will enable them to critically assess the effectiveness of church ministries in shaping attitudes toward human rights and love for others.

Sub-problems

Six sub-problems will be addressed by the current study.

1. The first sub-problem is the correlation between frequency of church attendance and attitudes toward torture.
2. The second sub-problem is the connection between religious conservatism and attitudes toward torture.
3. The third sub-problem is the relationship between years of attending SDA schools and attitudes toward torture.
4. The fourth sub-problem is the connection between gender and attitudes toward torture.
5. The fifth sub-problem is the correlation between political ideology and attitudes toward torture.
6. The sixth sub-problem is the relationship between one's view of God and one's attitude toward torture.

Hypotheses

There are four research hypotheses that will guide this study. Each of these hypotheses will be tested in its null form.

1. Those who attend church more frequently will support torture more than other participants.
2. There will be a positive correlation between religious conservatism and support for torture.
3. Men will exhibit more support for torture than women.
4. Politically conservative Adventists will support torture more than other Adventists.

Research Questions

There are two research questions that will also guide this study:

1. Will the amount of years in SDA education correlate with views toward torture?
2. Will there be a correlation between one's view of God and one's attitudes toward torture?

Definition of Terms

The following five concepts are operationally defined for the current study:

1. *Torture* is left undefined in the question used by the Pew Research Center (2009a). I will use this same question for comparison purposes: “Do you think the use of torture against suspected terrorists in order to gain important information can often be justified, sometimes be justified, rarely be justified, or never be justified? Additionally, respondents will also state their attitudes toward 18 interrogation techniques as outlined by Richards and Anderson (2007).
2. Consistent with the Pew Research Center (2009a), *church attendance* will be assessed according to three categories—attend religious services (a) at least weekly, (b) monthly or a few times a year, or (c) seldom or never.
3. *Religious conservatism* will be measured using an eight-point Likert scale “ranging from 1 (extremely liberal) to 8 (extremely conservative),” as done by Crowson and DeBacker (2008, p. 300).
4. *Political ideology* will be operationally defined in two ways. Consistent with Crowson and DeBacker (2008), participants will rate themselves on an eight-point Likert scale “ranging from 1 (extremely liberal) to 8 (extremely conservative)” (2008, p. 300). Also, participants will be asked to classify themselves as (a) Strong Republican, (b) Moderate Republican, (c) Leaning Republican, (d) Independent, (e) Leaning Democrat, (f) Moderate Democrat, (g) Strong Democrat, and (h) Other (please specify), in line with the Baylor Religion Survey (Bader et al., 2006).
5. *View of God* (benevolent, authoritarian, distant and critical) will be determined using the Baylor Religion Survey’s 26 “questions about God’s character and behavior” (Bader et al., 2006, p. 26).

Delimitations of Study

1. This is neither a comprehensive nor exhaustive treatment of this topic.
2. Only current adult members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in North America will participate in the study.
3. Of the many ways to define religiosity, this study uses only two measures (church attendance and views of God).

Assumptions of the Study

1. People will self-report accurately.
2. The chosen measures adequately define one's opinions on God, politics and torture.
3. Current Seventh-day Adventist members do actually believe in God.
4. Adventists can be studied as a unique sub-group within North American culture.
5. The sample of Adventists is representative of the North American Adventist population.

Importance of Study

The results of this study can be used by church pastors and administrators to evaluate the effectiveness of the church in teaching Jesus' message of love and forgiveness. Furthermore, Adventist educators can use the results to assess the efficacy of the classroom in teaching these same themes. Social studies, ethics and religious curricula can be adapted to help students think through these complicated issues in a world where such topics can no longer be ignored.

Method

Participants

Participants will include a maximum of 1,586 adult members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the United States and Canada (61 churches x 26 participants). Sixty-one of

the 6,134 churches in the North American Division (NAD) of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, which covers both Canada and the United States, will be selected by choosing every 100th church listed in the SDA Yearbook. Pastors at each of the 61 churches will be contacted and asked to participate. When a pastor agrees to participate, he will be sent a packet with 26 surveys and consent forms. The pastor will distribute a survey and consent form to the first adult church member listed under each letter of the church's directory. For churches that do not have members listed under every letter, for example Q, X or Z, those surveys will be discarded and the church will have less than 26 participants. Each person receiving the survey may complete the questionnaire or decline and throw it away. Those that complete the survey will mail it back to me at Andrews University in a self-addressed, stamped envelope which will be provided.

Respondents will not receive any incentive or compensation for completing the questionnaires. All participants will be treated in accordance with the Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct of the American Psychological Association.

Materials

Questions from multiple sources will be combined on one survey (Appendix B). After providing demographic information (e.g., age, geographic location, education, income, ethnicity, etc.), participants will answer questions about their attitudes toward torture consistent with questions by the Pew Research Center (2009a) and Richards and Anderson (2007). This section will also include a question regarding attitudes toward participation in the military.

Next, political ideology will be assessed in the same manner as Crowson and DeBacker (2008). Participants will rate themselves on an eight-point Likert scale "ranging from 1 (extremely liberal) to 8 (extremely conservative)" (2008, p. 300). Similarly, participants will also be asked to classify themselves as (a) Strong Republican, (b) Moderate Republican, (c) Leaning

Republican, (d) Independent, (e) Leaning Democrat, (f) Moderate Democrat, (g) Strong Democrat, and (h) Other (please specify), in line with the Baylor Religion Survey (Bader et al., 2006).

The final portion of the survey will assess religiosity. Consistent with the Pew Research Center (2009a), church attendance will be assessed according to three categories—attendance at religious services (a) at least weekly, (b) monthly or a few times a year, or (c) seldom or never. Religious conservatism will be measured using an eight-point Likert scale “ranging from 1 (extremely liberal) to 8 (extremely conservative),” as done by Crowson and DeBacker (2008, p. 300). View of God (benevolent, authoritarian, distant and critical) will be determined using the Baylor Religion Survey’s 26 “questions about God’s character and behavior” (Bader et al., 2006, p. 26).

This package of questions has not been combined in this manner previously. Consequently, the inventory has not been tested for validity or reliability.

Design and Procedure

This quantitative study will utilize a correlational design. As described above, every 100th church in the list of approximately 6,100 churches in the NAD will be selected to participate. A maximum of 26 individuals will be chosen from each of these churches, based on the first letter of their last name. That is, the first adult in each letter of the church directory will be invited to complete the questionnaire. Those who do agree to participate will complete the survey and return it in a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Responses will be tallied for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

Gender attitudes toward torture will be analyzed using an independent sample t-test. In order to calculate average responses for each gender, the torture attitude scale will be converted to a number scale (never justified=1, rarely justified=2, sometimes justified=3, often justified=4).

Frequency of church attendance will be analyzed in two ways. First, those with common attitudes toward torture will be grouped and displayed as simple percentages, consistent with the report by the Pew Research Center (“The Pew Forum,” 2009a). Additionally, torture scores will be converted to a mathematical scale described above to enable a correlational analysis using a Pearson’s *r*. Church attendance will be converted to a three-point scale for this calculation (attend seldom or never =1, attend monthly or a few times a year=2, attend at least weekly=3).

Three scores will also be correlated to torture scores in the same way as described above for church attendance using a Pearson’s *R*—(a) the number of years in SDA education, (b) religious conservatism (scale ranging from extremely liberal=1 to extremely conservative=8), and (c) political conservatism (scale ranging from extremely liberal=1 to extremely conservative=8). The other political assessment, which uses discrete categories ranging from “Strong Republican” to “Strong Democrat,” will be used to form a bar graph. This visual display of opinions will not be analyzed beyond simple percentage for each category.

Finally, one’s view of God (benevolent, authoritarian, distant or critical) will be analyzed in two ways. First, bar graphs will show how many participants in each of these four categories believe torture is often, sometimes, rarely or never justified. Second, converting these four responses into scores as described above will enable the calculation of a single average for each of the four views.

All responses will be entered into SPSS 11.0 for statistical analysis. Furthermore, all research hypotheses and research questions will be tested in their null form, as follows:

1. Frequency of church attendance has no correlation with attitudes toward torture.
2. Religious conservatism has no correlation with attitudes toward torture.
3. Political conservatism has no correlation with attitudes toward torture.
4. Gender has no correlation with attitudes toward torture.
5. The number of years in SDA education has no correlation with attitudes toward torture.
6. Views of God have no correlation with attitudes toward torture?

Results

Because past research has found a positive correlation between conservative political ideology and increased support for torture and North America Adventists tend to be politically conservative, it follows that on average Adventists may support torture more than the general population. However, it is quite possible that other factors may disrupt this correlation. Consequently, it is more than a little challenging to predict the outcomes of this research project.

Discussion

The Adventist church supports quality of life through healthy lifestyles and healthy relationships. However, it is possible that some ethical questions that Adventists deal with in the political sphere are not adequately addressed by the church, leaving members to form their opinions on information from public media rather than the Bible. The current study will look at one such issue—torture—and analyze the attitudes of church members. Adventist pastors and educators can use the results of the study to determine if they are satisfied with the ethical reasoning of church members. If they are unsatisfied, teachings and curricula addressing human rights and social justice can be developed.

References

- America by the Numbers: What We Believe. (2006, October 23). *Time Multimedia*. Retrieved December 25, 2009, from http://www.time.com/time/covers/20061030/what_we_believe/.
- Bader, C., Dougherty, K., Froese, P., Johnson, B., Mencken, F. C., Park, J. Z., et al. (2006, September). American Piety in the 21st Century: New Insights to the Depth and Complexity of Religion in the US. *Institute for Studies of Religion*. Retrieved December 17, 2009, from <http://www.isreligion.org/research/surveysofreligion/surveysofreligion.pdf>.
- Banks, A. M. (2008, September 11). Poll Shows Support for Torture among Southern Evangelicals. *The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life: Religion News*. Retrieved December 23, 2009, from <http://pewforum.org/news/rss.php?NewsID=16465>.
- Bennoune, K. (2008). Terror/Torture. *Berkeley Journal of International Law*, 26(1), 1-61.
- Binning, K. R. (2007). "It's Us against the World": How Distrust in Americans versus People-In-General Shapes Competitive Foreign Policy Preferences. *Political Psychology*, 28(6), 777-799.
- Brock, P. (1991). *Freedom from Violence: Sectarian Nonresistance from the Middle Ages to the Great War*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Byrd, A. (2009, January 7). Adventist College Students and Politics. *Spectrum Magazine*. Retrieved December 24, 2009, from http://www.spectrummagazine.org/articles/spectrum_interview/2009/01/05/adventist_coll_ege_students_and_politics.
- Carney, T. (2006, March 24). Americans, Especially Catholics, Approve of Torture. *National*

- Catholic Reporter*. Retrieved December 20, 2009, from http://www.natcath.com/NCR_Online/archives2/2006a/032406/032406h.htm.
- Carson, C. R. (2008). The Military Commissions Act of 2006: How Its Inability to Curb Abusive Interrogations Threatens the Future Treatment of Detainees and the United States' Reputation. *Emory Law Journal*, 57(3), 695-733.
- Crowson, H. M., & DeBacker, T. K. (2008). Belief, Motivational, and Ideological Correlates of Human Rights Attitudes. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 148(3), 293–310.
- Dominick, M. (2008). The US Alien Tort Claims Act of 1789, the US Torture Victims Protection Act of 1992, and the Gongadze Case: A Right without Adequate Remedy? *Human Rights Review*, 9, 545-547.
- Dudley, R. L., & Gillespie, V. B. (1992). *Valuegenesis: Faith in the Balance*. Riverside, CA: La Sierra University Press.
- Haider-Markel, D. P., & Vieux, A. (2008). Gender and Conditional Support for Torture in the War on Terror. *Politics and Gender*, 4, 5-33.
- Hoffmeyer, J. (2008). Torture: Thinking About It, Working Against It. *Dialog: A Journal of Theology*, 47(3), 206-207.
- Horne, A. (2009). Torture--A Short History of Its Prohibition and Re-emergence. *Judicial Review*, 14(2), 155-169.
- Ip, J. (2009). Two Narratives of Torture. *Northwestern Journal of International Human Rights*, 7(1), 35-77.
- Lechleitner, E. (2006, September 22). Is the Adventist Stance on Noncombatancy Shifting? Adventist News Network. Retrieved November 13, 2009, from

<http://news.adventist.org/2006/09/a-feature-is-the-avetist-stace-o-ocombatacy-shiftig.html>.

Losing My Religion? No, Says Baylor Religion Survey. (2006, September 11). *Baylor University News*. Retrieved December 6, 2009, from

<http://www.baylor.edu/pr/news.php?action=story&story=41678>.

Marcus, J. (2006, October 19). Heated debate over use of torture. *BBC News Online*. Retrieved December 22, 2009, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/6063800.stm>.

Mariana, P. (2008). Assessing the Proper Relationship between the Alien Tort Statute and the Torture Victim Protection Act. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 156(5), 1383-1438.

McGill, N. (2009, November 19). Adventist Global Campaign against Domestic Violence Launched in Three World Territories. *Adventist News Network*. Retrieved December 25, 2009, from <http://news.adventist.org/2009/11/adventist-global-cam.html>.

Morgan, D. (2007). The Beginnings of a Peace Church: Eschatology, Ethics, and Expedience in Seventh-day Adventist Responses to the Civil War. *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 45(1), 35-43.

Morgan, D. (2001). *Adventism and the American Republic: The Public Involvement of a Major Apocalyptic Movement*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

Morgan, D. (Ed.). (2005). *The Peacemaking Remnant: Essays and Historical Documents*. Silver Spring, MD: Adventist Peace Fellowship.

Plantak, Z. (1998). *The Silent Church: Human Rights and Adventist Social Ethics*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Public Remains Divided Over Use of Torture. (2009, April 24). The Pew Research Center for the

- People and the Press. Retrieved December 22, 2009, from <http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/510.pdf>.
- Ratner, S. R. (2008). Geneva Conventions. *Foreign Policy*, (165), 26-32.
- Rejali, D., & Gronke, P. (2009, May 2). U.S. Public Opinion on Torture, 2001-2009. Retrieved December 20, 2009, from <http://people.reed.edu/~gronkep/TortureWhitePaperV2.pdf>.
- Richards, D. L., & Anderson, M. R. (2007). What Do U.S. Citizens Really Think About Torture, and Why? (pp. 1-61). Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved December 21, 2009, from http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/2/0/9/6/6/pages209669/p209669-1.php.
- The Religious Dimensions of the Torture Debate. (2009, April 29). *The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life: Publications*. Retrieved December 23, 2009, from <http://pewforum.org/docs/?DocID=156>.
- The Torture Debate: A Closer Look. (2009, May 7). *The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life: Publications*. Retrieved December 23, 2009, from <http://pewforum.org/docs/?DocID=417>.
- UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. (1987, June 26). Retrieved December 23, 2009, from <http://www.hrweb.org/legal/cat.html>.

APPENDIX A

IRB FORM

Application for Approval



Institutional Review Board

Research Involving Human Subjects

Office of Scholarly Research

Tel: 269-471-6360 ~ Fax: 269-471-6246

INSTRUCTIONS:

Your application will not be processed unless ALL the relevant documentation has been submitted and is legible.

Use this form as a cover sheet and attach to it the following items: (1) An **Abstract**; (2) the appropriate **Research Protocol**; (3) an **Informed Consent Form** (if required); and, (4) **Letter of Institutional Consent** (Permission from local authority); and, (5) **Survey Instrument**; and, (6) Other documentation as needed—**Cover Letter of Explanation; Written Copy of Verbal Instructions**, etc. Submit the required number of full sets (**1 set for Exempt; 5 sets for Expedited; and 9 sets for Full Review**) to Andrews University, Institutional Review Board, Room 210 Administration Building, Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0355.

SUGGESTED CATEGORY OF IRB REVIEW

The investigator(s) should carefully read the **Brief Guidelines for Human Subjects Research** and discuss with his/her/their advisor and/or department chair the relationship of the present research project to the policies and procedures contained in the above document. The investigator(s) should then request that the research project be considered by the **I.R.B.** under one of the categories listed below. Final assignment of the review category is made by the **I.R.B.** The frequency of **I.R.B.** review action is noted by the respective review category.

Exempt from Full IRB Review [Weekly Review]

No risk/minimal risk research:
Exempt Category Checklist on page 2.

Expedited IRB Review [Monthly Review]

Full IRB Review [Monthly Review]

Submit the appropriate documentation two weeks prior to the next Scheduled meeting of the IRB.

DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH PROJECT

Please provide the requested information in the shaded space on the right.

Project Title →	Adventist Attitudes toward Torture
Academic Dept. of Researcher →	International Development Program
Desired beginning date of Research →	May 2010
Place/Location of Human Subject Involvement in Research →	At six SDA camp meetings across the North American Division
Target Population (Group and Age Range) →	Adult SDA Church members (age 18 and up)

INVESTIGATOR(S) AGREEMENT

Please note that if we cannot read your handwriting, we cannot guarantee that you will get a response from us.

"I (we) hereby agree to abide by the terms and methodology as outlined in the attached research protocol. I (we) also agree to begin the implementation of this project—if not approved under the exempt category—only after written notification of its approval (valid for one year) has been received. Furthermore, I (we) agree that in cases involving research to be conducted at non-university site(s), such research will commence only after written authorization has been received from an officer of the organization at each site involved and filed with our Office of Scholarly Research. Notification of any alterations in the attached protocol will be submitted to the Director of the Office of Scholarly Research.

Full Name(s) of Investigators	E-mail Address of Investigators	Mailing Address of Investigators	Signature of Investigator(s)	Signature Dated	Telephone # of Investigators
Jeff Boyd	boyd@andrews.edu	4550 W. Hillcrest Dr. Berrien Springs, MI 49103		12/29/09	269-277-0722
Name of Advisor	E-mail Address of Advisor	Mailing Address of Advisor	Signature of Advisor	Signature Dated	Telephone # of Advisor
---	---	---	---	---	---

— EXEMPT CATEGORY CHECKLIST —

If your proposed research project does not place the subjects at **more** than minimal risk and is included in one of six categories of research which are exempt from full review under the provisions of the Cod of Federal Regulations for the protection of human subjects from research risk, indicate the category(s) that apply to the proposed project placing a check in the appropriate box below.

Even if exempt from full IRB review, all research projects must make provision for compliance with published guidelines for obtaining informed consent and maintaining confidentiality. Some research listed below, if involving prisoners and/or directed toward pregnant women or other vulnerable populations is not exempt.

1	<p>Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Research on regular and special education instruction strategies, (or) (b) Research on the effectiveness of, or the comparison among, instructional techniques, curricula, or management only.
2 X	<p>Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey or interview procedures, or observation of public behavior UNLESS ALL of the following conditions exist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Responses are recorded in such a manner that the subjects can be identified directly or through identifying links, and— (b) The responses, if they become known outside the research, could reasonably place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subject's financial standing, employability, or reputation. <p>Note: The following types of Category 2 Exemptions do NOT apply to research where children (minors) are subjects: Survey Research, Interview Research, Observation of Public Behavior in which an investigator is a participant.</p>
3	<p>Research of the type listed in Category 2 which under the above provisions is not exempt but qualifies for exemption if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office, or (b) Federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.
4	<p>Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens and these sources are publicly available, or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a way that the subjects CANNOT be identified directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.</p>

5	Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of federal department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Public Benefit or Service Programs (b) Procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs (c) Possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures (d) Possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.
6	Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies if wholesome foods without additives are consumed, or if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe or agricultural, chemical, or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe by FDA or EPA or USDA determination.

In signing this form requesting exempt status, I (we) assure the Institutional Review Board that the only involvement of human subjects will comply fully with the criteria for one of the above exemption categories.							
Principal Investigator's Signature	Dated	Co-Principal Investigator's Signature	Dated	Co-Principal Investigator's Signature	Dated	Co-Principal Investigator's Signature	Dated

Abstract

The aim of this study is to explore North American Seventh-day Adventist attitudes toward torture. While Jesus taught love, even love of enemies, religiously active Christians in North America actually support torture more than their less religious neighbors and fellow citizens. Because the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) Church has traditionally shunned violent activities such as military combat duty and has instead promoted life-enhancing ideals such as the “health message” and Sabbath rest, the question arises whether church member attitudes toward torture are similar to or variant from the general Christian populace. Little is known about Adventists’ attitudes on this specific human rights issue. Does increased frequency of church attendance correlate positively with support for torture as it does for Christians in general, or are Adventists an anomalous denomination? Additionally, do characteristics such as gender, education level, and perceptions of God have a consistent interrelationship with attitudes toward torture? These are the questions which will be explored in this study.

Research Protocol

1. This is a study of Adventist beliefs regarding torture of suspected terrorists. Surveys will be sent to participants at 61 churches, representing 1% of churches in the North America Division. The project will occur from June 2010 until September 2010.
2. Subjects must be SDA Church members and be over the age of 18.
2. Pastors of the 61 churches will receive packets including 26 surveys and 26 consent forms. Pastors will distribute one survey to each adult listed first under each letter in the church directory. Selected participants who choose not to participate may discard the surveys but may not give them to others to complete.
3. Individual participants will not receive any benefit by participating in the study. SDA pastors, administrators and educators can use the information to determine if they are successfully training church members to think ethically about social justice and human rights issues.
5. Participants will retain their copy of the consent form. This form clearly states that by submitting the survey, they give consent for the data to be used in the study.
6. Participants will not face any risks, though they will be asked to think about politically, socially and morally charged questions.

Informed Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Andrews University
International Development Program

Study of Adventist Views on Human Rights
Jeff Boyd

**KEEP THIS CONSENT FORM.
DO NOT RETURN WITH THE SURVEY.**

You are being invited to take part in a research study conducted by a student at Andrews University. This consent form will give you a description of the study. If you have more questions, please contact Jeff Boyd, the primary researcher, for more information.

Description of the Project:

You are being asked to participate in a research study that will look at the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventists regarding the rights of detainees in the War on Terror.

Procedures:

You have been asked to participate because you are the first adult listed under the letter of your last name in the church director (example, Larry Acton listed under "A"). If you decide to take part in this study, please complete the enclosed four-page questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. You will retain this Consent Form.

By submitting the completed questionnaire, you give consent for your responses to be included in the study. The survey will take 10-15 minutes to complete. If you choose not to participate, you may dispense with this survey. Please do not give it to anyone else to complete.

Risks or Discomfort:

No risks or discomfort are foreseen as a result of participating in this study, other than those associated with considering ethical issues relating to the treatment of detainees.

Benefits of This Study:

Although there will be no direct compensation or benefit to you as a result of being in this study, the researcher hopes to learn more about the attitudes of North American Adventists toward the military and treatment of detainees.

Confidentiality:

The information you share on the questionnaire will be anonymous and will be treated with confidentiality. There will be no way for the researchers to know your name.

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal:

Your participation in this study is voluntary. Any refusal to participate in filling out the questionnaires will involve no penalty. If you should choose to change your mind about your participation in the study, you have the right to stop at any time. If there are questions on the survey that you would rather not answer, you may skip them. Whatever you decide, you will not be penalized.

Questions, Rights and Complaints:

If you have any questions or concerns about this research project, please feel free to contact Jeff Boyd, the primary researcher in this study, at Andrews University. He may be reached by phone at (269) 471-8380 or by e-mail at boyd@andrews.edu.

Consent Statement:

By signing this document, which you will keep, and by mailing the survey, you give consent to participate in the Study of Adventist Views on Human Rights being led by Jeff Boyd, graduate student in the Andrews University International Development Program.

This statement certifies the following: that you are 18 years of age or older and have read the consent and all your questions have been answered. You understand that you may withdraw from the study at any time.

All of the answers you provide will be anonymous. You have the right to see the results prior to publication.

Signature of Participant

Printed Name

Date

Survey Instrument

See Appendix B for the survey instrument.

APPENDIX B
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. Gender (circle one): M / F
2. In what year were you born? _____
3. What is your race/ethnicity (select one)?
 - White
 - Black or African-American
 - Hispanic
 - Asian
 - American American or Alaska Native
 - Other _____
4. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed (select one)?
 - 8th grade or less
 - 9th-12th grade (no high school diploma)
 - High school graduate (12)
 - Some college
 - Trade/Technical/Vocational Training
 - College graduate
 - Master's degree
 - Professional degree (J.D., M.D., Ph.D., etc.)
5. Into which of the following groups did your family's 2009 income, from all sources, fall (select one)?
 - \$10,000 or less
 - \$10,001 - \$20,000
 - \$20,001 - \$35,000
 - \$35,001 - \$50,000
 - \$50,001 - \$100,000
 - \$100,001 - \$150,000
 - \$150,001 or more
6. In which of the North American regions do you live (circle one)?
Northwest / Southwest / North central / South central / Northeast / Southeast

7. Which sentence best describes your belief regarding morally acceptable participation of Seventh-day Adventists in military service (select one)?
- Adventist should never enter the military. This includes avoiding drafts.
 - Adventists should never enlist, but may serve in noncombatant roles (medics, chaplains, etc.) if drafted.
 - Adventists may enlist as noncombatants (medics, chaplains, etc.).
 - Adventist may only participate as combatants if drafted during a just war.
 - Adventist may participate as combatants if drafted.
 - Adventists may enlist as combatants during a just war.
 - Adventists may enlist as combatants at any time.
8. Do you think the use of torture against suspected terrorists in order to gain important information can often be justified, sometimes be justified, rarely be justified, or never be justified (select one)?
- Often be justified
 - Sometimes be justified
 - Rarely be justified
 - Never be justified
9. As part of the U.S. campaign against terrorism, please state whether you think each item below is acceptable in some cases as a method of getting information from prisoners, or is unacceptable in all cases (check one per line).

	Acceptable in some cases	Unacceptable in all cases	I don't know/ I have no opinion
Not allowing the suspect to sleep.			
Not allowing the suspect to sit or lie down.			
Withholding food and/or water.			
Threatening to harm the suspect's family members.			
Applying electric shocks to the suspect.			
Making the suspect go naked.			
Bombarding the suspect with loud noise for long periods of time.			
Holding the suspect's head under water.			
Threatening to shoot the suspect.			
Keeping a hood over the suspect's head for long periods of time.			
Sexually humiliating the suspect.			
Exposing the suspect to extreme heat or cold.			
Punching or kicking the suspect.			
Threatening the suspect with a dog.			
Making the subject face a mock execution.			
Beating the subject short of breaking bones, but causing bruising			
Humiliating the subject through the use of degrading language			
Sexually assaulting the subject			

10. How *politically* conservative or liberal do you consider yourself (1=extremely liberal & 8=extremely conservative) (circle one number)?

1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8
Extremely Liberal *Extremely Conservative*

11. How would you describe yourself politically (select one)?

- Strong Republican
- Moderate Republican
- Leaning Republican
- Independent
- Leaning Democrat
- Moderate Democrat
- Strong Democrat
- Other. Please specify: _____

12. How many years have you been a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church? _____

13. How many years have you attended SDA schools (K-University)? _____

14. How frequently do you attend religious services (select one)?

- At least weekly.
- Monthly or a few times a year.
- Seldom or never.

15. How *religiously* conservative or liberal do you consider yourself (1=extremely liberal & 8=extremely conservative) (circle one number)?

1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8
Extremely Liberal *Extremely Conservative*

NEXT PAGE>

16. Even if you might not believe in God, based on your personal understanding, what do you think God is like (select one response per line)?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Undecided
a. A cosmic force in the universe.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Removed from worldly affairs.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Removed from personal affairs.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Concerned with the well-being of the world..	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Concerned with my personal well-being.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Angered by human sin.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Angered by my sins.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Directly involved in worldly affairs.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Directly involved in my affairs.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. A "He".....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. How well do you feel that each of the following words describe God (select one response per line)?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Undecided
a. Absolute.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Critical.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Distant.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Ever-present.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Fatherly.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Forgiving.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Friendly.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Just.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Kind.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Kingly.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Loving.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Motherly.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Punishing.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Severe.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. Wrathful.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. Yielding.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX C

PAPER OF INTENT (ITALY, JUNE 2009)

Topic

Seventh-day Adventist Attitudes toward War and Torture

Variable List

1. SDA Attitudes on combat-related military duties
2. SDA Attitudes about torture
3. Duration in SDA education
4. Duration in SDA church
5. Frequency of church attendance
6. Gender
7. Age
8. Political Affiliation
9. View of God

Statement of the Problem

Research Problem. There is a lack of clarity regarding SDA members' views on war and torture.

Justification of the Research Problem. Historically, the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) church has unofficially advocated for refraining from combat duty in the armed forces. As a voice for peace, it is presumed that the church is also against torture. A recent national survey has found a positive correlation between church attendance and support for torture; however, there is no data describing SDA member attitudes on these issues.

Purpose Statement. The purpose of this study is to analyze the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventists regarding torture and participation in the military, and to ascertain whether there is a

correlation between these attitudes and length of duration in SDA schools and church membership.

Research Questions

1. Are there gender differences in attitudes about torture?
2. Are there gender differences in attitudes on military combat duty?
3. Are there age differences in attitudes about torture?
4. Are there age differences in attitudes on military combat duty?
5. Is political affiliation related to attitudes about torture?
6. Is political affiliation related to attitudes on military combat duty?
7. Is view of God correlated with attitudes about torture?
8. Is view of God correlated with attitudes on military combat duty?

Research Hypotheses

1. SDAs have a negative view of participation in combat-related military activities.
2. SDAs have a negative view of torture of suspected terrorists.
3. There is a negative correlation between duration in the SDA church and positive views of combatant military participation.
4. There is a negative correlation between duration in the SDA church and positive views of torture.
5. There is a negative correlation between duration in SDA education and positive views of combatant military participation.
6. There is a negative correlation between duration in SDA education and positive views of torture.

7. There is a negative correlation between frequency of church attendance and positive views of combatant military participation.
8. There is a negative correlation between frequency of church attendance and positive views of torture.