

Racial Minority Representation in the Annual Conferences of The UMC

August 11, 2009

By Sarah Combs

Introduction

Are the numbers of racial minority clergy, laity, and candidates decreasing in the annual conferences? That question was explored using data obtained from the General Council on Finance and Administration (GCFA) for clergy and laity and from GBHEM for candidates for each of the years 2000 through 2008¹. For the purposes of this analysis, the clergy group includes ordained, probationary, and local pastors. Cases where race was not recorded were excluded from analysis. The recoding of race has vastly improved over the years making the number of cases excluded much smaller in 2008 than in 2000. In 2000, race was not recorded for 216 candidates but in 2008 that was true for only one candidate (Table 1).

Overall, racial minorities have not decreased since the year 2000. However, that does not mean that racial minorities increased consistently; nor does it mean that there were steady decreases at certain times. Instead, the number and percentage of racial minorities increased at some times and decreased at others.

This is a summary report. For an extended report including statistical tests contact GBHEM's Director of Research, Michelle Fugate.

Data Analysis

Several tests are performed to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in the minority representation of clergy, candidates, and laity in annual conferences from year to year. Examined are:

- 1) The total *numbers* of ethnic/racial minority people compared to non-minority people
- 2) The total *percentage* of ethnic/racial minority people compared to non-minority people
- 3) The difference in the mean (average) minority representation of all annual conferences between years (Paired samples t-test)
- 4) The difference in mean minority representation between years within each annual conference
- 5) The difference in numbers and percent of each racial group by annual conferences

Results

The number of clergy, candidates, and laity by year and race/ethnicity is shown in Table 1. For presentation, all racial/ethnic minorities are compared as a group to the White/Caucasian group.

Denomination Wide

Clergy

As seen in Table 1, the overall average number and percentage of minority clergy in 2008 was not less than in 2000. In fact, for most time periods the number and percentage of minority clergy increased. From 2004 to 2005 and 2006 to 2007 there were decreases in the number of minority clergy, however, because of decreases among Caucasian clergy, this did not prevent an increase in the percentage of minority clergy.

¹ Data were uploaded to SPSS for analysis. Significance tests were performed to determine whether the number and percentage of racial minorities decreased in each conference overall and between years.

Candidates

Table 1 also shows that the average number and percentage of minority candidates was not less in 2008 compared to 2000; the same was true from 2000 to 2001, 2002 to 2003, 2004 to 2005, and 2006 to 2007. For all other time periods, except from 2003 to 2004, the average number and percentage of minority candidates decreased. From 2003 to 2004 there was a decrease in the number of minority candidates, but no change in the overall percentage of minority candidates.

Laity

Overall, the average number and percentage of minority laity was not less in 2007 than in 2000; the same was true for most time periods. The only period where there was a decline in the number and percentage of minority laity was from 2006 to 2007. In fact, the only other time period to show any type of decline of minority representation among lay membership was from 2003 to 2004 when the number of minority laity declined. However, this decline did not result in an overall percentage decrease because during this time period Caucasian membership also declined.

So, what does this mean? Is minority representation in the annual conferences decreasing? These data paint a complex picture – among clergy, minority representation increased in some and decreased in other years. Overall minority representation, however, has not gone below the level found in the year 2000. The same picture is found among candidates. There have been years in which the representation of minority candidates was less than the previous year, but representation has not gone below that found in 2000.

Table 1. Race/Ethnicity of Clergy, Candidates, and Laity

Clergy[†]		2000	2001	2002	2003 ²	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Minority	9.1% (4,064)	9.6% (4,253)	9.7% (4,348)		10.0% (4,593)	10.0% (4,430)	11.1% (5,019)	11.8% (4,704)	12.3% (4,908)
	White	90.9% (40,572)	90.4% (40,070)	90.3% (40,573)		90% (41,213)	90% (40,030)	88.9% (40,078)	88.2% (35,286)	87.7% (35,126)
	TOTAL	44,636	44,323	44,921		45,806	44,460	45,097	39,990	40,034
Candidate		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Minority	14.6% (214)	18.9% (321)	17% (304)	17.8% (345)	17.8% (302)	18.2% (314)	18.1% (308)	21.3% (360)	20.9% (349)
	White	85.4% (1,256)	81.1% (1,379)	83% (1,488)	82.2% (1,590)	82.2% (1,398)	81.8% (1,416)	81.9% (1,398)	78.7% (1,328)	79.1% (1,317)
	TOTAL	1,470	1,700	1,792	1,935	1,700	1,730	1,706	1,688	1,666
	Missing	216	175	106	75	27	30	32	9	1
Laity[†]		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
	Minority	6.8% (530,217)	7.4% (572,610)	7.4% (575,145)	7.8% (607,264)	7.8% (554,369)	8.6% (651,312)	12.7% (975,852)	8.6% (659,850)	
	White	93.2% (7,232,593)	92.6% (7,214,201)	92.6% (7,180,407)	92.2% (7,206,346)	92.2% (6,565,563)	91.4% (6,935,610)	87.3% (6,684,678)	91.4% (7,049,888)	
	TOTAL	(7,762,810)	(7,786,811)	(7,755,552)	(7,813,610)	(7,119,932)	(7,586,922)	(7,660,530)	(7,709,738)	

[†]2004 lay data not available for South Indiana, West Ohio, Western New York, North Alabama, and Yellowstone Annual Conferences. Alaska Missionary Annual Conference did not have clergy data available from 2002 to 2006. In addition, no clergy data was available for Mississippi in 2005, Desert Southwest in 2006, Greater New Jersey in 2007, and Missouri in 2008.

² No clergy data was available for 2003 so change was measured from 2002 to 2004.

Annual Conference Level

Examining each annual conference separately, we find clergy and laity minority representation has indeed decreased between 2000 and 2007/8 for some annual conferences (see Table 2). Reasons vary. For example, the number of minorities decreased, the numbers of White/Caucasian increased, or both. A decrease in the number of minorities accounted for most of minority percentage decrease and was found in Alabama-West Florida, East Ohio, Illinois Great Rivers, Louisiana, Memphis (for laity), Nebraska, Oklahoma Indian Missionary, Oregon-Idaho, Rio Grande, South Carolina, West Michigan, West Virginia, and Western Pennsylvania annual conferences. Decrease due to increases in White/Caucasian membership is found in Memphis (for clergy), Rio Grande, and South Carolina annual conferences.

Most of the decrease in minority representation was of African American representation. Of the conferences showing a decrease, seven were a loss of African American representation and five were loss of Asian representation. These results are not surprising given that African American and Asian minorities represent most of the diversity in the annual conferences. The Oklahoma Indian Missionary had decreases of clergy and laity minorities due to a decrease of Native American members, and the Oregon-Idaho and Rio Grande conferences had minority percentage decreases due to a loss of Hispanic members.

Among the conferences there was also interesting reporting of multiracial laity membership for the first year it was available (2005). In 2005 a large number of multiracial lay members were reported, and then in 2006 there was a sharp decline of these members. This phenomenon occurred among 14 conferences.³ Among clergy, this change in reporting occurred in only one conference, the Oklahoma annual conference.

In addition, paired samples t-tests tested whether there were significant differences in the average minority representation each year among the annual conferences. These results are as follows:

Clergy

Overall, the average number and percentage of minority clergy in 2008 was not significantly less than in 2000. But, the number and percentage of minority clergy did decrease in the most recent time period (2007 to 2008). In fact, during six of the eight years examined, minority clergy numbers and percentage decreased⁴.

Candidates

The average number and percentage of minority candidates was not less in 2008 compared to 2000; nor did the number or percentage decrease from 2000 to 2001 or 2006 to 2007. For all six of the other time intervals, the average number and percentage of racial minority candidates decreased. This means that the most recent time period (2007-2008) and the four year period from 2001 – 2005 saw decreases in the number of racial minority candidates.

Laity

Overall, the average number and percentage of minority laity church membership was not less in 2007 than in 2000; the same was true from 2000 to 2001. For all other time periods, except from 2002 to 2003, the average percentage of minority laity decreased. These results are of interest because from 2003 to 2006, the overall average number of minority laity did not decrease, while the average percentage of laity did. This suggests that while minority laity numbers were increasing in most annual conferences, they were not increasing as rapidly as Caucasian lay membership.

³ Conferences where this reporting occurred were: East Ohio; Arkansas; Eastern Pennsylvania; Holston; Iowa; Missouri; New York; North Central New York; Oklahoma; Rocky Mountain; Tennessee; Troy; West Ohio; Virginia (the sharp increase appeared in 2006 then a sharp decline in 2007).

⁴ From 2001 to 2002, 2004 to 2005, 2006 to 2007, and 2007 to 2008.

In regard to each specific minority group, there was a decline for most periods among Asian, Pacific Islander, multi-racial, Hispanic clergy and laity, and ‘other’ candidate representation, but not an overall decline since 2000. The percentage of African Americans was not less in 2007/2008⁵ than in 2000, and did not decrease from 2000 to 2001 or from 2005 to 2006; however, African American clergy, laity, and candidates decreased every other time period. With the exception of candidates from 2003 to 2004 and 2007 to 2008, Native American clergy, laity, and candidates decreased for every time period tested.

Summary

There were several time periods when the results were conclusive about the status of racial minorities. For example, as a whole, racial minorities did not decrease among clergy, laity, and candidates from 2000 to 2007/2008. Thus, the number and percentage of racial minorities is not less in 2007/2008 than in 2000. Between 2001 to 2002 and 2004 to 2005, however, the number and percent of racial minority clergy, candidates, and laity decreased.

The number of minority clergy increased for 49 conferences and decreased for 14, and the percentage of minority clergy increased in 52 conferences and decreased in 11. The number of laity was found to have increased for 55 conferences and decreased for 8, and the percentage of laity increased in 58 conferences and decreased in 5.

With regard to each minority group, this study shows that Asian clergy and laity have increased since 2000, but Asian ministry candidates have decreased. African American clergy, laity, and candidates have increased slightly over time. Overall, Hispanic clergy and laity have increased slightly since 2000 while Hispanic candidates have been in slight decline with an almost 10% loss from 2007 to 2008. Native American clergy, laity, and ordination candidates all experienced slight decreases over time. Pacific Islander clergy representation decreased from 2000 to 2005, but then increased from 2006 to 2008. Pacific Islander laity have increased slightly since 2000, and Pacific Islander candidates have decreased from 2000 to 2002, increased from 2002 to 2007, and decreased from 2007 to 2008. ‘Other’ minority ordination candidates have increased continuously from 2000 to 2008, and there has been no significant change among multiracial clergy and laity from 2005 to 2008. Further research and reporting may do well to try and identify the ‘other’ minority ordination candidates.

Conclusion

The results of this study suggest that racial minorities have not decreased since the year 2000, but in fact has increased. Although increasing it is very slow, and the total percentage of racial minorities remains low at only 8.6% of total lay, clergy, and candidate membership. It is important for a church to know whether it encourages or discourages racial minority representation in its pews and pulpits. Although minority representation has never been a majority for the United Methodist Church, it does not appear that a new discouraging factor has appeared since 2000. Also, the ratio of minority clergy and minority laity representation appears balanced so that racial minorities are reciprocal in their representation in both pew and pulpit. Evidence from this research, however, shows that candidate minority representation (by percentage) is consistently far larger than the percentage of minority clergy. In other words, it appears that racial minority candidates finish candidacy at a lower rate than their Caucasian peers. Further research is needed to identify reasons for this inequality and how it may translate into clergy and laity minority representation.

⁵ 2008 data was available only for clergy and candidates; the 2007 data is for laity.

Table 2: Clergy and Laity Change Over Time by Annual Conference

ANNUAL CONFERENCE	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2002/2003 to 2004 ⁶	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2000 to 2008/2007 ⁷
ALABAMA-WEST FLORIDA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+39%	.62%		+65%	-3.61%	+88%	+05%	-28%	-1.3%
<i>Laity</i>	+06%	+2%	+05%	+13%	-09%	+01%	+03%		+39%
ALASKA MISSIONARY									
<i>Clergy</i>								+16.67%	
<i>Laity</i>	+1.68%	-3.45%	+1.5%	+2.4%	+87.02%	-86.85%	+1.15%		+3.45%
ARKANSAS									
<i>Clergy</i>	-1.08%	-.24%		+91%	+1%	+43%	-.16%	+1.38%	+1.34%
<i>Laity</i>	+01%	-.96%	+1.62%	+1.71%	-1.52%	+25%	+31%		+1.42%
BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON									
<i>Clergy</i>	-.27%	-.02%		+93%	+92%	+85%	+17%	+33%	+2.91%
<i>Laity</i>	+75%	0%	+1.97%	-1.35%	+94%	+1%	+17%		+2.58%
CALIFORNIA-NEVADA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+2.02%	+76%		+1.17%	+2.17%	+2.97%	+2.12%	-5.97%	+5.23%
<i>Laity</i>	+75%	+46%	-.3%	-.12%	+4%	-.74%	-.45%		+3.6%
CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC									
<i>Clergy</i>	+68%	-.22%		0%	+1.03%	+64%	-6.29%	+7.49%	+3.33%
<i>Laity</i>	+2.06%	-.27%	+2.5%	+2.51%	+2.27%	-.13%	+86%		+9.8%
CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA									
<i>Clergy</i>	0%	-.2%		0%	+05%	+34%	-.16%	+22%	+25%
<i>Laity</i>	+08%	+74%	-.62%	+02%	+15%	+28%	-.26%		+4%
CENTRAL TEXAS									
<i>Clergy</i>	+2%	-2.41%		-.45%	+11%	+34%	+1%	+03%	+61%
<i>Laity</i>	+1.9%	+02%	+23%	+19%	+58%	-.11%	+15%		+124%
DAKOTAS									
<i>Clergy</i>	+1.49%	-.53%		-.05%	-.58%	+63%	+03%	0%	+99%
<i>Laity</i>	+05%	+02%	-.01%	+11%	+01%	+7%	-.64%		+23%
DESERT SOUTHWEST									
<i>Clergy</i>	+2.98%	-1.55%		-.07%	0%			+1.63%	+1.37%
<i>Laity</i>	-.96%	+82%	+11%	-.41%	+61%	+55%	+08%		+79%
DETROIT									
<i>Clergy</i>	+68%	+2.13%		-.58%	+18%	-.69%	-.12%	+08%	+1.68%
<i>Laity</i>	+21%	+1.74%	+82%	+76%	-.17%	-.55%	+01%		+2.82%
EAST OHIO									
<i>Clergy</i>	+15%	+12%		-.09%	-.25%	+12%	-.14%	-.23%	-.33%
<i>Laity</i>	+29%	-.75%	-.99%	+93%	+3.13%	-2.38%	-.75%		-.53%

⁶ No clergy data was available for 2003. This table represents clergy change from 2002 to 2004 and laity change from 2003 to 2004.

⁷ No laity data was available for 2008. This table represents clergy change from 2000 to 2008 and laity change from 2000 to 2007.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2002/2003 to 2004 ⁸	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2000 to 2008/2007 ⁹
EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+29%	-.57%		-.97%	+1.93%	-.14%	-.46%	0%	+0.09%
<i>Laity</i>	+77%	-.39%	+1%	-.15%	+6.55%	-4.34%	+1.19%		+2.74%
FLORIDA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+2.92%	-.05%		-.83%	+1.62%	+29%	-.1%	+0.06%	+3.9%
<i>Laity</i>	+2.02%	+1.39%	-.76%	+0.09%	-1.56%	+2.38%	+42%		+3.99%
GREATER NEW JERSEY									
<i>Clergy</i>	+6.4%	-6.14%		+33%	-.55%	0%			-6%
<i>Laity</i>	-.13%	+1.2%	+65%	+35%	+7%	+1.06%	+8%		+4.63%
HOLSTON									
<i>Clergy</i>	-.38%	+61%		-.05%	+36%	-.21%	+21%	-.27%	+28%
<i>Laity</i>	-.09%	+0.4%	+0.2%	+0.4%	+1.03%	-.79%	-.1%		+1.15%
ILLINOIS GREAT RIVERS									
<i>Clergy</i>	-.14%	+29%		+22%	0%	-.13%	-.76%	-.61%	-1.12%
<i>Laity</i>	+1.4%	-.08%	-.26%	+21%	+33%	+0.7%	+0.5%		+4.6%
IOWA									
<i>Clergy</i>	-.23%	+12%		+24%	+0.1%	-.13%	-.01%	+35%	+35%
<i>Laity</i>	-.04%	+6%	-.52%	+64%	+25%	-.66%	-.12%		+1.14%
KANSAS EAST									
<i>Clergy</i>	+1.16%	+26%		-.07%	+46%	-.11%	-.87%	+1.22%	+1.06%
<i>Laity</i>	-.04%	+23%	-.02%	-.05%	+49%	-.27%	+0.6%		+3.9%
KANSAS WEST									
<i>Clergy</i>	+44%	-.85%		+9%	+45%	+43%	-.15%	+1.28%	+2.51%
<i>Laity</i>	+75%	+28%	+72%	-3.21%	+3.94%	+93%	+22%		+3.64%
KENTUCKY									
<i>Clergy</i>	0%	+13%		-.51%	+54%	+61%	+34%	+38%	+1.49%
<i>Laity</i>	+38%	+31%	-.21%	+46%	+12%	+0.1%	-.17%		+9%
LOUISIANA									
<i>Clergy</i>	-.79%	+34%		-.2%	-.48%	+38%	+0.3%	+49%	-.23%
<i>Laity</i>	-.16%	+0.4%	+0.3%	+52%	-.13%	+49%	-.53%		+2.6%
MEMPHIS									
<i>Clergy</i>	-1.04%	-.01%		+78%	+12%	+51%	+26%	-.72%	-.09%
<i>Laity</i>	-.76%	+75%	+62%	-2.03%	+1.65%	+0.3%	-.46%		-.19%
MINNESOTA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+36%	+0.4%		+32%	+42%	-.01%	-.21%	+44%	+1.37%
<i>Laity</i>	+21%	+1.6%	+1.5%	+0.4%	+24%	+1.7%	+0.7%		+1.05%

⁸ No clergy data was available for 2003. This table represents clergy change from 2002 to 2004 and laity change from 2003 to 2004.

⁹ No laity data was available for 2008. This table represents clergy change from 2000 to 2008 and laity change from 2000 to 2007.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2002/2003 to 2004 ¹⁰	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2000 to 2008/2007 ¹¹
MISSISSIPPI									
<i>Clergy</i>	+1.6%	+32%		+3.39%			+31%	-.29%	+6.53%
<i>Laity</i>	+88%	-.26%	+48%	-19.07%	+19.35%	-.62%	+5%		+1.27%
MISSOURI									
<i>Clergy</i>	+1.08%	+19%		-.24%	-.03%	+12%	+03%		+1.14% ¹²
<i>Laity</i>	+67%	+08%	+33%	-.29%	+2.71%	-2.43%	+33%		+1.4%
NEBRASKA									
<i>Clergy</i>	-.2%	+8%		-1.3%	+1.4%	-.3%	+3%	-1%	-3%
<i>Laity</i>	0%	+99%	0%	+2%	0%	+1%	+1%		+1.39%
NEW ENGLAND									
<i>Clergy</i>	0%	-1.09%		+44%	-.23%	+82%	+36%	+01%	+3%
<i>Laity</i>	+1.24%	+74%	+05%	-1.61%	+18%	+1.61%	-.87%		+1.33%
NEW MEXICO									
<i>Clergy</i>	+38%	+1.72%		-1.26%	-.05%	-.08%	-.1%	-.09%	+52%
<i>Laity</i>	+2%	+05%	-.24%	+1.52%	+04%	+1.81%	+2.75%		+6.13%
NEW YORK									
<i>Clergy</i>	+11%	+28%		-.62%	+38%	+6.2%	+36%	+54%	+7.25%
<i>Laity</i>	+4.85%	-.82%	+48%	-1.28%	+1.44%	+67%	+7%		+6.05%
NORTH ALABAMA									
<i>Clergy</i>	-.28%	+2.59%		+32%	+1.43%	+49%	-.94%	+29%	+3.9%
<i>Laity</i>	+41%	-.67%	+38%	-4.49%	+6.74%	-1.81%	-.35%		+22%
NORTH CAROLINA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+29%	-.27%		-.03%	+2.28%	+7%	-1.65%	+7.69%	+9.02%
<i>Laity</i>	+02%	+12%	-.08%	+06%	+14%	+1%	-.77%		+49%
NORTH CENTRAL NEW YORK									
<i>Clergy</i>	+38%	+1.25%		+16%	-.01%	+02%	+05%	+49%	+2.35%
<i>Laity</i>	+15%	-.01%	-.13%	+01%	+68%	+36%	-.57%		+48%
NORTH GEORGIA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+1.83%	-.89%		-.31%	+48%	+14%	+72%	-.7%	+1.28%
<i>Laity</i>	+54%	+1%	+19%	+4%	+17%	+48%	+22%		+2.11%
NORTH INDIANA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+03%	-.08%		+17%	-.05%	+15%	+15%	-.17%	+2%
<i>Laity</i>	+23%	+16%	+01%	+07%	+18%	+14%	-.25%		+54%
NORTH TEXAS									
<i>Clergy</i>	+34%	+73%		+53%	+54%	+93%	+42%	+25%	+3.74%
<i>Laity</i>	+38%	+26%	+49%	+07%	+41%	+79%	-.28%		+2.11%

¹⁰ No clergy data was available for 2003. This table represents clergy change from 2002 to 2004 and laity change from 2003 to 2004.

¹¹ No laity data was available for 2008. This table represents clergy change from 2000 to 2008 and laity change from 2000 to 2007.

¹² Because 2008 data was not available this number is based on the difference between 2000 and 2007.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2002/2003 to 2004 ¹³	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2000 to 2008/2007 ¹⁴
NORTHERN ILLINOIS									
<i>Clergy</i>	+91%	+52%		+69%	+39%	-44%	0%	+2%	+2%
<i>Laity</i>	-23%	+1.14%	+46%	+17%	+48%	+72%	+2.66%		+5.41%
NORTHWEST TEXAS									
<i>Clergy</i>	-28%	-04%		+39%	+27%	+9%	-1.06%	+09%	+27%
<i>Laity</i>	-04%	+16%	+04%	+13%	+44%	+42%	+22%		+1.36%
OKLAHOMA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+29%	+1.24%		+45%	+4.79%	-3.5%	+24%	+03%	+3.55%
<i>Laity</i>	+38%	+64%	+12%	+16%	+4%	0%	+22%		+1.92%
OKLAHOMA INDIAN MISSIONARY									
<i>Clergy</i>	-2%	-1.3%		+3.1%	+2%	-1.7%	-5%	0%	-2.2%
<i>Laity</i>	0%	+95.93%	-1%	+3%	-4%	+3%	-3%		-3%
OREGON-IDAHO									
<i>Clergy</i>	-3%	+3%		+3%	-1.3%	-6%	+2%	+2%	-1.2%
<i>Laity</i>	+4%	+1%	0%	+2%	+2%	+3.6%	0%		+4.5%
PACIFIC NORTHWEST									
<i>Clergy</i>	-1%	-1%		+4%	+5%	+1.5%	-8%	+2%	+1.6%
<i>Laity</i>	+9%	0%	+2%	+5%	+3%	+4.6%	0%		+6.6%
PENINSULA-DELAWARE									
<i>Clergy</i>	+1.61%	+1.49%		-44%	-1.4%	+1.63%	-01%	+96%	+3.85%
<i>Laity</i>	+1.21%	-17%	+66%	+41%	-96%	+1.84%	-1.61%		+1.37%
RED BIRD MISSIONARY									
<i>Clergy</i>	0%	0%		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Laity</i>	-36%	+88%	-2%	-47%	+38%	+25%	+3%		+78%
RIO GRANDE									
<i>Clergy</i>	0%	0%		0%	+1.9%	-4.58%	+1.84%	0%	-84%
<i>Laity</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%	-14%	-06%	-02%		-21%
ROCKY MOUNTAIN									
<i>Clergy</i>	+85%	+73%		+86%	-2.19%	+1.29%	+45%	+23%	+2.22%
<i>Laity</i>	+1.19%	+35%	+01%	-1.16%	+8.57%	-2.62%	-2.44%		+3.89%
SOUTH CAROLINA									
<i>Clergy</i>	-54%	+12%		+61%	+05%	-89%	-05%	-49%	-1.2%
<i>Laity</i>	-03%	+07%	+29%	-07%	+36%	+1%	-08%		+64%
SOUTH GEORGIA									
<i>Clergy</i>	-19%	-1.19%		+45%	+4%	+1.64%	-1.26%	-46%	-61%
<i>Laity</i>	+1.55%	-03%	-4%	-2%	+04%	+13%	-06%		+1.05%

¹³ No clergy data was available for 2003. This table represents clergy change from 2002 to 2004 and laity change from 2003 to 2004.

¹⁴ No laity data was available for 2008. This table represents clergy change from 2000 to 2008 and laity change from 2000 to 2007.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2002/2003 to 2004 ¹⁵	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2000 to 2008/2007 ¹⁶
SOUTH INDIANA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+2%	+88%		+25%	+07%	+19%	-.63%	+15%	+1.12%
<i>Laity</i>	+74%	-.01%	-.43%	-2.68%	+2.91%	+1.58%	+2.29%		+2.39%
SOUTHWEST TEXAS									
<i>Clergy</i>	+39%	+23%		+57%	+34%	-.44%	+28%	+26%	+1.64%
<i>Laity</i>	+88%	-.09%	+26%	+07%	+9%	-.29%	+95%		+2.68%
TENNESSEE									
<i>Clergy</i>	+71%	+39%		-1.04%	+08%	+24%	+73%	+97%	+2.08%
<i>Laity</i>	-.57%	+97%	-.19%	+79%	+1.59%	-.76%	-.32%		+1.51%
TEXAS									
<i>Clergy</i>	+81%	-.64%		+2.63%	+54%	+1.4%	+32%	-.34%	+4.7%
<i>Laity</i>	+56%	+84%	+62%	+56%	-.66%	-.19%	+9%		+2.62%
TROY									
<i>Clergy</i>	+2%	+1%		-.3%	+1%	+1%	+3%	+1%	+6%
<i>Laity</i>	0%	+1.59%	-.6%	+2%	+3%	0%	+5%		+1.99%
VIRGINIA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+1.89%	+37%		-.08%	+47%	+02%	-.06%	+45%	+3.06%
<i>Laity</i>	+74%	+26%	+28%	+17%	-.38%	+95.7%	-.94.7%		+2.06%
WEST MICHIGAN									
<i>Clergy</i>	+15%	+11%		-.31%	+19%	+16%	+18%	-.9%	-.42%
<i>Laity</i>	+15%	+10%	+03%	+05%	+15%	+26%	0%		+74%
WEST OHIO									
<i>Clergy</i>	+42%	+02%		+47%	-.9%	+1.32%	-.28%	-.02%	+1.02%
<i>Laity</i>	-.05%	-.05%	-.01%	-2.77%	+5.72%	-1.65%	-.35%		+83%
WEST VIRGINIA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+71%	-.05%		+4%	-.93%	+39%	-.01%	-.22%	+29%
<i>Laity</i>	0%	-.09%	-.37%	-.33%	+35%	0%	-.03%		-.47%
WESTERN NEW YORK									
<i>Clergy</i>	-.27%	+1.44%		-.5%	+29%	+1.03%	+2%	-.05%	+2.13%
<i>Laity</i>	+23%	+1.47%	-.08%	-2.55%	+5.55%	-.66%	-.45%		+3.52%
WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+36%	+56%		+1.15%	-.31%	+21%	-.1%	+1.88%	+1.88%
<i>Laity</i>	+06%	0%	+13%	+05%	+07%	+14%	+14%		+59%
WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA									
<i>Clergy</i>	+14%	+01%		-.46%	+02%	+3%	+32%	+1%	+43%
<i>Laity</i>	-.12%	-.06%	-.08%	+14%	0%	+03%	+03%		-.07%

¹⁵ No clergy data was available for 2003. This table represents clergy change from 2002 to 2004 and laity change from 2003 to 2004.

¹⁶ No laity data was available for 2008. This table represents clergy change from 2000 to 2008 and laity change from 2000 to 2007.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2002/2003 to 2004 ¹⁷	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2000 to 2008/2007 ¹⁸
WISCONSIN									
<i>Clergy</i>	+61%	+56%		+91%	+23%	+64%	-99%	+11%	+2.07%
<i>Laity</i>	+1.11%	-36%	+12%	+17%	-33%	+04%	-01%		+73%
WYOMING									
<i>Clergy</i>	+4%	-05%		+56%	+13%	-06%	+01%	+34%	+1.34%
<i>Laity</i>	+12%	+11%	-09%	+75%	-87%	+56%	-06%		+51%
YELLOWSTONE									
<i>Clergy</i>	0%	0%		0%	0%	0%	+7%	-01%	+69%
<i>Laity</i>	-01%	+12%	-02%	-67%	+9%	+1.38%	+3.3%		+4.93%

¹⁷ No clergy data was available for 2003. This table represents clergy change from 2002 to 2004 and laity change from 2003 to 2004.

¹⁸ No laity data was available for 2008. This table represents clergy change from 2000 to 2008 and laity change from 2000 to 2007.