

## Cultural Research Center

---



### **2024 Election Research – Report #2** **Decisive Christian Vote Carries Trump to Historic Victory,** **Post-Election Research Shows**

Dr. George Barna, Director of Research  
[Cultural Research Center](#) at [Arizona Christian University](#)  
Release Date: November 13, 2024

Post-election reports attribute the landslide victory of Donald Trump to various population segments, most notably young adults and Hispanics. Realistically, those groups were helpful but hardly indispensable to the Trump triumph.

The one segment that has gotten virtually no attention from the media are Christians. Simply put, among self-identified Christians, President Trump won a 56% share of their vote. And because Christians represented 72% of the voters who turned out, their support for the re-elected Republican made the difference in the race.

In comparison, among people of other faiths or no faith, Vice President Harris was preferred with 60% of the non-Christian vote. Although Harris won a larger share of the non-Christian vote than Trump's share of the Christian votes, Christians outnumbered non-Christian voters by more than a five-to-two margin—delivering the decisive Nov. 5 victory to President Trump.

These and other faith-related insights are from post-election research conducted by the Cultural Research Center at Arizona Christian University, under the direction of Dr. George Barna. The survey, conducted during the three days immediately after the election, involved extensive interviews with a national sample of 2,000 voting-age adults.

#### **Turnout Levels Were Down**

The turnout among the voting-age population (VAP) this election was 55%—a substantial decline from four years earlier. The 2020 VAP turnout was reported to be 62%. Although the official numbers for 2024 have yet to be recorded, currently the difference in the number of ballots cast for president between 2020 and 2024 is projected to be about 10 million votes.

Among self-identified Christians, 56% voted, which was barely higher than the involvement among people aligned with non-Christian faiths (53%), but significantly higher than among voting-age Americans who have no religious faith (48%).

In other words, the [pre-election research](#) by CRC predicted turnout among Christians would fall below their 2020 levels. While that prediction clearly was fulfilled, its potentially devastating impact for the Trump campaign was blunted by the even lower levels of turnout among the Harris campaign's target segments.

The numerous Christian population segments studied by the Cultural Research Center had a wide range of participation levels. The groups with the highest participation rates were recorded among

SAGE Cons (i.e. Spiritually Active Governance Engaged Conservative Christians) who held true to form and almost universally voted (99% turnout, copying their 2020 level, and eight points higher than their 2016 turnout); Catholics (70%); people who possess a biblical worldview (67%); adults who attend mainline Protestant churches (65%); attenders of Pentecostal or charismatic churches (62%); and individuals whose religious beliefs and behaviors (rather than self-identification) characterize them as evangelicals (62%).

Turnout in 2024 was lower than 2020 levels for most voter segments, though the declines varied by subgroup. Among key faith segments, increases in turnout included Catholics (70%, up from 67% in 2020) and people with a biblical worldview (known as Integrated Disciples, up 3 points from their 64% in 2020).

Religious segments with the most substantial drop in turnout included adults associated with a faith other than Christianity (cratering from 65% to 53%); adults who have no religious faith (off by nine percentage points from their 2020 level of 57%); self-identified Christians (decrease from 64% to 56%); theologically-defined born-again Christians (dipped from 64% to 58%); and attenders of evangelical churches (down to 59% from 65%).

<b>General Election Turnout Levels Among Key Religious Segments, 2020 and 2024</b>			
<b>(Based on Voting-Age Population)</b>			
<b>Population Segment</b>	<b>2020 Turnout</b>	<b>2024 Turnout</b>	<b>Change</b>
All US adults	62%	55%	-7 Percentage Points
Catholics	67%	70%	+3 Points
Integrated Disciples (have a biblical worldview)	64%	67%	+3 Points
Pentecostal church attenders	62%	62%	No Change
Mainline Protestant church attenders	66%	65%	-1 Point
Protestants	62%	59%	-3 Points
Evangelical church attenders	65%	59%	-6 Points
Theologically-defined born-again Christians	64%	58%	-6 Points
Self-identified Christians	64%	56%	-8 Points
No religious faith	57%	48%	-9 Points
Adherent of a non-Christian faith	65%	53%	-12 Points

Sources: 2024 Post-Election Project, Cultural Research Center at Arizona Christian University, N=2,000 voting-age adults; 2020 Post-Election Project, Cultural Research Center at Arizona Christian University, N=1,000 voting-age adults. For survey definitions of segments, see the research methodology notes at the end of this report.

## Trump Was Heavily Preferred Among Christians

Trump was a heavy favorite among most of the three dozen Christian segments studied by the Cultural Research Center survey. The former president received a landslide 56% to 43% margin of victory among all self-identified Christians.

The Trump margin of preference varied across Christian segments but was most pronounced among groups that are theologically conservative. The most Trump-supportive niches were SAGE Cons (90% voted for the former president); white theologically-defined (as opposed to self-identified) born-again Christians (74%); adults attending Pentecostal/charismatic churches (74%); and theologically-identified (not self-identified) evangelicals (68%).

Among the approximately 75 million votes Trump garnered in the election, more than three-quarters of them—78%—came from the Christian community.

In contrast, Harris was awarded slightly more than 71 million votes. Overall, less than two-thirds of her votes (63%) came from Christians. While a majority of Trump’s votes were cast by people attending evangelical, Pentecostal, Catholic and non-denominational Christian churches, the largest proportions of the votes from Christians given to Harris were from people who attend mainline and traditionally-black Protestant congregations.

Results of the Presidential Race, by Religious Voting Segments				
Religious Segment	% of 18+ Population	% of Total Turnout	Candidate Voted for	
			Trump	Harris
Self-identified Christians	68%	72%	56%	43%
Catholics	16%	23%	51%	49%
Protestants	37%	41%	60%	39%
Evangelical church attenders	12%	14%	64%	34%
Pentecostal church attenders	3%	4%	74%	26%
Mainline Protestant church attenders	12%	15%	56%	43%
Adherent of a non-Christian faith	8%	8%	48%	50%
No religious faith	24%	19%	35%	64%
Integrated Disciples (have a biblical worldview)	4%	11%	75%	23%
Theologically-defined born-again Christians	28%	29%	64%	35%
SAGE Cons	5%	7%	90%	10%

Sources: 2024 Post-Election Project, Cultural Research Center at Arizona Christian University, N=2,000 voting-age adults; 2020 Post-Election Project, Cultural Research Center at Arizona Christian University, N=1,000 voting-age adults. For survey definitions of segments, see the research methodology notes at the end of this report.

## Voting Influences

When voters were asked how much each of nine influences impacted their voting decisions, by far the biggest impacts came from people's religious faith and the party platforms.

Among self-identified Christians the biggest influences on their thinking about how to vote were the party policy platforms (mentioned by 30%), the voter's religious faith (26%), and their family members (16%). Theologically-identified evangelicals had a dramatically different response, with a majority (59%) citing their faith, less than half as many naming the party platforms (27%), and one out of six (16%) listing news and commentary from the media. Among SAGE Cons, the top influences were faith (57%) and the party platforms (43%).

In contrast, among the people of non-Christian faith or no faith, the only influence named by more than 13% was the party platforms (34%).

Further, the research found little difference between people who attend Catholic, Protestant, and mainline churches, with party platforms the most common influence, followed distantly by religious faith, news media, and family, in that order.

Consistent with the patterns established, Trump voters were twice as likely as Harris voters to identify their religious faith as a major influence on their candidate of choice (30% vs. 14%, respectively).

While endorsements from celebrities and experts generally have a limited effect on voters—just 7% of voters said such recommendations had a lot of influence on their own voting choices—several voter segments were comparatively more influenced by such endorsements. People who attend traditionally-black churches (21%), individuals who are most active in their Christian faith (17%), and born-again Christians under the age of 22 (16%) were all two to three times more likely than average to be influenced by such words of candidate support.

Voter guides, while listed as having “a lot of influence” on the voting choices of less than one in 10 voters (9%), nevertheless were a more important source of guidance for Asian born-again Christians (24%), Pentecostals (18%), Gen Z voters (17%), and Jews (15%).

Pastors and churches, not surprisingly, almost exclusively had an impact on the election choices of religious people. Although just 8% of all voting-age adults attributed a lot of influence on their voting decisions to a pastor or church—the lowest level of influence among the nine influence entities tested—that level was considerably higher among a few religious segments. For instance, 15% of the people who attend evangelical churches, 14% of SAGE Cons, and 11% of Protestants all credited pastors or churches with a lot of influence.

<b>Influences on Faith-Related Voter Segments</b>						
(% who said the entity had “a lot” of influence on their voting choices)						
<b>Influencers</b>	<b>SIDX</b>	<b>TIDEV</b>	<b>SAGE</b>	<b>No Faith</b>	<b>Catholic</b>	<b>Protestant</b>
Family members	16%	13%	11%	12%	17%	13%
Your church or pastor	9%	14%	14%	5%	7%	11%
Your religious faith	26%	59%	57%	8%	20%	30%
Friends	11%	9%	13%	8%	11%	11%
Media news and commentary	16%	16%	11%	13%	18%	14%
The party platforms	30%	27%	43%	34%	34%	30%
Celebrity/expert endorsements	8%	5%	3%	6%	8%	8%
Voter guides	10%	10%	4%	7%	11%	11%
Advertising for candidates	13%	14%	13%	11%	11%	13%

Abbreviations: SIDX = self-identified Christians; TIDEV = theologically-defined evangelicals; SAGE = Spiritually Active Governance Engaged Conservative Christians; No Faith = no religious faith.

Source: *2024 Post-Election Project*, Cultural Research Center at Arizona Christian University, N=2,000 voting-age adults, conducted November 6-8, 2024. For survey definitions of segments, see the research methodology notes at the end of this report.

### **Doing the Homework**

Most voters did not spend much time investigating the details of the party platforms, candidates, and ballot initiatives before deciding how to vote. The survey asked each person who had voted to estimate how much time they had spent specifically researching the policies, people, and proposals represented on their ballot prior to voting.

The data revealed that on average, voters invested about two hours figuring out who and what they would vote for. Almost one out of every five voters admitted to not having spent any time doing such research. A person’s faith preference and the depth of their commitment showed no impact on the amount of time they spent preparing to vote.

### **Candidate Appeal**

There are many reasons why voters select and support particular candidates. The CRC study identified the most compelling reasons for supporting a candidate to be the candidate’s perceived leadership abilities (listed by 26% as one of the two most important reasons for the presidential candidate they backed) and the candidate’s positions on fiscal and economic matters (cited by 21%). Other oft-noted reasons included personal dislike of the other major-party presidential candidate (18%), positions on social issues (16%), the perceived morals and character of the candidates (16%), and the experience and track record of the candidates (15%).

Faith played a differing role in the reasons given by voters. A comparison of the three mega-faith categories (Christians, non-Christian faiths, and no faith) found that Christians placed a higher value on the track record and leadership abilities of the candidates. People associated with non-Christian faiths were the least likely to consider the character and morals of the candidates. Voters with no religious

faith were more likely than other voters to prioritize candidate character and morals, their positions on social issues, and their dislike of competing candidates.

SAGE Cons, who are consistently conservative and by definition are active in both faith and government matters, differed from other Christians in their heightened emphasis upon the track record, political ideology, and economic positions of a candidate. They were also much less likely to be driven by their dislike of a candidate, positions on social issues, and the perceived trustworthiness of a given candidate.

The only significant difference between Catholics and Protestants on reasons for choosing a particular candidate was Catholics placing more trust in the recommendations of family and friends.

## **The Impact of Issues**

Among Christians, by far the most consequential issues were inflation (identified by 38% of self-identified Christians as an issue that determined who they voted for as president) and immigration/ border control (34%). Other important issues were abortion (selected by 20%), protecting democracy and freedom (16%), and crime/law and order (14%).

While people from the various faith segments generally held similar views regarding the importance of particular issues in their candidate selection ruminations, there were some noteworthy differences in emphasis.

- Theologically-identified evangelicals placed relatively higher emphasis on immigration (40% chose it as a deciding factor in their candidate selection).
- The war in Israel was most compelling as a motivating issue to theologically-identified evangelicals, as 12% said it was a candidate-deciding issue for them. However, that means the situation in Israel was generally a secondary (at best) issue to at least seven out of every eight theologically conservative Christians.
- Mainline Protestants distinguished themselves by elevating the importance of immigration (listed by 42%) and protecting freedoms and democracy (21%).
- Catholics were surprisingly similar in their issues orientation to Protestants, the notable exception being the degree to which abortion was a deciding factor in their candidate choice. Catholics were slightly more likely than Protestants (23% versus 19%, respectively) to mention abortion as a dominant decision-making issue.
- Voters aligned with a non-Christian faith were notably more compelled by healthcare costs (16% vs 9% among other voters) and quality of life (14% compared to 9% of self-identified Christians). They were also far less likely to be driven by immigration (23%) and inflation (29%) than were other voters.
- People of no religious faith were focused on a different set of issues than were Christian voters. The irreligious voters were far more interested in candidate positions on abortion (35% versus 20% among self-identified Christians); protecting democracy and freedoms (24% versus 16%), and environmental policies (14% compared to 4%). Likewise, the voters with no interest in religious faith were less likely to be influenced by positions on crime (5% versus 14% among self-identified Christians), immigration (17% versus 34%, respectively), inflation (29% versus 38%) and national security (6% compared to 11%).

## Reasons for Not Voting

Despite close to \$2 billion being spent on the presidential race alone, and months of frenzied media coverage of the Biden, Harris, Kennedy, and Trump candidacies, close to one-half of the voting-age population (45%) chose not to bother voting. Both parties as well as candidates in all states and at all levels of government engaged in extensive get-out-the-vote campaigns (GOTV).

Why did so many Americans voluntarily abdicate their opportunity to shape the government and, through it, their own future? The survey found that the most common reason was lethargy: one out of five voting-age, self-identified Christians (20%) said they had intended to vote but simply forgot or never got around to it. There was a similar level of neglect among non-Christian adults, as one-sixth of them gave the same reason.

Several alternative explanations were given by 12% to 15% of self-identified Christians who were of voting age. Those included believing their single one vote would not make a difference; disliking all of the major candidates; not knowing enough about the candidates to choose one; believing the election results would be rigged; and lacking sufficient interest in politics and elections.

A deeper dive into the religious subgroups provides a few surprises. Theologically-defined evangelicals, a group widely deemed to be politically active and informed—and sometimes chastised for the intensity of their political engagement—were twice as likely as other religious segments to explain the decision to not vote as driven by a lack of interest in government and elections (22%).

Among the religious non-voters, Protestants were five times as likely as Catholics (15% vs. 3%) to cite the expectation of the election being rigged as their reason for abstaining. Mainline Protestants who failed to vote were more likely than any other religious subgroup to give each of several reasons, including their dislike all of the major candidates (20%), feeling the candidates did not reflect their most important views (16%), stating that their one vote would not make a difference (26%), and confessing that they did not know enough about the candidates to choose one (18%).

Meanwhile, non-voters associated with a non-Christian faith were less likely than other faith groups to explain their voting abstinence by claiming they disliked all the major candidates (9%) or that they did not know enough about the candidates (7%). They did, however, emerge as the faith segment most likely to explain their abstinence by claiming the election was too controversial, which made them uncomfortable about voting (18%).

People with no faith connection were notably more likely than Christians to avoid voting because they disliked the candidates (20%) or that they were disinterested in politics and elections (18%).

<b>Reasons for Not Voting</b>					
(% who gave the reason listed as an explanation for why they did not vote in the 2024 General Election)					
<b>Reason for not voting</b>	<b>SIDX</b>	<b>Catholic</b>	<b>Protestant</b>	<b>Other Faith</b>	<b>No Faith</b>
Disliked all of the major candidates	14%	12%	14%	9%	20%
Candidates did not reflect your views	10%	12%	10%	9%	14%
Believed election results would be rigged	12%	3%	15%	4%	13%
Your vote would not make a difference	15%	10%	18%	11%	18%
Your favored candidate could not win	6%	3%	7%	7%	6%
Did not know enough about candidates	13%	7%	16%	7%	11%
Not interested in politics and elections	12%	9%	11%	16%	18%
Election was too controversial; made you feel uncomfortable	9%	7%	9%	18%	12%
Planned to vote, never got around to it	20%	21%	21%	18%	13%

Abbreviations: SIDX = self-identified Christians; Other Faith = associated with a religious faith other than Christianity; No Faith = no religious faith.

Source: *2024 Post-Election Project*, Cultural Research Center at Arizona Christian University, N=2,000 voting-age adults, conducted November 6-8, 2024. For survey definitions of segments, see the research methodology notes at the end of this report.

### **Church Engagement in the Election**

Voters who regularly attended a Christian church were asked about their church’s participation in the electoral process. Seven actions were evaluated, providing a glimpse at how many pastors and churches were active in the election, and what types of activities they engaged in.

The most common election-related action by pastors and churches was the simple act of encouraging congregants to vote. About half of all Christian churches (53%) asked their congregants to cast a ballot. That act was more common in Protestant churches (57%) than in Catholic parishes (48%). Within the Protestant domain, encouraging voting was most prevalent in Pentecostal/charismatic churches (65%) and evangelical churches (61%).

A similar percentage of Christian churches (54%) had preached at least one sermon during the past year on the Bible’s stand on one or more specific issues discussed during the political season. Once again, teaching about current issues was more common in Protestant than Catholic churches (61% versus 41%, respectively), and was most likely to have happened in Pentecostal (69%) and evangelical (67%) churches.

Not quite half of Christian churches (46%) provided congregants with written information about the Bible’s stand on particular issues.

About one out of four churches engaged in other election-related practices, as well. Those included inviting or hosting candidates to speak at the church (30%); providing voter guides to congregants (28%); registering new voters (26%); and recommending or endorsing particular candidates to the congregation (23%).



The church patterns noted above were identified in relation to each of the seven practices. Protestant churches were more likely than Catholic churches to engage in each practice. Among Protestant congregations, in each case it was the Pentecostal/charismatic churches that were the most likely to enact the practice, followed by evangelical churches.

<b>Church Participation in the 2024 Election</b> (% of adults who attend such a church, indicating how their church participated in the election during the year prior to the election)						
Type of election-related activity by the church	All	Cath	Evang	Pent/Charis	Main-line	Non-Denom
Provided teaching re' Bible's stand on specific issues	54%	41%	67%	69%	56%	52%
Encouraged vote, without recommended candidates	53%	48%	61%	65%	53%	50%
Provided written info re' Bible's stand on issues	46%	35%	54%	65%	34%	40%
Invited/hosted candidates to speak at the church	30%	20%	31%	29%	32%	24%
Provided voter's guides	28%	19%	35%	29%	29%	23%
Registered new voters	26%	23%	30%	29%	27%	22%
Endorsed/recommended particular candidate(s)	23%	21%	29%	27%	21%	13%

Abbreviations: All = All Christian churches; Cath = Catholic church; Evang = Evangelical church; Pent/Charis = Pentecostal or charismatic church; Mainline = Mainline Protestant church; Non-Denom = Non-denominational or Independent Christian church.

Source: *2024 Post-Election Project*, Cultural Research Center at Arizona Christian University, N=2,000 voting-age adults, conducted November 6-8, 2024. For survey definitions of segments, see the research methodology notes at the end of this report.

The same set of practices had been evaluated in early September in a [pre-election survey](#) conducted by the Cultural Research Center. Over the final eight weeks of the campaign, little change was seen among Christian churches in their election-related activity. The only statistically significant increase in activity over the final weeks of the election season was a minor uptick in the number of churches that provided voter guides to the congregation (rising from 24% to 28%).

Across the nation, equal numbers of regular churchgoers wanted their church to be more involved as to be less involved in future elections. Overall, 21% of churchgoers wanted a heightened level of election engagement compared to 20% who wanted a reduced level of election involvement. About half of all churchgoers (49%) opted for no change in the existing level of engagement, and the remaining 10% did not have an opinion on the matter.

The types of churches in which the desire for heightened engagement outweighed those seeking less engagement were Pentecostal churches (37% wanted increased participation compared to 9% who desired less involvement) and non-denominational or independent Christian churches (30% opted for more engagement, 20% sought less engagement). Catholic churches led the way among churches where voters were more likely to desire less involvement (24% wanted less, 17% desired more).

## Changes from 2020

Upon comparing data from the Cultural Research Center's 2020 post-election survey to the 2024 version, many similarities emerged—and some interesting differences.

The findings show that there has been no significant change in the past four years in the proportion of the voting-age population that self-identifies as Democrat (32%) or Republican (34%), or in the number preferring socialism to capitalism (32%).

Among the notable political changes have been the drop in the number of people who paid a substantial amount of attention to news about politics, government, and the election. In the 2020 post-mortem, 58% of adults fit the highly attentive category compared to just 44% in 2024. This conforms to several measures of interest in the election that suggested voter enthusiasm was substantially diminished in 2024, perhaps helping to explain the decline in turnout.

Voters also had some divergent criteria in mind in 2024 as they evaluated the presidential candidates. An examination of the most important reasons for supporting their candidate of choice highlights a large drop in the importance of the character and morals of the candidates (34% in 2020, 16% in 2024) and in the professed dislike for the other party's presidential candidate (down from 24% to 18%). At the same time, the influence of the candidates' economic policies rose in importance by six percentage points (up from 15% in 2020 to 21% in 2024) and by seven points related to social policy positions (from 9% to 16%).

The decision-influencing issues of the 2020 election were topped by COVID-19 management (34%) and economic policies (33%). In 2024, concern about COVID-19 was not a factor, but the candidate's economic policies and plan was far and away the top consideration (rising from 33% in 2020 to 46% in 2024). Immigration and border control were named as a key issue influencing their vote by 7% in 2020, but mentioned as such by four times as many voters in 2024 (30%).

Abortion also rose in significance from 13% in 2020 to 23% in 2024. That increase in interest was primarily identified among individuals who were not born-again Christians, likely reflecting the Harris campaign's focus on abortion policy. Twelve percent of that group named abortion as an influential issue for them in 2020; twice as many (24%) listed abortion as a vote-defining issue in 2024.

The failure of the Harris campaign's emphasis on supporting abortion can largely be traced to resistance from born-again Christians 50 and older. The survey discovered that 45% of the voting-age population said they support abortion under any circumstances. A majority of people who align with a non-Christian faith (53%) and those who have no religious faith (56%) supported allowing abortions at any time, under any circumstances. Not surprisingly, half or more of the voters from each adult generation who were not theologically-defined born-again Christians supported abortion on-demand.

It was primarily theologically-defined born-again Christians—and especially those from the Gen X and Baby Boomer generations—who rejected abortion on-demand. Specifically, only one out of every four Gen X adults who were theologically-defined born-again Christians (26%) or Baby Boom adults who were theologically-defined born-again Christians (24%) advocated for abortion on-demand regardless of the circumstances.

<b>Support for Abortion Under Any Circumstances Varied by Age and Faith Commitment</b>			
<i>Percentage Who Supports Abortion Under Any Circumstances</i>			
<b>Segment:</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Segment:</b>	<b>%</b>
All US voting-age adults	45%	Gen Z, theologically-defined born-again	41%
Attend a traditionally-black Protestant church	59%	Gen Z, not theologically-defined born-again	60%
Have no religious faith	56%	Millennial, theologically-defined born-again	42%
Associated with a non-Christian faith	53%	Millennial, not theol.-defined born-again	49%
Catholics	44%	Gen X, theologically-defined born-again	26%
Attend a mainline Protestant church	41%	Gen X, not theologically-defined born-again	50%
Self-identified Christians	40%	Boomer, theologically-defined born-again	24%
Attend a non-denominational or independent Christian church	37%	Boomer, not theol.-defined born-again	53%
Protestant	37%		
Attend a Pentecostal/charismatic church	31%		
Theologically-defined born-again Christians	30%		
Theologically-defined evangelicals	15%		
Integrated Disciple (have biblical worldview)	14%		

Source: 2024 Post-Election Project, Cultural Research Center at Arizona Christian University, N=2,000 voting-age adults. For survey definitions of segments, see the research methodology notes at the end of this report.

### **Election Impact Continues to Unfold**

George Barna, who serves as the Director of Research at the Cultural Research Center and was responsible for designing and analyzing the election research, highlighted the significant impact of biblical principles and Christian voters as commentators scramble to explain the Trump landslide in the wake of widespread expectations of a close race.

“Thanks to relentless Christian-bashing by the mainstream media, as well as the dramatic impact of today’s culture on the lives of Christians, Americans forget that two-thirds of adults in this nation consider themselves to be Christians,” the ACU professor explained. “Although very few adults have a distinctively biblical worldview—just 4 percent—most Americans have embraced basic principles and tendencies advocated by well-known Bible stories and teachings, attributes that have historically been building blocks of the nation.”

“Donald Trump, for all of his perceived and ridiculed faults,” Barna continued, “did a better job than did

Kamala Harris of representing hallowed Christian characteristics such as the importance and support of family, the rule of law, limited government authority, financial responsibility, and the like. In contrast, Vice President Harris's doubling down on abortion on-demand, open borders, transgenderism, and central tenets of socialistic governance clashed with the core values of the nation's dominant spiritual perspectives."

"Millions of President Trump's votes came from people who would not vote for him as the nation's pastor or as a behavioral model for their children, but who perceived he would protect their traditional, cherished values and lifestyle preferences while Mrs. Harris was more likely to limit or ban such ways of life," Barna explained.

He noted that not only did most of President Trump's votes come from Christians, but they gave him a 17 million vote cushion over Mrs. Harris, which proved to be an insurmountable lead. The incumbent Vice President fared much better among people associated with non-Christian faiths and with no religious faith, but those segments represented too small a slice of the voting population to make her bid for the White House viable.

Barna, a bestselling author of 60 books regarding the contours and changes in American culture and faith, also cautioned observers to realize that the election alone cannot restore America to strength.

"The only way that public officials can facilitate stability and security is by instituting laws and policies that the people understand, accept, and embody," he commented. "America is in a time when it needs to move toward biblical truth and morality in people's hearts, first and foremost, so that government laws and policies reflect the soul of its people."

"That's a big challenge. Parents, pastors, and other people of influence must intentionally and strategically commit to shaping the worldview and values of the nation—especially among children—to coincide with the beliefs and values they just voted to protect," Barna explained. "Successfully refining the worldview and values of the American people is the foundation required to facilitate desired national outcomes such as unity, equality, opportunity, safety, peace, justice, and joy."

### **Survey Methodology**

The research was designed and analyzed by George Barna and the Cultural Research Center at Arizona Christian University. The survey was administered to a national sample of 2,000 adults drawn from a national research panel during the three days (November 6-8, 2024) immediately following Election Day. The interviews were conducted using text-to-web technology, with a systematic sampling of panel members. To best approximate the demographic profile of the national population, minor statistical weighting was applied to the final database, calibrated to Census data. For survey results based upon the aggregate sample of respondents, the estimated sampling error is a maximum of plus/minus 3 percentage points, based on the 95% confidence interval. The average interview lasted 17 minutes.

The survey included a variety of population segments based on a combination of theological measures. Those included:

- Theologically-defined evangelicals: deeply committed to practicing their faith, regularly share faith in Christ with non-believers, trust the Bible as a reliable source of truth and moral guidance, actively disciple other people, believe in the God of Israel, and trust Jesus Christ as their savior
- Theologically-defined born-again Christians: confident they will live eternally in Heaven solely because they have confessed their sins to God, repented, and trust Jesus as their Savior.

- Mainline churches: congregations associated with the American Baptist, Episcopal, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Presbyterian Church in the USA, United Church of Christ, and United Methodist denominations.
- Evangelical churches: those that teach the Bible is true, relevant and reliable, who profess Jesus Christ as the only means to salvation, and who actively promote eternal salvation by God's grace through Jesus Christ.
- Integrated Disciples: people who possess the biblical worldview, determined through measured beliefs and behaviors that are largely consistent with biblical teaching on more than 30 attributes (related to morality, the supernatural, truth, character, relationships, lifestyle and values, etc.).
- SAGE Cons: an acronym for **S**piritually **A**ctive **G**overnance **E**ngaged Conservative Christians, determined by their consistent participation and belief in core Christian principles and religious endeavors, plus above-average political attentiveness and participation, possessing conservative political ideology, and a commitment to Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior.
- Gen Z: born 2002-2020
- Millennials: born 1984-2002
- Gen X: born 1965-1983
- Baby Boomers: born 1946-1964

### **About the Cultural Research Center**

The Cultural Research Center at Arizona Christian University in Glendale, Arizona, conducts the annual *American Worldview Inventory* as well as other nationwide surveys regarding worldview and cultural transformation. National studies completed by the Cultural Research Center (CRC) have investigated topics related to family, values, lifestyle, spiritual practices, and politics.

One of the groundbreaking efforts by CRC has been the worldview-related surveys conducted among the ACU student population. The first-of-its-kind *ACU Student Worldview Inventory* is administered to every ACU student at the start of each academic year, and a final time just prior to graduation. The results of that student census enable the University to track and address the worldview development of its students from a longitudinal perspective.

CRC is guided by Dr. George Barna, Director of Research, and Dr. Tracy Munsil, Executive Director. Like ACU, CRC embraces biblical Christianity. The Center works in cooperation with a variety of Bible-centric, theologically conservative Christian ministries and remains politically non-partisan. Results from past surveys conducted by CRC and information about the Cultural Research Center are available at [www.CulturalResearchCenter.com](http://www.CulturalResearchCenter.com).

Further information about Arizona Christian University is available at [www.ArizonaChristian.edu](http://www.ArizonaChristian.edu).

### **About George Barna and *Raising Spiritual Champions: Nurturing Your Child's Heart, Mind and Soul***

In addition to being a professor at Arizona Christian University and Director of Research of the Cultural Research Center at ACU, George Barna is a veteran researcher of 40-plus years and author of 60 books. His most recent book is *Raising Spiritual Champions: Nurturing Your Child's Heart, Mind and Soul*, which immediately became a bestseller on Amazon upon its release in late 2023.

*Raising Spiritual Champions*, published by [Arizona Christian University Press](#) in collaboration with [Family Research Council](#) (Washington, D.C.) and Texas-based [Fedd Books](#), covers a variety of topics helpful to parents and Christian leaders. The volume includes research-based descriptions of how a child's worldview develops; the relationships between worldview and discipleship; how parents can develop a simple plan to guide their child to a biblical worldview, and how to become a disciple of Jesus Christ; the role churches and godly church leaders can play in that process; measuring the worldview of children; and more.

[Click here](#) for more information about *Raising Spiritual Champions* or visit [www.RaisingSpiritualChampionsBook.com](http://www.RaisingSpiritualChampionsBook.com). For information about discounts for quantity orders, email [info@culturalresearchcenter.com](mailto:info@culturalresearchcenter.com).