

It's Not All About Sunday Morning:  
Religiosity and Religious Belief in Public Opinion

By Sarah Loren Fleck  
Completed at Lycoming College, Williamsport, PA  
August 2007 – April 2008  
Departmental Honors Project in Political Science

Advised by Dr. Jonathan Williamson  
Chair, Political Science Department

Honors Project Committee:  
Dr. Jonathan Williamson, Chair  
Dr. Jinney Smith  
Dr. Philip Sprunger  
Dr. Donald Kurtz

## **Acknowledgements**

First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Williamson for helping me through this project. More than a professor, he has been a mentor and a friend to me throughout my four years at Lycoming College. Thank you, Drs. Smith, Sprunger, and Kurtz for being on my honors panel and assisting me through the process. Thank you, Jane Keller for helping me through some tough times and helping to strengthen my conviction. To my friends and band mates, Garrett, Greg, Patrick, and Kristin, for sticking with me through everything and showing me how I want to live my life. And last but not least, I would like to thank my family. My brother Kyle came to college with me and we've grown even closer throughout this last year. Thank you Mom and Dad— for love, shoulders to cry on, and money. Also, thank you Onnie and Pappy for unconditional love and for making me into the Democrat that I am today.

## Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Religion and Politics	4
Data and Measures	15
Results	21
Conclusions	36
Appendix A	39
Appendix B	44
Works Cited	52

## Index of Tables

Table 1 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Opinion on Same-Sex Marriage	23
Table 2 – Nation Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Homosexual Index	25
Table 3 – Nation Frequency - “Do you think that homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the United States Armed Forces, or don’t you think so?”	25
Table 4 – Nation “Do you think that gay or lesbian couples, in other words, homosexual couples, should be legally permitted to adopt children?”	26
Table 5 – Nation “Recently, there has been a lot of talk about job discrimination. Do you favor or oppose laws to protect homosexuals against job discrimination?”	26
Table 6 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Opinion on Abortion	28
Table 7 – Nation Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Opinion on Abortion	29
Table 8 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Opinion on the Death Penalty	31
Table 9 – Nation Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Opinion on the Death Penalty	32
Table 10 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Crosstab – Religious Belief and Opinion on Same-Sex Marriage	33

Table 11 – Nation Crosstab – Religious Belief and Homosexual Index	33
Table 12 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Crosstab – Religious Belief and Opinion on Abortion	34
Table 13 – Nation Crosstab – Religious Belief and Opinion on Abortion	34
Table 14 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Crosstab – Religious Belief and Opinion on the Death Penalty	35
Table 15 – Nation Crosstab – Religious Belief and Opinion on the Death Penalty	35
Table A1 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Frequency – “Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent or what?”	39
Table A2 – Nation Frequency – “Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent or what?”	39
Table A3 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Frequency – “Do you generally think of yourself as a liberal, moderate, or conservative?”	40
Table A4 – Nation Frequency – “When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road, slightly conservative, conservative, extremely conservative, or haven't you thought much about this?”	40

Table A5 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Frequency – “Do you consider religion to be an important part of your life, or not?”	40
Table A6 – Nation Frequency – “Do you consider religion to be an important part of your life, or not?”	40
Table A7 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Frequency – “Would you say your religion provides some guidance, quite a bit of guidance, or a great deal of guidance in your day-to-day living?”	41
Table A8 – Nation Frequency – “Would you say your religion provides some guidance in your day-to-day living, quite a bit of guidance, or a great deal of guidance in your day-to-day life?”	41
Table A9 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Frequency – “Would you describe yourself as a born-again or evangelical Christian?”	41
Table A10 – Nation Frequency – “Would you call yourself a born-again Christian, that is, have you personally had a conversion experience related to Jesus Christ?”	42
Table A11 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District Frequency – Church Identification	42
Table A12 – Nation Frequency – Church Identification	43

## **Abstract**

The existing research on the interaction between religion and politics almost exclusively uses church attendance as a measure of religiosity, and then attempts to explain political opinions with this measure. Religiosity is a complicated thing to measure, but the definition of religiosity as church attendance falls short. Using a local study of the 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional district of Pennsylvania through the Lycoming College Polling Institute of the Center for the Study of Community and the Economy, and data from the 2000 American National Election Study, this study finds evidence to support the contention that personal religious beliefs, (such as belief about the Bible, and belief in God, etc.), have an effect on respondents' opinion on three political issues: abortion, same-sex marriage, and the death penalty. These religious beliefs are separate from the traditional measure of religiosity, church attendance. Upon analysis of both the CSCE and ANES surveys, religious beliefs appear to have an effect on political opinion that appears to exist alongside the effects of religiosity.

The interaction between religion and politics has been heavily studied. Especially since the 2004 presidential election between George W. Bush and John F. Kerry, in which religion, according to some, played an extremely important role (Langer, 745). Previous research explores the role of religion in elections, the importance of politicians being religious to their electorates, and how religion may affect political participation and other civic involvement (Langer 747, Erzen 48, Beyerlein 120). The increased political participation of groups considered to be part of the "Religious Right" has also caused considerably increased interest in, and concern about the topic (Erzen 46).

To study the interaction of religion and politics, researchers in the past have almost exclusively used church attendance as a measure of religiosity. As such, religiosity does not capture the full meaning of, for lack of a better word, a person's "religiousness"; another measure is warranted. This study will define and operationalize "religious belief," a measure of a person's religious commitment outside of religious services. It is hypothesized that the effects of religious belief will go above and beyond religiosity even when controlling for the effects of other variables.

Many issues exist today that have religious significance to many people including abortion, same-sex marriage, and the death penalty. Religiosity has a strong possibility of affecting their opinions on these specific issues. Religiosity is typically defined as a measure of devotion to a religion or piety; however, this is a complicated variable to measure. It is nearly impossible to quantify an individual's level of religiosity. Generally, researchers simplify the measurement of religiosity as frequency of church attendance (Greenberg 62). The operationalization of religiosity through the measurement of church



attendance has face validity; however, it does not entirely capture the notion of devotion to religion.

Although church attendance is really the most common way to measure religiosity, it is not, by itself, sufficient. An individual can attend church every week, but still have liberal views on issues. Similarly, an individual can go to church very rarely or never, and still have fundamental views on issues. The current literature has not adequately addressed the relationship of religious *belief* to political opinion. Like religiosity, religious belief can also be a complicated thing to measure. The goal of this research is to quantitatively measure respondents' religiosity (measured by church attendance) and personal religious beliefs. These quantitative measurements will then be used to better understand the effects of an individual's religion on political beliefs by going beyond the traditional measurement of religiosity and seeking understanding of how these two concepts relate to each other. Religiosity and religious beliefs should have effects on political opinions separately.

The current literature focuses exclusively on church attendance to determine a person's religiosity. However, different studies come to different conclusions about the role of religiosity because church attendance is not the only factor of religion that should be taken into account when studying religiosity. A few articles mention the possible role of religious beliefs on political opinion, but none of these articles expand on this subject. Religious beliefs could be the missing factor in the analysis of religion and politics. These religious beliefs that focus on religious activities other than church attendance may explain why someone who goes to church often still holds liberal political opinions and why someone who rarely or never goes to church still has conservative political opinions.

## Religion and Politics

Despite the recent increase in interest, the topic of how religion affects politics is not a brand-new one. Sue T. Rinehart and Jerry Perkins (1989) discuss the effect of religion on individuals' voting choices focusing on the interaction of religion, voting, and gender. The authors theorize that women's voting decisions are more affected by religious factors such as importance of religion, the amount of guidance religion provides in life and the attendance of religious services than by gender (38). The first two factors were combined into a four-point index with rankings ranging from "religion is not important and offers no guidance" to "religion is both important and offers a great deal of guidance." The study finds that women are more religious than men, but religion is not, as is hypothesized in the study, a more important predictor of religious behavior for women than for men (39).

Not only is their hypothesis not supported, but they also found that except for a small group of fundamentalist women and conservative Catholic women, the gender gap (the concept that women tend to be more Democratic and men tend to be more Republican) actually widened in both of the elections that were studied: the 1980 presidential election between Ronald Reagan and Jimmy Carter and the 1984 election between Ronald Reagan and Walter Mondale (53).

The study of gender, religion, and political opinion is again addressed by Anna Greenberg (2001). The study contained in the article analyzes different variables that affect women's votes, in particular, ideology, party identification, and religious values. Greenberg says that the only reason that the Democratic Party continues to earn a majority of the women's vote every election is because of African-American women. In

the 1992 election, both Clinton and Bush received 41% of the white, female vote and in 1996, Clinton's percentage of this vote exceeded Dole's by only 5% (61). Unlike the preceding article and much of the literature on the subject of the interplay between religion and politics, this research makes a distinction between religious practice and religious belief. (74).

David E. Campbell (2004) also finds that Evangelical Protestants' civic engagement is not affected by church attendance. He argues that the time that Evangelical Protestants spend in church comes at the expense of time they would be spending participating in the wider community. This, and the preceding Beyerlein and Hipp study on church activity are both important to understanding the roles that different churches and other religious groups play in mobilizing their congregations and persuading them to vote a certain way or donate to a certain cause. Congregants that are persuaded to vote a certain way or donate to a certain cause may be more concentrated in a certain denomination (173).

Carol A. Cassel (1999) also claims that, as is often true in studies in social science, the effect of churches in civic engagement and community participation can be extremely difficult to measure. Researches don't really distinguish which people are motivated by their church to participate in wider community activity and which people are just naturally inclined to community participation, including the activity they do in their church or other religious organization. Finally, Cassel says that the increased sense of community gained by going to church may also increase the inclination of someone to vote with their church's position or the position of other people who also attend their church or other religious organization. This plays a role in understanding how religiosity,

as traditionally measured, is related to political opinions. Cassel's research shows that it may or may not be valid to assume that frequency of church attendance is the real predictor of political opinions (514).

A third line of research focusing the role of churches in community and voter mobilization is addressed by Brian D. McKenzie (2004) who hypothesizes that it is not the messages conveyed by ministers, priests, etc. that affect political positions or voting decisions, but rather the personal interaction between members of the congregation and the opinions shared among them that matter most in shaping the views of individual congregants. McKenzie argues that it is not so much the church itself or the leaders of the church that matter, but the kind of people that attend that church and the ideas that they have and choose to share with those around them.

Ideas are exchanged at church, and sometimes so is political literature. Clyde Wilcox and Lee Singelman discuss the role of interest group contacting through churches. Some political interest groups that focus on issues of religious importance will directly contact people in church through a minister, priest, or other religious leader, or will distribute literature that focuses on specific issues. This is the most direct form of influence through a church or other religious organization; it is also the least common. However, regardless of the prevalence of this type of religious contacting, it is probably the most influential and hardest to ignore; therefore, it is important.

Wilcox and Singelman (2001) conclude that this form of religious contacting may not be as influential as it first seems. Through their study, they conclude that people who are contacted by these religious groups that contact through churches are no more likely to be persuaded or influenced by them than they are to be persuaded or influenced by a

political party or other interest group. The reason for this, say the authors, is that groups that target people through churches tend to be more narrowly targeted, and therefore there are less people who will listen or take information and then act on it (527). Contact is an important part of religiosity study, but evidence about contact is limited.

Tanya Erzen (2005) deals particularly with the political organizations associated with Evangelical Christian churches. Erzen claims that these "ground campaigns" were largely responsible for George W. Bush's reelection success over John F. Kerry in the 2004 presidential election. Churches provide a good space for institution organization and when political groups use a church to contact people, the group's cause becomes an extension of the parishioners' religious obligation. Erzen theorizes that these groups can actually "[blur] the boundaries between the pulpit and the arena of partisan politics." In theory, this could be one of the motivations for groups like this to use churches for institutional organization; it becomes religiously important for believers in this church to vote the way that they are told to in church (50).

Mark D. Regnerus, et al. (1999) mark an important point in the evolution of literature on politics and religion. They conduct the earliest available research that deals with the role of what the authors call the "Christian Right" (or Religious Right as it's commonly referred to today), and when it started to become more politically important. The authors discuss the ways in which the Christian Right influences voters' positions on "personal" matters and whether or not the Christian Right tries to persuade people to vote in a certain way. The article concludes that the Christian Right has the most influence on Evangelical Christians. The group also has moderate influence among the elderly, the less educated, whites, the economically insecure, and southerners (1382).

As aforementioned, religion played an extremely important role in the 2004 presidential election. Three articles in particular outline this importance and what it meant for both candidates. James L. Guth et al. (2006) discuss the importance that "moral values" played in the reelection of George W. Bush in their 2006 article: "Bush showed himself willing to use religion forcefully to sharpen partisan divisions and highlight his own qualities as a leader" (330). The "Wednesday morning" analysis showed that "moral values" was the most important issue in previous night's election. As it turns out, the Iraq War proved to be the most important issue to all voters overall. However, Bush's conservative stances on issues including abortion and same-sex marriage did play a critical role in his reelection.

The authors point out the fact that religion was not a central issue in only the Bush campaign; Kerry's campaign also had a religious strategy. If elected, Kerry would become only the second Roman Catholic to ever serve as president. However, despite this affiliation, Kerry did not perform well among traditionally Democratic Catholics. Because Bush came out with the more conservative stance on abortion, he managed to do well among Catholic voters. The authors of this article claim that "Bush's [religious strategy] was well developed and consistent while Kerry's was reactive and erratic" (239). This article shows the growing importance of religion and particularly conservative religious beliefs in elections. Bush was able to steal a political demographic that was traditionally in the Democratic camp because of conservative religious belief. Both candidates in the election managed to define their base along religious lines and this led the way to even more partisanship that was already present in electoral politics of the

time. The 2004 presidential race managed to increase the importance of voters' religion in their voting choices and political opinions (240).

Although Guth et al. write about the large importance of "moral values" in the 2004 presidential election, Gary Langer and Jon Cohn (2005) argue that that large importance may be over exaggerated or misinterpreted. The authors argue that moral values cannot be treated as a discrete issue the way that issues like the Iraq War, the economy, or Social Security can. Moral issues are actually something completely separate from political values, and although these moral values may play a role in affecting the voter's decisions and may influence the voter's opinion on other discrete issues, it is in itself, not an issue.

Langer and Cohen's argument counters all the literature and analysts that argue that "moral values" has been an issue of rising importance in recent political history. The authors control for variables such as partisan self-identification, race, ideology, religion, and church attendance and find that "moral values has less predictive power than terrorism, the economy, and Iraq; it is tied with health care for fourth in terms of predictive probability" (753). However, fourth place is important in a tight election competition.

A political science concept that was borrowed for politics and religion research is the concept of racial threat. Racial threat is the idea that Caucasians who live in areas with high levels of African-Americans, will be more likely to vote along Caucasian lines. David E. Campbell (2006) applied the concept of threat to religion. He examines how Evangelical Christians' voting patterns will change when they live in areas considered to be highly secular. Campbell finds that these Evangelical Christians who live among

seculars are more likely to vote along conservative, Christian lines. However, the reverse is not true; secular people who live among large numbers of Evangelical Christians are not more likely to vote along secular lines than they would be if not living in such an area.

Most of the literature regarding the growing importance of religion in politics has pointed to the fact that conservatives in America are becoming more religious or at least voting along religious lines more often. Because of this, the Republican Party has been moving more and more to the right. However, Louis Bolce and Gerald Maio in their 2001 article argue that it is not the Republican Party that is moving further right, but the Democratic Party is actually moving further left. They agree that the role of religion in today's political life is changing and becoming more important, but they ultimately point to the Democratic Party as the catalyst. Bolce and Maio claim that the media is ignoring the growing influence of secularists in the Democratic Party and "obfuscates how their worldview is just as powerful a determinant of social attitudes and voting behavior as is a religiously traditionalist outlook." The authors describe the "culture wars" and how they have evolved since the 1960s. The two main parties in the "culture wars" are the Evangelical Christians and secularists. The article ends with a section entitled "The party of irreligion?" and theorizes that the Democratic Party is a natural home to those voters who are non-religious even though the Party is typically associated with African-American Protestants and those of the Jewish faith. They also say that a public discussion of the overarching ideologies of the two parties would damage the Democrats because of the prevalence and importance of religion in today's American society (14).



The research of Christopher P. Gilbert, et. al. in their 1995 article can also be considered when examining the religious ideologies of the parties. Because both of these parties' fairly solid standpoints on religious issues, it is hard for a third-party candidate to make any headway in the issue of religion. Third-party candidates cannot forge constituencies based on denominational lines, no major third-party candidates have used appeals based on social issues of religious importance, religious factors motivate some *not* to vote for third-party candidates, and religion can play a role in a citizen's evaluation of a third-party candidate (492).

Laura R. Olsen and John C. Green (2006 a) also write about the importance of religion in the 2004 presidential election, but with a different focus. They focus on the concept of voting gaps. This article examines all of the "gaps" observed in voting behavior. These "gaps" include the race and ethnicity gap, the religion gap, the class gap, the region and place gap, the famous gender gap, the generation gap, and the education gap. The authors identify the religion gap as the second largest gap in the 2004 presidential election. Specifically, this gap lies between those that do attend worship at a church, synagogue, or mosque, and those who do not. The authors notes that "some two-thirds of those who reported attending worship weekly or more often voted for Bush." The religion gap is also tied to race. Weekly attendees include White Evangelical Protestants as well as African-American Protestants who are one of the Democratic Party's strongest bases (445).

In another article, Olsen and Green (2006 b) later explain that differences within religious communities appear to be more significant than those those among different religious communities. It is more relevant to compare people who say that religion plays

an important role in their lives to those who do not make this claim than to compare those with different levels of church attendance. It is still unknown exactly why religious Americans view the world so differently than those who are not religious.

The authors speculate on this difference in voting behavior. Religious affiliation may affect this difference. It may also be that those people who frequently attend worship services are concentrated in one or a few particular religious sects. The gap may also be associated with religious commitment. Finally, the authors theorize that the cause of the gap may be religious belief. The current research project expands from this point. Olsen and Green say that people who tend to attend church more often may hold different religious beliefs than those who attend church less often. This is the first instance where religious belief is mentioned as a probable cause of increased church attendance. It is also the inspiration for the current research question at hand. Like Olsen and Green, Anna Greenberg, in her article regarding the interaction of gender, religion, and politics also speculates about religious belief playing a role in political opinions. However, like Olsen and Green, Greenberg does not elaborate on this possibility. Nor does the survey used as the basis for Greenberg's research ask any questions to get at the level or nature of a respondent's personal religious beliefs.

These articles by Olsen and Green and Greenberg mark an important point in the evolution of the literature. How often an individual attends church and the personal religious beliefs that an individual might hold should be treated as two separate issues. An individual can have a "conservative" church attendance, but "moderate" or "secular" personal religious beliefs

All of the above literature more is important to framing the context in which the current research is taking place. The study of religion and politics is advanced and it is an area of study that has many smaller areas contained within it. Because the research that is currently being conducted studies the effect of religiosity (measured by amount of church attendance) and religious beliefs on political opinions of issues with religious significance, there are many different facets of the study of religion and politics that must be taken into account. The study will try to separate the effects of the two factors and determine which one has a larger effect on opinion on political issues with religious significance. Studies examining the role of gender, religious contacting, and the Religious Right must all be scrutinized for potential importance. The effects of religion on the 2004 presidential election, the study of "gapology," "religious threat," the secularization of the Democratic Party, and third-party voting all contain elements of importance to the research currently being conducted. Religion and politics is a complicated arena of study with many areas of interest. Any study of any part of the role of religion and politics first involves a large amount of research into the other areas already examined and explained.

In short, the study of religion and politics has been an extensive one. Researchers have been studying the interplay of the two concepts for many years and with many different variables, theories, and outcomes. Until recently, however, no one has considered how religious belief affects political opinion. Olsen and Green came close, and so did Anna Greenberg, but neither of them attempt to explain the operationalization of this concept or how it would affect political opinion.

The research revolves around the theory that religiosity, measured by frequency of church attendance and the nature of one's personal religious beliefs are two separate

concepts. While the two may interact, both influence political opinion and have separate effects. This study hypothesizes that personal religious beliefs and political opinion are related and that those with more fundamental religious beliefs will hold more conservative political opinion than those with more secular religious beliefs, and that relationship will be stronger than the effect of religiosity on political beliefs.

What is meant by the words “conservative,” “fundamental,” “secular,” and “liberal?” Like “religiosity,” these terms are complicated to define. It is even more difficult to measure and create a scale of “fundamentalness” or “secularness.” Someone who is a more religiously fundamental is more likely to hold conservative political beliefs. Oppositely, someone who is religiously secular is more likely to hold liberal political beliefs. A respondent who is fundamental will most likely think, for example, that the Bible is the word of God and that God definitely exists. A fundamental respondent would also pray and read the Bible often as well as attempt to convert people in their lives to Christianity. A respondent who is secular will hold the opposite religious beliefs of a fundamental respondent (think the Bible was written by men alone, have doubts about the existence of God, will pray and read the Bible more rarely, and probably hasn’t attempted to convert anyone to Christianity).

“Conservative” will be used to describe someone who is predisposed to right-leaning political policies. Someone who is the opposite of “conservative” on political issues would be considered to be “liberal,” and will be predisposed to left-leaning policies. Someone who is “fundamental” is someone who holds more traditional religious beliefs. In contrast, people who are secular are people who are more areligious. Every

respondent is different, of course, and someone who chooses the most conservative response for one question may not make the equivalent response for another question.

### **Data and Measures**

Two surveys will be used in the analysis of the theory and hypothesis. The first survey was conducted by The Center for the Study of Community and the Economy of the 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional district of Pennsylvania representing parts of twelve counties in northeastern Pennsylvania. The survey contacted 551 registered voters between Sunday, September 23<sup>rd</sup> and Thursday, September 27<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

The second survey utilized for the study is the 2000 American National Election Study survey. The 2000 ANES was conducted by the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research. The 2000 ANES surveyed 1,807 respondents. A pre-election survey and a post-election survey were conducted. The pre-election survey was started on September 5<sup>th</sup>, and the post-election survey was started on November 8<sup>th</sup>. The 2000 ANES focused on many subject areas including partisanship and evaluations of the political parties, the Clinton legacy, and opinions about the nation's most important problem. The survey also includes questions regarding religiosity (as traditionally measured) and religious beliefs. Questions similar to the ones asked in the CSCE survey, including how often a respondent reads the Bible, how often a respondent prays, and what the respondent's opinion on the Bible is were also asked in the ANES survey. Both surveys also include questions about the denomination of respondents. The denomination of respondents as well as their party identifications and ideologies will also be included in sections of the analyses.

There is one major difference between the two surveys used in this research that must be addressed. The CSCE survey was based on a random sample of registered voters from the 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District. The ANES survey is not based on registered voters; all citizens are included in the population. This difference could result in measurable differences in the results if registered voters are significantly different than those who are not registered to vote. People who register to vote tend to be better off economically, more educated, older, and white. Comparisons of the results between the two surveys should keep that population difference in mind.

The CSCE survey sample resulted in a disproportionately large share of respondents who were female, older, and from certain counties. Weights were calculated on the basis of those three variables to make the sample more reflective of the population of registered voters in the district.

The results from the CSCE survey were compared to the results from the ANES survey, allowing for the comparison of religious and political issues across the two surveys. The 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional district of Pennsylvania diverges from the country as whole in both religious and political contexts. The use of a local survey and a national survey allows understanding of regional political and religious differences. It also allowed for a better understanding of the political and religious opinions of the residents of Pennsylvania's 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District.

Analysis began simply with the construction of crosstabs examining religiosity and opinion on the three political issues included in the study and religious belief and the three issues. This analysis was conducted with the data from the CSCE study and the ANES study. The indices of religiosity and religious belief were crossed with the

different opinions on the political issues (three in the case of abortion and same-sex marriage and two for the death penalty). The crosstabs of religiosity and political opinion also included a third variable – religious affiliation. Religious affiliation is broken into six different categories: Evangelical Protestant, Non-Evangelical Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, other, and the non-religious. Frequencies of religiosity, the five questions regarding religious belief, and church affiliation were then created.

The dependent variables in this research involve political opinion across three issue areas with religious implications in contemporary American politics: same-sex marriage, abortion, and the death penalty. After the analysis of the CSCE was completed, it was discovered that there was no question regarding same-sex marriage in the ANES survey. Three questions regarding rights of homosexuals were asked however. The three questions focused on homosexuals in the military, the right of homosexual couples to adopt children, and laws against job discrimination against homosexuals.

In the CSCE survey, the questions regarding same-sex marriage and abortion were both measured on a three-point scale. Respondents who chose “same-sex couples should receive no legal or religious recognition” were given a score of one. Those who chose “same-sex couples should be able to obtain legal civil unions, but not marriages” were given a two. Finally, respondents who chose “same-sex couples should be able to obtain both civil unions and marriages” were given a three. A similar system was used for the abortion question. Respondents who gave the most conservative answer, “abortion should never be an option” were given a one, those who chose “abortion should be an available option only in limited circumstances” got a two, and those who thought that “abortion should be an available option in all or almost all situations” were given a three.

The question contained in the CSCE survey regarding the death penalty was a little different from the previously described two questions. Respondent were only given two options in this question: favor the death penalty for persons convicted of murder or oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder. This question was adjusted to also fit on a three-point scale. Respondents who favor the death penalty were given a one while those who opposed the death penalty were given a three. The questions were all put on the same scale so the answers for the questions could be comparable for each respondent.

The questions about abortion and the death penalty contained in the ANES survey were asked and measured in the same way as the corresponding questions in the CSCE survey. However, as aforementioned, there was no question directly regarding same-sex marriage. To create a measure comparable to the one regarding same-sex marriage in the CSCE survey, an index was created, combining the three ANES questions regarding the rights of homosexuals. All three of these questions were measured on a simple “yes or no” scale. Again to keep comparability across surveys, they were adjusted to three-point scales. Therefore, respondents who gave conservative answers, (homosexuals should not be allowed to serve in the military, same-sex couples should not be permitted to adopt children, and no job discrimination protection for homosexuals is unnecessary), were given a score of one for each question. All three of the included questions were weighted equally. Similarly, those respondents who gave the opposite, liberal answers, (homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the military, same-sex couples should be permitted to adopt children, and job discrimination protection for homosexuals is necessary), were given scores of three for each question. When combined the lowest



score, and therefore most conservative score that a respondent could get was a three, (answering “one” to all three questions), and the highest or most liberal score that could be earned was a nine, (answering “three” to all three questions).

The primary independent variables are religiosity and religious belief. Religiosity is the concept of being devoted to religion or being pious. This is a very complicated variable to measure. Traditionally, the method used to analyze religiosity is through church attendance; the more a person goes to church the more fundamental he or she is and the less a person goes to church, the more secular he or she is.

Measuring religiosity with church attendance is an imperfect method, however, it is the easiest to measure, obtain, and analyze. In both the CSCE survey and the ANES survey, religiosity is measured by church attendance. Respondents were asked a series of questions regarding their affiliation with different churches and the amount of attendance. Respondents were grouped into six different categories: attends church more than once a week, attends church once a week, attends church once or twice a month, attends church a few times a year, doesn't attend church but does identify with a religion, and doesn't attend church nor identify with a religion. For purposes of crosstab analysis, these categories were collapsed into three categories: attends church once a week or more, religious, but attends church less than once a week, and non-religious.

Because church attendance is an imperfect way to measure religiosity, different methods need to be developed and used. Another way to measure religiosity besides church attendance is with religious belief. For the purposes of this study, religious beliefs are those beliefs that are held by an individual that are separate and not necessarily dependent on church attendance. This variable can be complicated to measure. In the

CSCE survey, five questions were asked regarding a respondent's religious belief: belief on the inherency of the Bible, attempts to evangelize others into Christianity, belief in the existence of God, frequency of scripture reading, and frequency of prayer.

Similar to the creation of the rights of homosexuals index, these five questions were all adjusted to fit on the same scale. In this instance, a four-point scale was created. Again, respondents giving a more fundamental answer for a question, ("the Bible is the word of God and all it says is true," "I know that God really exists and have no doubts about it," etc.), were given a one. Respondent giving more secular answers, ("the Bible was written by men who lived so long ago that it is worth very little today," "I don't believe in God," etc.), were given a score of four. As stated, there were five questions asked, so the lowest score a respondent could receive in this index, and therefore the most fundamental, was a five, and the highest and therefore most secular score a respondent could receive would be a twenty. These scores ranging from five to twenty were then collapsed into equally ranged categories ranging from a "1 Most Fundamental" to a "4 Most Secular," (fives through eights were recoded to be a one, nines through twelves were recoded to be a two, etc.).

Where the CSCE survey contained five questions regarding a respondent's religious beliefs, the ANES survey contained only three of these questions. The three that were included in the ANES survey were frequency of prayer, frequency of scripture reading, and belief in God. These three questions were combined into an index of religious belief. Unlike the CSCE index of religious belief that ranged from five to twenty, the index of ANES religious belief question ranged from three to fifteen. The more fundamental answers were given a score of one and the more secular answers were

given a score of five. (This is measured on a five-point scale because the questions regarding frequency of prayer and frequency of scripture reading were both measured on five-point scales.) The question regarding belief on the Bible was adjusted to fit on this five-point scale even though it was originally measured on a three-point scale. To make this index comparable to the religious belief index created from the CSCE data, this index was also collapsed into four categories ranging from “1 Most Fundamental” to “4 Most Secular.”

### **Results**

To begin to explore the relationships between religiosity, religious belief, and political opinion, the first step is to consider the bivariate relationships between the two religion variables and the three issue areas across the two surveys. As Table 1 shows, when looking at the relationship between religiosity and same-sex marriage in the 10<sup>th</sup> District, the more a respondent attends church, the more conservative his or her political beliefs will be, at least among Evangelical Protestants and Non-Evangelical Protestants. 84.1% of Evangelical Protestants who attend church more than once a week believe that same-sex couples should receive no legal or religious recognition. The percentage of respondents with this opinion among Evangelical Protestants who are religious, but attend church less than once a week drops to 53.8%. In addition, the relationship between religiosity and opinion on same-sex marriage was only significant for Evangelical Protestants.

Another interesting relationship shown in the crosstab is the distribution of respondents within a religion that choose the three different options within the same-sex marriage variable. Among Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Protestants, regardless of

their frequency of church attendance, the more liberal an answer is, the less likely a respondent is to choose it. Again examining Evangelical Protestants, the percentage of those who choose “civil unions, but not marriages” among those who attend church once a week or more is 69.8 percentage points lower and the difference between percentages of who chose “civil unions, but not marriages” and who chose “civil unions and marriages” is 12.7 percentage points lower. There is a similar pattern among those Evangelical Protestants who attend church less than once a week, and all Non-Evangelical Protestants.

The relationship among Catholics, Jewish respondents, those of other religions, and the non-religious, however, is different than expected. The modal category among Catholics regardless of church attendance is “civil unions, but not marriages,” not “no legal or religious recognition” as it is among both Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Protestants. The CSCE survey interviewed a limited amount of respondents of the Jewish faith, and those of other religions, therefore, analysis of these two groups by religiosity would be fruitless. Among those who are non-religious, 41.4% of respondents chose “civil unions and marriages” making that category the modal category. This is to be expected because those who are non-religious, atheist, or agnostic tend to be more liberal than those who are religious.

The ANES survey did not ask a question regarding same-sex marriage. The three questions regarding the rights of homosexuals, (right of same-sex couples to adopt, right of homosexuals to serve in the military, and right of homosexuals to job discrimination protection), were then combined into an index and analyzed in the same fashion that opinion on same-sex marriage was measured with the CSCE data.

Table 1 - 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District  
 Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Opinion on Same-Sex Marriage

		SS Marriage			
		No Recognition	CU but not Marriages	CU & Marriages	
Church	Religiosity				X <sup>2</sup> λ
Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	53 (Frequency) 84.1% (% within religiosity)	9 14.3%	1 1.6%	16.881* .648
	<Once/Week	35 53.8%	16 24.6%	14 21.5%	
Non-Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	15 46.9%	10 31.3%	7 21.9%	.706 .142
	<Once/Week	44 38.6%	39 34.2%	31 27.2%	
Catholic	≥Once/Week	24 36.9%	30 46.2%	11 16.9%	1.496 .152
	<Once/Week	29 31.2%	41 44.1%	23 24.7%	
Jewish	Total	0 0.0%	7 100.0%	0 0.0%	
Other	Total	12 46.2%	5 19.2%	9 34.6%	
Non-Religious	Total	18 25.7%	23 32.9%	29 41.4%	

\* P < .05

The patterns found in this analysis differed somewhat from those found in the CSCE data regarding same-sex marriage. For every church affiliation and every level of church attendance except for that of Jewish respondents and the non-religious, the modal category was “moderate” indicating mostly moderate answers on all three of the questions. Like in the survey of the 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District, the relationship between religiosity and political opinion is only significant for Evangelical Protestants. At first, this relationship seems counter-intuitive. However, when the index is broken down and

analyzed by question, the relationship becomes easier to understand (See Tables 2 through 5).

This index is not a perfect comparison to the question from the CSCE survey regarding same-sex marriage, but it is a valid comparison. Separate analysis of the three questions used to create the index shows that 75.3% of respondents think that homosexuals should be able to serve in the military and 66.9% of respondents favor laws to protect homosexuals against job discrimination. The only question of the three in which the more conservative answer is the modal category is the question regarding homosexual couples' right to adopt children. A majority of respondents do not think that homosexual couples should be able to adopt children. The more liberal modal answers on the question regarding homosexuals in the military and job discrimination again homosexuals lead to a "moderate" being the modal category for the homosexual index. Indeed, more work should be done to test the validity of using these measures together as an index of opinion on issues regarding homosexuals' rights.

Table 2 - Nation  
Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Homosexual Index

		Homosexual Index			
		Most Conservative	Moderate	Most Secular	
Church	Religiosity				X <sup>2</sup> λ
Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	46 37.7%	64 52.5%	12 9.8%	18.717* .497
	<Once/Week	15 14.7%	62 60.8%	25 24.5%	
Non-Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	6 16.2%	21 56.8%	10 27.0%	2.347 .230
	<Once/Week	34 12.0%	137 48.2%	113 39.8%	
Catholic	≥Once/Week	5 5.2%	56 58.3%	35 36.5%	.133 -.005
	<Once/Week	7 6.3%	63 56.8%	41 36.9%	
Jewish	Total	0 0.0%	5 33.3%	10 66.7%	
Other	Total	28 15.6%	100 55.6%	52 28.9%	
Non-Religious	Total	16 8.4%	78 41.1%	96 50.5%	
* P < .05					

Table 3 - Nation

“Do you think that homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the United States Armed Forces, or don’t you think so?”

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	1278	75.3%
NO	419	24.7%
TOTAL	1697	100.0%

Table 4 - Nation

“Do you think that gay or lesbian couples, in other words, homosexual couples, should be legally permitted to adopt children?”

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	734	44.1%
NO	930	55.9%
TOTAL	1665	100.0%

Table 5 - Nation

“Recently, there has been a lot of talk about job discrimination. Do you favor or oppose laws to protect homosexuals against job discrimination?”

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Favor	980	66.9%
Oppose	486	33.1%
TOTAL	1466	100.0%

Some similar patterns emerge when analyzing the relationship between church, religiosity and opinion on abortion. As can be seen in Table 6, 59.4% of Evangelical Protestants who attend church once a week or more believe that abortion should never be an option, compared with 16.9% of those Evangelical Protestants who attend church less than once a week. The modal category for Protestants regardless of church attendance is “abortion should be an option in limited circumstances.” Because Catholics are traditionally anti-abortion, it is not surprising that, similarly to Evangelical Protestants, the modal category for those Catholics who attend church once a week or more is “abortion should never be an option.” Somewhat surprisingly however, is that only 8.1% of Catholics who attend church less than once a week have the same opinion about abortion. The relationship between religiosity and abortion is significant for Evangelical Protestants and Catholics. This shows that religiosity measured by church attendance can have some effect on opinion on political issues, specifically on abortion.



Analysis of the nation-wide ANES data tells a different story about opinion on abortion. None of the church affiliations for any amount of church attendance have a modal category of “abortion should never be an available option,” however, some similar patterns between church affiliations and religiosity are found. Among Evangelical Protestants and Catholics, the more a respondent attends church, the more likely he or she is to choose a conservative or moderate answer than a liberal one; for those two groups, that relationship is significant. Like in the CSCE data, Jews and the non-religious tend to be more liberal as a whole than other religious groups. Generally, when considering the issue of abortion, those respondents nation-wide are more liberal than those respondents in the 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District, as expected (See Table 7).

The death penalty is a hotly debated topic in modern American politics and also has a religious component to it. Much debate has been had regarding whether to “turn the other cheek” and practice forgiveness thereby abolishing the death penalty or to take “an eye for an eye” and punish those who commit murder with a similar outcome.

From the data below from both surveys, it is easy to see that the death penalty is favored by a majority of all respondents regardless of church affiliation or church attendance. It appears that, regardless of church attendance, Evangelical Protestants favor the death penalty heavily. In the data from the 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District, those Evangelical Protestants who attend church once a week or more have an 84.5% approval rating of the death penalty. When examining those Evangelical Protestants who attend church less than once a week, the percentage barely goes up, only to 86.4%, inside the margin of error.

Table 6 - 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District  
 Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Opinion on Abortion

		Abortion			
		Never	Limited	All/Almost All	
Church	Religiosity				$X^2$ $\lambda$
Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	38 59.4%	24 37.5%	2 3.1%	26.087* .719
	<Once/Week	11 16.9%	44 67.7%	10 15.4%	
Non-Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	4 11.4%	21 60.0%	10 28.6%	3.052 .303
	<Once/Week	8 6.8%	57 48.7%	52 44.4%	
Catholic	≥Once/Week	37 53.6%	27 39.1%	5 7.2%	44.478* .779
	<Once/Week	8 8.1%	56 56.6%	35 35.4%	
Jewish	Total	0 0.0%	1 14.3%	6 85.7%	
Other	Total	8 30.8%	10 38.5%	8 30.8%	
Non-Religious	Total	8 10.8%	33 44.6%	88 44.6%	
* P< .05					

Table 7 - Nation  
Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Opinion on Abortion

		Abortion			
		Never	Limited	All/Almost All	
Church	Religiosity				X <sup>2</sup> λ
Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	44 29.3%	88 58.7%	18 12.0%	13.788* .388
	<Once/Week	19 16.0%	67 56.3%	33 27.7%	
Non-Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	2 4.9%	22 53.7%	17 41.5%	1.934 .142
	<Once/Week	21 6.8%	131 42.3%	158 51.0%	
Catholic	≥Once/Week	23 20.7%	72 64.9%	16 14.4%	22.766* .541
	<Once/Week	7 5.1%	81 59.6%	48 35.3%	
Jewish	Total	1 5.9%	2 11.8%	14 82.4%	
Other	Total	41 19.0%	109 50.5%	66 30.6%	
Non-Religious	Total	14 6.9%	67 33.2%	121 59.9%	
* P < .05					

Non-Evangelical Protestants and Catholics are different. Among Non-Evangelical Protestants and Catholics, those who attend church more often are significantly less likely to support the death penalty. In the data from the 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional district, among Non-Evangelical Protestants, the difference is 18.1 percentage points and among Catholics, the difference is 23.7 percentage points. These patterns indicate an interesting relationship. When analyzing the death penalty, it is clear to see that church affiliation plays a role in a respondent's opinion. The relationships are similar within the nation-wide ANES data. For Evangelicals, church attendance has no effect. For Non-Evangelicals and Catholics,

however, more church attendance causes a more liberal view on the death penalty, which is the reverse of the outcome that was expected (See Tables 8 and 9).

When examining Table 10, it is easy to see that there is a positive relationship between the two variables. Those respondents with the most fundamental religious beliefs are most likely to choose the most conservative option of opinion on same-sex marriage; 65.8% of the most conservative respondents chose “no recognition.”

The modal category for respondents who have religious belief scores of “2” or “3” is “civil unions, but not marriages.” Respondents with a religious belief score of two chose this category 45.6% of the time, and respondents with a religious belief score of three chose this category 39.5% of the time. In addition, those respondents who are most secular also chose the most liberal option for opinion on same-sex marriage – “civil unions and marriages.” Table 11, which shows the same two variables, only from the nation-wide ANES data, shows a similar pattern. Those respondents who were given scores of two or three for the religious belief variable chose the moderate political choice for the homosexual index and those who scored “most secular” chose the most liberal political opinion option 51.4% of the time. The one main difference between this ANES data and the corresponding CSCE data occurs within the “most fundamental” category of the variable religious belief. Unlike in the data from Pennsylvania, respondents who fall into the “most fundamental” category also fell into the moderate category of homosexual index. In both surveys, the relationship between religious belief and opinion on homosexual rights issues is statistically significant.

Table 8 - 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District  
 Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Opinion on the Death Penalty

		Death Penalty		
		Favor	Oppose	
Church	Religiosity			X <sup>2</sup> λ
Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	49 84.5%	9 15.5%	.140 -.098
	<Once/Week	53 86.9%	8 13.1%	
Non-Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	21 63.6%	12 36.4%	4.709* -.435
	<Once/Week	89 81.7%	20 18.3%	
Catholic	≥Once/Week	39 65.0%	21 35.0%	12.787* -.616
	<Once/Week	86 88.7%	11 11.3%	
Jewish	Total	5 71.4%	2 28.6%	
Other	Total	18 78.3%	5 21.7%	
Non-Religious	Total	58 85.3%	10 14.7%	
* P < .05				

Perhaps surprisingly, the modal category for those who are most fundamental is not “abortion should never be an available option.” The pattern is easy to see. Those respondents who are most fundamental and respondents who score a two chose “limited” as their modal category and those who scored threes and those who are most secular chose “all or almost all” as their modal category. The results for the national data are similar. The only difference is the modal category for those who scored a three in the religious belief variable (See Tables 12 and 13). Once again, the relationship between religious belief and abortion is significant under both surveys.

Table 9 - Nation  
 Crosstab – Church, Religiosity, and Opinion on the Death Penalty

		Death Penalty		
		Favor	Oppose	
Church	Religiosity			X <sup>2</sup> λ
Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	109 70.8%	45 29.2%	1.047 -.136
	<Once/Week	105 76.1%	33 23.9%	
Non-Evangelical Protestant	≥Once/Week	31 68.9%	14 31.1%	1.702 -.222
	<Once/Week	268 77.7%	77 22.3%	
Catholic	≥Once/Week	72 62.6%	43 37.4%	13.713* -.471
	<Once/Week	135 82.3%	29 17.7%	
Jewish	Total	17 94.4%	1 5.6%	
Other	Total	178 69.8%	77 30.2%	
Non-Religious	Total	181 75.1%	60 24.9%	
* P <.05				

Similar to the analysis of the relationship between religiosity and the death penalty, in the 10<sup>th</sup> district of Pennsylvania, there is a large amount of support for the death penalty. Those who are most fundamental and those who are most secular have a lower approval rate of the death penalty than those who fall in the middle, but support is still vary high. The approval ratings are similar nation-wide, but in the national data, those who scored threes or are “most secular” have lower approval ratings than those who are more fundamental (See Tables 14 and 15). The relationship at the national level was significant, however, it was not significant at the local level.

Table 10 - 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District  
Crosstab – Religious Belief and Opinion on Same-Sex Marriage

		Religious Belief			
		Most Fundamental	2	3	Most Secular
SS Marriage	No Recognition	102 65.8%	44 32.4%	21 25.9%	7 23.3%
	CU but not Marriages	38 24.5%	62 45.6%	32 39.5%	6 20.0%
	CU & Marriages	15 9.7%	30 22.1%	28 34.6%	17 56.7%
$X^2 = 64.418, \lambda = .419$ (significant at the .05 level)					

Table 11 - Nation  
Crosstab – Religious Belief and Homosexual Index

		Religious Belief			
		Most Fundamental	2	3	Most Secular
Homosexual index	Most Conservative	63 33.7%	52 16.0%	31 7.3%	24 8.5%
	Moderate	103 55.1%	183 56.3%	230 53.9%	113 40.1%
	Most Liberal	21 11.2%	90 27.7%	166 38.9%	145 51.4%
$X^2 = 141.947, \lambda = .404$ (significant at the .05 level)					

Table 12 – 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District  
Crosstab – Religious Belief and Opinion on Abortion

		Religious Belief			
		Most Fundamental	2	3	Most Secular
Abortion	Never	Count % Within Religious Belief 64 39.8%	30 21.3%	5 6.1%	0 0.0%
	Limited	Count % Within Religious Belief 81 50.3%	81 57.4%	38 46.3%	14 41.2%
	All/Almost All	Count % Within Religious Belief 16 9.9%	30 21.3%	39 47.6%	20 58.8%
$X^2 = 86.217, \lambda = .576$ (significant at the .05 level)					

Table 13 – Nation  
Crosstab – Religious Belief and Opinion on Abortion

		Religious Belief			
		Most Fundamental	2	3	Most Secular
Abortion	Never	Count % Within Religious Belief 72 32.0%	60 15.5%	38 7.9%	7 2.3%
	Limited	Count % Within Religious Belief 130 57.8%	222 57.5%	241 49.8%	109 35.0%
	All/Almost All	Count % Within Religious Belief 23 10.2%	104 26.9%	205 41.4%	195 62.7%
$X^2 = 237.953, \lambda = .520$ (significant at the .05 level)					



Table 14 - 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District  
Crosstab – Religious Belief and Opinion on the Death Penalty

		Most Fundamental	2	3	Most Secular
Favor	Count	113	107	71	22
	% Within Religious Belief	75.8%	80.5%	88.8%	75.9%
Opposed	Count	36	26	9	7
	% Within Religious Belief	24.2%	19.5%	11.3%	24.1%

$X^2 = 5.778, \lambda = -.171$  (not significant at the .05 level)

Table 15 – Nation  
Crosstab – Religious Belief and Opinion on the Death Penalty

		Religious Belief			
		Most Fundamental	2	3	Most Secular
Death Penalty	Favor	Count 164 66.7%	Count 302 68.8%	Count 431 78.8%	Count 274 77.4%
	Opposed	Count 82 33.3%	Count 137 31.2%	Count 116 21.2%	Count 80 22.6%

$X^2 = 21.611, \lambda = -.174$  (significant at the .05 level)

For all of the above charts, measures of chi squared and gamma are provided. For the first set of crosstabs, (the crosstabs analyzing the relationships between church affiliation, religiosity, and political opinion), a chi squared and gamma are provided for each relationship within the chart. For example, the chi squared in Table 1 for Evangelical Protestants is 16.881 and the gamma is .648. This relationship is significant.

The relationship between religiosity and opinion on same-sex marriage among those who are Non-Evangelical Protestants is not.

The results yield some outcomes that support the hypothesis and some that do not. Whether or not religiosity, measured by amount of church attendance, has a significant effect on political opinion depends on which church the respondent is affiliated with. For same-sex marriage and the homosexual index, the relationship is only significant for Evangelical Protestants. When examining the issue of abortion, the relationship between abortion and religiosity is only significant if for Evangelical Protestants and Catholics. Finally, when considering the death penalty, the relationship between the death penalty and religiosity is significant among Non-Evangelical Protestants and Catholics.

The relationships between religious belief and opinion on political issues show more strength. The relationship between the various issues at the local and national levels is significant for all cases with one exception. The relationship between religious belief and the death penalty at the local level is not significant. The relationships between religiosity and opinion on issues are only significant for some religious affiliations while, except for one, all relationships between religious belief and political opinion are significant.

### **Conclusions**

While the study of religion and politics is an extensive one, it is also incomplete. Much research has been done studying the effects of religion and gender, race, age, and many other variables on political opinion. Most of the studies conducted on religion and politics to date have used frequency of church attendance as a measure of religiosity. However, measuring religiosity by church attendance is imperfect. Church attendance

does not tell the whole story of a person's religion. The analysis provided in this study supports the notion that the concept of religious beliefs must be included in analysis of the connection between religion and political opinion. One thing that can be included in analysis of the relationships between religion and politics is the concept of religious beliefs. These "religious beliefs" encompass religious concepts and beliefs that are not only relevant to church attendance. Respondents can have fundamental religious beliefs but attend church rarely or never and vice versa. Anna Greenberg (2001) and Laura R. Olsen and John C. Green (2006) speculate about the effect of religious beliefs on political behavior, but they all fail to elaborate on this relationship or attempt to explain this potential relationship.

The hypothesis for this study was that religious beliefs would have measurable effects on political opinion on issues with religious significance such as same-sex marriage, abortion, and the death penalty, and that effect would be more evident than the effect of religiosity on political opinions. The relationships between religious belief and political opinion are significant for nearly all issues. It is important that religious belief is included as a variable in analysis of the effects of religion on political opinion.

Future research dealing with the relationship between religion and political opinion should account for more than traditional measures of religiosity to fully capture the effects of religion. The results yielded from this study bring up more questions that need to be answered about the intertwining relationships between religiosity, religious belief, political opinion, party identification, ideology, and church affiliation. The relationship between religiosity and religious belief requires further study. It may be that religious belief is a function of religiosity, or the reverse may be true. For example, as

Olsen and Green point out in their research on political “gaps,” perhaps people who have more fundamental religious beliefs will attend church more often than those who have more secular religious beliefs. There is a possibility that a relationship could exist that is the opposite of the one proposed in this study. Political opinion on different issues may affect a person’s religiosity or religious belief. Political opinion may also affect which denomination of church a respondent choose to attend. In addition, future research should explore whether the relationship between these two aspects of “religiousness” and political opinion hold up when controlling for political variables, like ideology and party identification.

## Appendix A

On the whole, as would be expected, respondents in the 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional district of Pennsylvania are more conservative politically and religiously than are national respondents sampled in the ANES study. The percentage of Republicans in the 10<sup>th</sup> district is much higher than the percentage throughout the nation (46.3% in PA's 10<sup>th</sup> district and 27.5% throughout the nation). The percentage of both Independents and Democrats is lower in the 10<sup>th</sup> district as well.

Table A1 - 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District  
 "Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent or what?"

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Republican	253	46.3%
Independent	128	23.4%
Democrat	166	30.3%
TOTAL	547	100.0%

Table A2 - Nation  
 "Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent or what?"

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Republican	430	27.5%
Independent	512	32.8%
Democrat	619	39.7%
TOTAL	1561	100.0%

The frequencies of ideology tell a different story, however. The percentage of those respondents self-identifying as conservative is about the same in the 10<sup>th</sup> district of Pennsylvania as it is throughout the nation as a whole. The percentage of respondents self-identifying as moderate is significantly higher in the 10<sup>th</sup> district, and the percentage of respondents who call themselves liberal is also much lower.

Table A3 - 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District  
 “Do you generally think of yourself as a liberal, moderate, or conservative?”

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Conservative	220	40.0%
Moderate	232	42.2%
Liberal	98	17.8%
TOTAL	549	100.0%

Table A4 - Nation  
 “When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road, slightly conservative, conservative, extremely conservative, or haven't you thought much about this?”

(Collapsed into three categories)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Conservative	589	40.7%
Moderate	449	31.0%
Liberal	408	28.2%
TOTAL	1446	100.0%

A higher percentage of respondents in the 10<sup>th</sup> district claim that religion is an important part of their life. The margins of error of both polls make it impossible to tell if the different distribution of respondents in the “guidance” question is significant.

Table A5 - 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District  
 “Do you consider religion to be an important part of your life, or not?”

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes, Important	467	82.1%
No, Not Important	102	17.9%
TOTAL	569	100.0%

Table A6 - Nation  
 “Do you consider religion to be an important part of your life, or not?”

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes, Important	1372	76.2%
No, Not Important	428	23.8%
TOTAL	1800	100.0%

Table A7 - 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District

“Would you say your religion provides some guidance, quite a bit of guidance, or a great deal of guidance in your day-to-day living?”

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Some	130	28.5%
Quite a Bit	87	19.0%
A Great Deal	240	53.4%
TOTAL	457	100.0%

Table A8 - Nation

“Would you say your religion provides some guidance in your day-to-day living, quite a bit of guidance, or a great deal of guidance in your day-to-day life?”

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Some	380	22.5%
Quite a Bit	390	28.5%
A Great Deal	672	49.0%
TOTAL	1371	100.0%

One of the more interesting differences between the 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional district of PA and the nation as a whole that was discovered through this research was the high percentage of respondents claiming to be “born-again” or Evangelical Christians in the 10<sup>th</sup> district. In the nation as a whole, the percentage is much lower. As Erzen discussed in her article on the Religious Right and its role in politics, the percentage of Evangelical Christians is rising, along with their influence in the political sphere.

Table A9 - 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional District

“Would you describe yourself as a born-again or evangelical Christian?”

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	130	57.9%
No	95	42.1%
TOTAL	225	100.0%

Table A10 - Nation

“Would you call yourself a born-again Christian, that is, have you personally had a conversion experience related to Jesus Christ?”

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	582	39.7%
No	885	60.3%
TOTAL	1467	100.0%

Which church a respondent attends or identifies with may play a role in respondents' religiosity or religious belief. Because of this fact, it is important to analyze the distribution of church identification in the 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional district and the nation. The percentages of Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Protestants as well as Jewish respondents are relatively similar. However, there is a higher percentage of Catholics in the 10<sup>th</sup> district and a lower percentage of respondents who identify with a church that is not Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish.

Table A11 - 10th Congressional District  
Church Identification

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Evangelical Protestant	130	23.2%
Non-Evangelical Protestant	156	27.8%
Catholic	169	30.0%
Jewish	6	1.1%
Other	26	4.7%
Non-Religious	74	13.2%
TOTAL	562	100.0%



Table A12 - Nation  
Church Identification

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Evangelical Protestant	360	20.5%
Non-Evangelical Protestant	456	25.9%
Catholic	360	20.5%
Jewish	23	1.3%
Other	306	17.4%
Non-Religious	254	14.5%
TOTAL	1759	100.0%

**Appendix B -  
Center for the Study of  
Community and the Economy  
Survey**

**Survey Script**  
September 2007 Poll

Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Hello, may I please speak with \_\_\_\_\_.

My name is \_\_\_\_\_ from the Lycoming College Polling Institute. We are conducting a survey of residents of Pennsylvania this evening. We are not selling anything, and I want to assure you that your responses will be confidential. Could I have 6 to 7 minutes of your time?

[If yes, go on]

[If no] Thank you, and have a good evening.

[If they ask a question]

[About sponsorship] The sponsor is Lycoming College, a small liberal arts college in Williamsport, PA.

[About how they were chosen] You were chosen as part of a random sample of residents of Pennsylvania.

[About what the survey is about] **The questions focus on a range of political issues facing Pennsylvanians**

[About seeing the results] Results of the survey will be made available through the media.

1. To begin, I'd like to read you a short list of names. For each name, could you please indicate whether your opinion of that person is favorable or unfavorable? If you have never heard of someone, or don't know enough to rate that person, please let me know and we will move on.

	Favorable		Unfavorable		No Opinion		Never Heard Of		Refused
a. Bob Casey, Jr.	1	54.1%	2	18.0	3	18.2	4	9.6	9
b. Arlen Specter	1	54.3%	2	25.5	3	14.0	4	6.2	9
c. Ed Rendell	1	41.3%	2	42.6	3	12.5	4	3.6	9
d. Christopher Carney	1	40.1%	2	13.6	3	26.7	4	19.3	9

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT CURRENT POLITICAL ISSUES:

2. What do you think is the most important problem facing the country today?

1. Abortion(1.1%)	2. Budget/ Deficit(0.5)	3. Crime(0.6)	4. Death penalty(0.0)
5. Economy(7.0)	6. Gay marriage/rights(0.2)	7. Education(0.9)	8. Environment(1.2)
9. Gun Control(0.0)	10. Health care(16.6)	11. Homeland Security(1.9)	12. Immigration(4.7)
13. Iraq(30.2)	14. Jobs(2.0)	15. Morals/ Ethics(2.8)	16. A Politician or Party(2.1)
17. Poverty(0.7)	18. Price of Oil(2.7)	19. Social Security(0.5)	20. Taxes(0.6)
21. Terrorism(4.2)	22. Welfare(0.7)	23. Other _____ (13.6)	98. Don't Know(4.9)
99. Refused			

3. I am going to read three statements. Please indicate which statement best applies to your beliefs regarding same sex marriage. 1) Same-sex couples should be able to obtain marriages and legal civil unions; 2) Same-sex couples should be able to receive a legal civil union, but not marriages; OR 3) Same-sex couples should receive no religious or legal recognition.

1. I believe that same-sex couples should be able to obtain marriages and legal civil unions, 23.2%
2. I believe that same-sex couples should be able to receive a legal civil union, but not marriages, 32.8%
3. I believe that same-sex couples should receive no religious or legal recognition 44.0%
8. Don't Know
9. Refused

4. Next, I will read three more statements. Please indicate which statement best applies to your beliefs regarding abortion. 1) Abortion should be an available option in all or almost all situations; 2) Abortion should be an available option only in limited situations; OR 3) Abortion should never be an option.

1. Abortion should be an available option in all or almost all situations 29.2%
2. Abortion should be an available option only in limited situations 49.0%
3. Abortion should never be an option. 21.9%
8. Don't Know
9. Refused

5. Do you favor or oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder?
1. Favor – [5a] Do you favor the death penalty for persons convicted of murder strongly or not strongly? 80.9%
    1. Strongly 74.9%
    2. Not Strongly 24.9%
  2. Oppose – [5b] Do you oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder strongly or not strongly? 19.1%
    1. Strongly 52.1%
    2. Not Strongly 47.2%
  8. Don't Know
  9. Refused
6. Would you describe the state of the nation's economy these days as excellent, good, not so good or poor?
1. Excellent 3.9%
  2. Good 34.3%
  3. Not so good 40.7%
  4. Poor 20.1%
  8. Don't Know / No Opinion
  9. Refused
7. Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent or what?
1. Republican 46.3%
  2. Democrat 23.4%
  3. Independent 30.3%
  4. Other \_\_\_\_\_
  8. Don't Know / No Opinion
  9. Refused
8. Do you generally think of yourself as a liberal, moderate, or conservative?
1. Liberal 17.8%
  2. Moderate 42.2%
  3. Conservative 40.0%
  4. Other \_\_\_\_\_
  8. Don't know/Not sure
  9. Refused
9. What is your current marital status?
1. Single / never married 14.6%
  2. Married 70.5%
  3. Divorced 5.1%
  4. Widowed 8.5%
  5. Separated 0.7%
  8. Don't Know
  9. Refused

10. What is your highest level of education?

- |  |                |
|--|----------------|
| 1. Less than high school diploma 3.2%      |                |
| 2. High school diploma or equivalent 32.7% | 10. Don't Know |
| 3. Some College 23.6%                      | 11. Refused    |
| 4. College Degree 27.4%                    |                |
| 5. Advanced Degree 12.8%                   |                |

11. How many children under the age of 18 live with you in your home?

1. One 68.3%
2. Two 25.5%
3. Three 12.2%
4. Four or more 0.6%
9. Refused

NOW I'D LIKE TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR PERSONAL BELIEFS

12. Please consider the following statement and tell me whether you strongly agree, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat or strongly disagree. Morality is a personal matter and society should not force everyone to follow that standard.

- |                               |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| 1. Strongly agree             | 27.7% |
| 2. Agree somewhat             | 26.1% |
| 3. Neither agree nor disagree | 4.2%  |
| 4. Disagree somewhat          | 17.7% |
| 5. Strongly disagree          | 18.7% |
| 8. Don't Know                 |       |
| 9. Refused                    |       |

13. Do you consider religion to be an important part of your life, or not?

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| 1. Yes, Important (Go to Question 14)    | 82.1% |
| 2. No, not important (Go to Question 15) | 17.9% |
| 8. Don't Know (Go to Question 15)        |       |
| 9. Refused (Go to Question 15)           |       |

14. [IF RELGION IS IMPORTANT] Would you say your religion provides some guidance in your day-to-day living, quite a bit of guidance, or a great deal of guidance in your day-to-day living?

- |                 |       |
|-----------------|-------|
| 1. Some         | 28.5% |
| 2. Quite a bit  | 19.0% |
| 3. A great deal | 52.4% |
| 8. Don't Know   |       |
| 9. Refused      |       |

15. Have you ever been encouraged to vote for a particular candidate by a minister, priest, or rabbi?

- 1. Yes 5.2%
- 2. No 93.9%
- 8. Don't know/Not sure 0.8%
- 9. Refused

16. Has political information such as pamphlets or flyers ever been distributed or made available to you at religious services or functions in recent years?

- 1. Yes (Go to question 17) 9.7%
- 2. No (Go to question 18) 88.8%
- 3. Refused (Go to question 18)

17. What issue did this information focus on?

1. Abortion(41.9%)	2. Budget/ Deficit(5.3)	3. Crime(0.0)	4. Death penalty(0.0)
5. Economy(1.8)	6. Gay marriage/rights(2.3)	7. Education(0.0)	8. Environment(0.0)
9. Gun Control(0.0)	10. Health care(0.0)	11. Homeland Security(0.0)	12. Immigration(0.0)
13. Iraq(0.0)	14. Jobs(0.0)	15. Morals/ Ethics(1.6)	16. A Politician or Party(0.0)
17. Poverty(0.0)	18. Price of Oil(0.0)	19. Social Security(1.3)	20. Taxes(0.0)
21. Terrorism(0.0)	22. Welfare(0.0)	23. Other_____ (13.8)	98. Don't Know(17.2)
99. Refused			

18. Overall, do you feel that your religious views and beliefs affect your voting decisions?

- 1. Yes 29.6%
- 2. Sometimes/Maybe 14.1%
- 3. No 54.7%
- 8. Don't know/Not sure 1.5%
- 9. Refused

19. Do you feel that it is important that American politicians are religious people?

- 1. Yes 50.3%
- 2. No 42.7%
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Refused

20. Lots of things come up that keep people from attending religious services even if they want to. Thinking about your life these days, do you ever attend religious services, apart from occasional weddings, baptisms or funerals?

- |                                   |       |
|-----------------------------------|-------|
| 1. Yes (Go to Question 21)        | 73.5% |
| 2. No (Go to Question 23)         | 26.3% |
| 8. Don't Know (Go to Question 23) |       |
| 9. Refused (Go to Question 23)    |       |

21. [IF R ATTENDS RELIGIOUS SERVICES] Do you go to religious services every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never?

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| 1. Every week (Go to Question 22)            | 42.2% |
| 2. Almost every week (Go to Question 24)     | 21.9% |
| 3. Once or twice a month (Go to Question 24) | 17.9% |
| 4. A few times a year (Go to Question 24)    | 17.1% |
| 5. Never (Go to Question 23)                 | 0.3%  |
| 8. Don't Know (Go to Question 24)            |       |
| 9. Refused (Go to Question 24)               |       |

22. [IF R SAYS ATTENDS RELIGIOUS SERVICES 'EVERY WEEK'] Would you say you go to religious services once a week or more often than once a week?

- |  |       |                                   |
|--|-------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Once a week (Go to Question 24)                 | 62.9% | 8. Don't Know (Go to Question 24) |
| 2. More often than once a week (Go to Question 24) | 36.7% | 9. Refused (Go to Question 24)    |

23. [IF R DOES NOT ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES] Regardless of whether you now attend any religious services do you ever think of yourself as part of a particular church or denomination?

- |                            |       |                                   |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Yes (Go to question 25) | 51.0% | 8. Don't Know (Go to Question 27) |
| 2. No (Go to question 28)  | 46.7% | 9. Refused (Go to Question 27)    |

24. [IF R ATTENDS RELIGIOUS SERVICES] Do you mostly attend a place of worship that is Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or something else?

- |                                       |       |                                       |      |
|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Protestant (Go to Question 26)     | 56.8% | 4. Something Else (Go to Question 26) | 6.9% |
| 2. Roman Catholic (Go to Question 28) | 33.4% | 8. Don't Know (Go to Question 27)     |      |
| 3. Jewish (Go to Question 30)         | 1.2%  | 9. Refused (Go to Question 27)        |      |

25. [IF R DOES NOT ATTEND CHURCH BUT THINKS OF SELF AS PART OF CHURCH OR DENOMINATION] Do you consider yourself Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or something else?

- |                                       |       |                                       |      |
|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Protestant (Go to Question 26)     | 51.0% | 4. Something Else (Go to Question 26) | 8.6% |
| 2. Roman Catholic (Go to Question 28) | 36.4% | 8. Don't Know (Go to Question 27)     |      |
| 3. Jewish (Go to Question 30)         | 1.5%  | 9. Refused (Go to Question 27)        |      |

26. What church or denomination is that? \_\_\_\_\_

[If any type of Protestant or any other type of Christian other than Roman Catholic, go to Question 27. If Roman Catholic, go to Question 28. If Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist or other non-Christian, go to Question 30. When in doubt, ask Question 31]

27. Would you describe yourself as a born-again or evangelical Christian?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Yes, Born again or evangelical (Go to Question 28) 57.9% | 8. Don't Know / No opinion (Go to Question 28) |
| 2. No (Go to Question 28) 42.1%                             | 9. Refused (Go to Question 28)                 |

[FOR RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED THEY WERE CHRISTIAN/PROTESTANT/CATHOLIC OF ANY TYPE]

28. I am going to read four statements about the Bible and I'd like you to tell me which is closest to your own view. 1) The Bible is God's word and all it says is true; 2) The Bible was written by men inspired by God but it contains some human errors; 3) The Bible is a good book because it was written by wise men, but God had nothing to do with it; OR 4) The Bible was written by men who lived so long ago that it is worth very little today.

1. The Bible is God's word and all it says is true 37.5%
2. The Bible was written by men inspired by God but it contains some human errors 52.0%
3. The Bible is a good book because it was written by wise men, but God had nothing to do with it 7.3%
4. The Bible was written by men who lived so long ago that it is worth very little today. 3.1%
8. Don't Know
9. Refused

[FOR RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED THEY WERE CHRISTIAN/PROTESTANT/CATHOLIC OF ANY TYPE]

29. Have you ever tried to encourage someone to believe in Jesus Christ or to accept Jesus Christ as his or her savior?

1. Yes 42.8%
2. No 54.7%
8. Don't Know
9. Refused



[FOR ALL RESPONDENTS]

30. Next I will read six statements. Please indicate which come closest to expressing what you believe about God? 1) I don't believe in God; 2) I don't know whether there is a God and I don't believe there is a way to find out; 3) I don't believe in a personal God, but I do believe in a Higher Power of some kind; 4) I find myself believing in God some of the time, but not at others; 5) While I have my doubts, I feel that I do believe in God; OR 6) I know God really exists and I have no doubts about it.

1. I don't believe in God 1.5%
2. I don't know whether there is a God and I don't believe there is a way to find out 3.2%
3. I don't believe in a personal God, but I do believe in a Higher Power of some kind 13.2%
4. I find myself believing in God some of the time, but not at others 3.8%
5. While I have my doubts, I feel that I do believe in God 14.5%
6. I know God really exists and I have no doubts about it. 60.6%
8. Don't Know
9. Refused

31. In the past week, how many times would you say that you read from religious texts including the Bible, the Quran, the Torah, the Talmud, etc? Would you say that you have read from a religious text more than once in the last week, once, or none at all?

1. More than once 27.0%
2. Once 20.7%
3. Zero 49.8%
8. Don't know
9. Refused

32. On average, would you say that you pray more than once a day, once a day, a few times a week, occasionally, rarely, or never?

1. More than once a day 30.5%
2. Once a day 24.8%
3. Few times a week 11.1%
4. Occasionally 18.7%
5. Rarely 8.3%
6. Never 5.0%
8. Don't know
9. Refused

Thank you for your time in completing this survey. Good (morning, afternoon, night).

### Works Cited

- Beyerlein, Kraig, and John R. Hipp. (2006) "From Pews to Participation: The Effect of Congregation Activity and Context on Bridging Civic Engagement." *Social Problems*, 53 (1): 97-177.
- Bolce, Louis, and Gerald De Maio. 2002. "Our Secularist Democratic Party." *The Public Interest*, (149): 3-20.
- Campbell, David E. 2004. "Acts of Faith: Churches and Political Engagement." *Political Behavior* 26 (2) 155-180.
- Campbell, David E. 2006. "Religious "Threat" in Contemporary Presidential Elections." *The Journal of Politics* 68 (1): 104-15.
- Cassel, Carol A. 1999. "Voluntary Associations, Churches, and Social Participation Theories of Turnout." *Social Science Quarterly* 80 (3): 504-517.
- Erzen, Tanya. 2005. "Warriors for Christ: The Electoral Politics of the Religious Right." *New Labor Forum* 14 (3): 45-52.
- Gilbert, Christopher, P., Timothy Johnson, David Peterson. "The Religious Roots of Third Candidate Voting" A Comparison of Anderson, Perot, and Wallace Voters." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 34 (4): 470-484.
- Greenberg, Anna. 2001. "Race, Religiosity, and the Women's Vote." *Women & Politics* 22 (3): 59-82.
- Guth, James L., Lyman A. Kellstedt, Corwin E. Smidt, and John C. Green. 2006. "Religious Influences in the 2004 Presidential Election." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 36 (2): 223-242

- Langer, Gary, and Jon Cohen. 2005. "Voters and Values in the 2004 Election." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69 (5): 744-759.
- McKenzie, Brian D. 2004. "Religious Social Networks, Indirect Mobilization, and African- American Political Participation." *Political Research Quarterly* 57 (4): 621-632.
- Olson, Laura R., and John C. Green. 2006 a. "Introduction -- "Gapology" and the Presidential Vote." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39 (3): 443-5.
- . 2006 b. "The Religion Gap." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39 (3): 455-9.
- Regnerus, Mark D., David Sikkink, and Christian Smith. 1999. "Voting with the Christian Right" Contextual and Individual Patterns of Electoral Influence." *Social Forces* 77 (4): 1375-1401
- Rinehart, Sue Tolleson, and Jerry Perkins. 1989. "The Intersection of Gender Politics and Religious Beliefs." *Political Behavior* 11 (1): 33-55.
- Wilcox, Clyde, and Lee Sigelman. 2001. "Political Mobilization in the Pews: Religious Contacting and Electoral Turnout." *Social Science Quarterly* 82 (3): 524