

**Reexamining Religiosity:
A Report on the New Religion Items in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study**

Stephen T. Mockabee, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Cincinnati
Kenneth D. Wald, Distinguished Professor of Political Science, University of Florida
David C. Leege, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, University of Notre Dame

June 2007

In recent years, surveys of the American public have provided considerable evidence that religiosity—as measured by items tapping individual piety and involvement—is strongly correlated with partisanship and vote choice. Among whites, the standard finding has been that religiosity has a positive relationship to Republican identification and vote choice. The “God Gap” has become part of the current political lexicon among journalists and scholars (e.g., Olson and Green 2006, in the *PS* symposium on voting gaps). However, there are important reasons to suspect that standard survey measures of religiosity are inadequate to capture fully the complexity of religion. The current measures tend to be tradition-specific; that is, what counts as a “good” or “faithful” Catholic, Episcopalian, African-American Christian, or Jew, etc. is measured by criteria appropriate for a “good” evangelical Protestant (Leege 1996; Mockabee, Monson, and Grant 2001; Cohen et al. 2005). Those outside the evangelical Protestant tradition may place much more emphasis on tradition itself (observance of the Law, sacramental beliefs and practices, respect for authority of leaders, or what is affirmed about the faith in creeds or liturgy). Or they may identify with the community itself almost in an ethnic group sense, with apprehensions about persecution, emphasis on theological themes of liberation from oppressors, and efforts toward the common good of the group. The social and communal aspects of religion that are present in the daily lives of people of faith from different religious traditions are often poorly tapped.

To address the limitations of existing religiosity measures, we proposed for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study several new items designed to broaden the scope of measurement with respect to doctrine and practice (Leege, Mockabee, and Wald 2006). Three of these items (labeled Q6-Q8 in our original Online Commons proposal) addressed sacramental and communal aspects of Christian belief that will likely reflect norms in catholic Christianity. First, we proposed asking about the importance of several Christian beliefs, including the divinity of Jesus, the mystery of Holy Communion, the sanctity of human life, and the resurrection of Jesus. We also proposed two items designed to differentiate between individualists and communitarians by asking each respondent to indicate which type of conduct was more important to his/her sense of being a Christian: personal piety or serving others. Two other proposed belief items (to be asked of all self-identified religious people, not just those in Christian traditions) addressed religious themes that have historically received greater emphasis in communitarian, collective responsibility traditions outside evangelical Protestantism: environmental conservation, and the morality of war. Specifically, we hoped that the new measures would introduce a style of religiosity that is likely to encourage liberal political choices and add nuance to the “God gap” equation of religiosity with Republican support. Because that style of religiosity (like its counterpart, the more individualistic expression of religious commitment) is only imperfectly related to denomination, it cannot be measured thoroughly with existing ANES religion items.

In response to our proposals, the ANES planning committee crafted eight new items on the 2006 Pilot Study that were asked of respondents who identified themselves as Christians in the 2004 study. The intent of these items reflected the spirit of our recommendations, but the specific question wordings differ from what we proposed. In some cases, the changes implemented by the ANES investigators sharpened the questions we had written and made them more suitable to telephone interviewing. In other cases, we think important theological nuance was likely lost in an effort to balance the questions and eliminate religious vocabulary that might be considered jargon by some. The usefulness of various question wordings is ultimately an

empirical question that will require further data collection to resolve. In any event, the new items do shed light on the catholic dimensions of religiosity that have been previously under-measured in ANES questionnaires. Below we examine the distributions of the new items, their correlations with existing religion items, and their associations with political attitudes and behaviors. We conclude the report with recommendations on the use of the items in future studies.

New Religion Items in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study

Table 1 shows the frequency distributions of the new religious belief items, which appear in Module 11 of the Pilot Study questionnaire.¹ The initial question in the module asked, “Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God, or do you believe that Jesus Christ is not the son of God?” There was limited variance on this item, with about 94% of the self-identified Christian respondents answering in the affirmative. However, when a follow-up question asked about the personal importance of this belief, more variance is generated. A majority indicated that belief in the divinity of Christ was “extremely important,” 27% said “very important,” and about 13% said it was only “moderately” or “slightly” important, or not at all important.

(Table 1 about here)

The next items addressed beliefs about the Eucharist. The item read, “Do you believe that for the people who take Holy Communion, the bread and wine become the body and blood of Jesus Christ, or do you believe that does not happen?” More than three-fifths of respondents expressed belief in transubstantiation, with about 35% saying they did not believe.² As with the previous items, greater variance is generated by the follow-up asking about the importance of the belief, with 45% saying “extremely important,” 35% “very important,” and about one-fifth stating that this belief was moderately, slightly, or not at all important. We expect the transubstantiation items to tap the communitarian dimension of religiosity because one must be present with other believers (and a member of the clergy) in order to have the experience of Communion; in other words, unlike individual piety, transubstantiation is a “horizontal” phenomenon (Benson and Williams 1982). For sacramental believers, being united in the eating of Christ's body and drinking his blood means that they not only receive individual forgiveness in his atoning act, but also are united in a Christian community whose obligation is to bring peace and justice to a hurting world. In many liturgical traditions, the dismissal from the Communion is an individual and collective call to action.

The final item displayed in Table 1 addresses beliefs about God’s intentions for humans’ treatment of the environment. The question read, “Do you believe that God gave people the responsibility to protect the natural environment, or that God gave people the right to use the

¹ Analyses in this report were conducted using the early release (1/10/06) version of the ANES Pilot Study data.

² In this report we follow the ANES Pilot Study codebook by referring to this item with the term “transubstantiation.” However, it should be noted that some theologians would argue that what the item describes is not precisely the Roman Catholic dogma of transubstantiation (change in the *substance* of the bread and wine), but is closer to “consubstantiation” or “sacramental union,” a doctrinal approach taken by some in the Lutheran, Anglican, and Episcopalian traditions. In this view, Christ is present in the Communion, but no change in the substance of the bread and wine takes place.

environment however they choose, even if doing so does not protect the environment?” This item grew out of a research tradition stimulated by Lynn White’s classic *Science* essay which attributed the environmental crisis to the prevalence of “dominion” thinking in the Judeo-Christian tradition (White 1967). White argued that biblical verses granting humanity “dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth” (Genesis 1:28, KJV) encouraged human exploitation of nature. While White’s article generated a flood of empirical research about the relationship between religion and environmental concern, no scholar developed or deployed a measure of religious conceptions of creation.³ To fill this gap, we created a forced-choice item that asked respondents to choose from two fairly stark statements of the competing religious ethics of dominion and stewardship. Because of concerns about the utility of the item’s format for telephone interviewing, the question was re-written by the ANES investigators. The item on the 2006 Pilot Study failed to generate as much variance as one might have hoped for, with 83% stating that humans have a God-given responsibility to protect the environment, and 13% taking the view that people have the right to use the environment as they see fit. Although further experimentation would be needed to determine precisely the effects of question wording, we would speculate that the phrase “even if doing so...” worked to suppress responses consistent with the “dominion” view of nature.

Table 2 presents the distributions of the three remaining new religion items. The first in this three-question sequence was a filter asking, “Have there been times in your life when you tried to be a good Christian, or is that not something you have tried to do?” As with many general religiosity measures, there was a pronounced “halo effect” due to social desirability bias; 94% of respondents said there had been times when they tried to be good Christians. This filter question was useful, however, in setting up the following items. The next question asked, “When you have tried to be a good Christian, which did you try to do more: avoid doing sinful things yourself, or help other people?” This is a new question that has no exact match in the literature. The nearest thing to it is found in Benson and Williams’ (1982) and Legee and Kellstedt’s (1993) work on individualism and communitarianism. More than a third of respondents (35%) chose the individual piety option of avoiding sinful personal behavior. Those who answered that being a good Christian was more about helping others were then asked a follow-up designed to further tap communitarian tendencies: “When you have tried to be a good Christian, did you mostly try to help other people one at a time, or did you mostly join with groups of people who were helping many others all at once?” Two-thirds of those who were asked the follow-up indicated that they mostly tried to help others one at a time rather than by joining groups to help many people at once.

(Table 2 about here)

³ The closest was a four-part scale included in the 1993 ISSP battery that measured respect for nature. Although some have described it as a “spiritual” form of environmentalism, it is hard to see any such motif implicit in the questions (Ignatow 2006). For the most part, the presence of a certain environmental ethic has been inferred from differences in support for environmental protection between members of various religious traditions or adherents of various doctrines.

Table 3 provides a first cut at examining the validity of the new items by displaying their distributions by religious tradition.⁴ Several findings are noteworthy. First, as expected, there are large and significant differences across traditions on the Communion items. However, it is striking that a majority of respondents outside the Roman Catholic tradition indicated belief that the Communion bread and wine become for them the body and blood of Christ. Somewhat surprising is the fact that a slightly greater percentage of African-American Protestants (83%) expressed this belief than was the case among Roman Catholics (79%). These results likely reveal again the “halo effect” associated with asking any questions about religious belief, particularly when Christ’s name is invoked. The data also evince the tendency of African Americans to express religious belief, as in addition to the results noted above for Communion, fully 100% of Black Protestants said they believe Jesus is the Son of God, and 98% said they had tried to be good Christians. However, it is likely that social desirability is not the sole explanation for the high percentage of respondents expressing belief that the Communion bread and wine become Christ’s body and blood. First, those who believe the Bible should be interpreted literally may express support for the notion presented in item Mod11_3 because the words of the Eucharistic liturgy are taken from Jesus’ own words at the Last Supper (e.g., “This is my body...”). Taking this passage literally could lead to an affirmative response on the transubstantiation item.⁵ In addition, as noted above (fn 2), the wording of Mod11_3 might be interpreted by some as consubstantiation, a view held by some Protestant denominations, rather than transubstantiation, as practiced historically by Roman Catholics. Finally, in recent years Protestant churches have increasingly celebrated Communion every Sunday, as Roman Catholics always have, rather than once a month or a few times a year. Together, these factors likely worked to boost expression of belief above 50% across religious traditions.

(Table 3 about here)

The environmental protection item varies slightly across traditions, but the difference is not statistically significant, and is not in the expected direction. The highest percentage of pro-conservation beliefs is found in the evangelical tradition, and the lowest in the Roman Catholic tradition. This suggests that the item is not measuring the dominion/stewardship dichotomy as cleanly as we had hoped, although validation requires further analysis of the item’s association with political variables, which will follow below.

Another finding of note is the inter-tradition variation in the item asking respondents whether avoiding sin or helping others is the more important part of trying to be a good Christian. As expected, evangelicals are more likely than either mainliners or Catholics to answer avoiding sin rather than helping others. Black Protestants are split evenly between the two choices. For both mainline Protestants and Roman Catholics, 73% opt for helping others rather than avoiding sin. The follow-up question about helping others one at a time versus in groups does not appear to discriminate as successfully across traditions, with no statistically significant difference emerging.

⁴ The religious tradition classification is based on the widely used system developed by Lyman Kellstedt and colleagues (Kellstedt et al. 1996), and follows the same coding scheme used by Mockabee (2007) for analysis of the 2004 data.

⁵ Some support for this interpretation is found in the data. Nearly 75% of those who take the Bible literally reported belief in transubstantiation, compared to 58% of those who do not take the Bible literally.

A next step in the analysis of these new items is to look at the correlations among the religion measures. On the one hand, the new belief items should correlate with existing religiosity items to some degree as an indication of their validity. On the other hand, if the new items correlate at extremely high levels with existing items, then they will offer little in the way of new explanatory power. Table 4 presents the Pearson correlations among the religion measures appearing on the 2006 ANES Pilot Study and the 2004 ANES. The Son of God belief item correlates strongly, but certainly not perfectly, with existing measures of religiosity including church attendance, prayer, the amount of guidance religion provides in the respondent's daily life (salience), and the respondent's views of biblical inerrancy. The correlations for the transubstantiation item are consistently smaller in magnitude, but are still statistically significant. In general, the environment belief item does not correlate strongly with the other religion measures, although the correlations with prayer, belief in Jesus' divinity, and trying to be a good Christian are statistically significant. The individualist/communitarian measures show weak correlations with many of the other religion measures, although the "help others" variable has a statistically significant positive correlation with the transubstantiation variable, as would be expected theoretically. This pattern suggests that the avoid sin/help others item likely taps a dimension not being captured by current ANES measures.

(Table 4 about here)

To further explore the dimensionality of religiosity, factor analysis was conducted using the religion items on the 2006 Pilot Study (see Appendix). The variables analyzed were church attendance, salience (religion is important and provides guidance), the importance of belief in Jesus as the Son of God, importance of belief in transubstantiation, and the avoid sin/help others item. The factor analysis confirmed the presence of two distinct factors. The first factor corresponds to an individualist notion of religiosity. Attendance, salience, and belief in the divinity of Christ all load strongly on this factor. The second factor corresponds to a more communitarian notion of religiosity. Belief in transubstantiation and the avoid sin/help others item load on this second factor. The results support the theoretical contention above that a communitarian/ sacramental dimension of religion is not adequately measured with existing ANES items.

Of course, the critical test of the utility of the new religion items comes when they are correlated with political variables. We turn to this in the following section.

Religiosity and Political Variables

The next aspect of the assessment of the new religion measures is an analysis of their relationships to political attitudes and behaviors. Table 5 presents the Pearson correlations between the religion items and several political attitude measures. Most of these political variables are familiar: the standard seven-point party identification scale, presidential job approval, and seven-point liberal-conservative self-identification. In addition, there are two indexes created to tap opinions on the controversial moral issues of abortion and gay rights (using the 2004 data). The abortion rights scale is built from answers to the standard ANES

four-category item on abortion, plus answers to questions about federal funding for abortion and support for a ban on partial birth abortion. The gay rights index is built from questions about legal protections from discrimination, allowing gays to serve in the military, legalizing gay marriage, and legalizing adoption by gay couples. As with all issue variables presented below, higher values on these indexes represent more conservative positions. The seven-point scale measuring attitudes toward women's role in society provides another indicator of cultural conservatism. It is coded so that the highest value represents the view that women's place is in the home; the opposite endpoint of the scale represents the view that women should have an equal role with men. Feeling thermometer ratings (0-100 degrees) of Christian fundamentalists further measure "culture war" political attitudes. Two measures tap attitudes about environmental protection: a seven-point scale offering a tradeoff between protecting jobs (coded 6), on the one hand, and protecting the environment on the other (coded 0); and a feeling thermometer rating of environmentalists. Finally, two items address attitudes on social welfare spending: an item asking whether the respondent favors increasing, decreasing, or keeping the same spending on government aid to the poor (coded 0 for increasing, 1 for keeping the same, and 2 for decreasing); and a seven-point scale forcing a tradeoff between increasing government services even if it increases spending (coded 0), and decreasing government spending even if it means reducing services (coded 6).

(Table 5 about here)

Overall, the new religion items perform well in terms of their association with the political variables in Table 5. The correlations are of a similar magnitude to those found between existing religiosity measures (church attendance, salience, etc.) and political attitudes. For the Son of God importance scale, nine of the possible eleven correlations are statistically significant; for the Communion item, five of eleven are significant. The avoid sin/help others measure generates significant correlations with ten of the eleven variables. The environmental belief item does correlate with the environment/jobs scale and the environmentalists thermometer in the expected direction for each, although the magnitude of the association is fairly modest. Of particular note are the results for the two religiosity factor scores. Both are significantly correlated with party identification, presidential approval, ideology, attitudes on women's role in society, ratings of Christian fundamentalists, and attitudes about government spending; but, importantly, the relationships run in opposite directions for the two factors. Consistent with the theoretical expectations presented above, the communitarian dimension of religiosity is associated with more liberal or moderate political views, while individualistic religiosity is strongly linked to conservative positions. This reaffirms our belief that current measures of religiosity are prone to discover only one kind of relationship between religion and politics and thus present a distorted picture of the way religious commitment influences political behavior.

The analysis thus far has only examined bi-variate relationships, so it is necessary to move to a multivariate analysis that controls for standard influences on political attitudes and behaviors. Table 6 displays a regression model of party identification, with the standard seven-point scale as the dependent variable (higher values indicate more Republican identification). In addition to the two religiosity factor scores, the independent variables in the model include controls for age, gender, educational attainment, and southern residence, plus dummy variables

for religious tradition (with mainline Protestant as the excluded reference category). All independent variables have been re-scaled to range from 0 to 1 to facilitate interpretation of the coefficients (Achen 1982). The multivariate results confirm that the association between religiosity and partisanship persists even under controls for standard demographic influences. Again, consistent with theoretical expectations, the signs on the coefficients for the two religiosity variables are opposite, with individual piety having a positive relationship to Republican identification, and communitarianism having a negative relationship.⁶ Clearly, religious ethos—not merely religiosity—matters in how faith is linked to political behavior by American Christians.

(Table 6 about here)

Next we turn to analyses of attitudes on policy issues. Table 7 presents regression models of attitudes on three prominent cultural issues: abortion rights, gay rights, and the role of women in society. In addition to the independent variables described above, each of the models includes controls for party identification (the standard seven-point scale). The model of opposition to abortion rights shows, as expected, strong positive effects for Republican partisanship and individual religiosity. Interestingly, the communitarian dimension of religiosity is not significantly associated with attitudes on abortion, all else equal. For gay rights and the role of women, individualistic religiosity again has the expected conservative influence. However, in the model of opposition to gay rights, there is no statistically significant effect for communitarian religiosity. And in the women's role equation, communitarian religiosity has a strong, *negative* relationship to traditionalist views of women's participation in business and politics. In fact, only educational attainment has a more potent negative effect on traditionalism with respect to women's place in society. Clearly the standard "more religious, more conservative" view of cultural politics does not hold up when the communitarian dimension of religiosity is taken into account. There are ways of being religious that do not affect what some analysts define as "religious issues" in politics or that affect them in ways that contradict the simplistic "God Gap" hypothesis.

(Table 7 about here)

The complex effects of religion on policy positions are further demonstrated in Table 8, which presents models of attitudes on social welfare issues. The dependent variables include the following: two scales measuring spending preferences for aid to the poor and welfare spending; a seven-point scale capturing attitudes toward government involvement in providing health insurance; a seven-point scale tapping views on the government's role in providing help to blacks; and a seven-point scale asking the respondent to indicate the extent to which government should guarantee people jobs and a good standard of living. (Higher values on these scales indicate more conservative positions.) The theoretical expectation is that religious communitarians will be supportive of government initiatives on social welfare issues. This expectation is confirmed in each of the models in Table 8. The communitarian religiosity factor emerges as a statistically and substantively significant predictor of liberal attitudes on government involvement across these multiple policy domains. In stark contrast, the individual

⁶ The model of partisanship was also estimated using ordered logit, and the substantive results were unchanged. This is also the case for the other ordinal dependent variables in the models of policy positions presented below.

piety variable does not attain statistical significance in any of the models. It is noteworthy that the effects of the communitarian religiosity variable persist under controls for demographic variables, religious tradition, and party identification.

(Table 8 about here)

These patterns—the significance of individualist religiosity on questions of personal morality but irrelevance to social welfare, and the parallel importance of communitarian religiosity in judgments about social welfare but not on most questions of traditionalist morality—confirm what scholars have long suspected. There appears to be a division of labor such that evangelical-style religiosity attends to questions of personal morality without much interest in social welfare policy, while communitarian-style religiosity addresses social welfare but gives much less priority to issues like abortion and gay rights (Olson and Carroll 1992). Without measures of communitarian style religiosity, scholars have not been able to trace this dialect in American political behavior and have thus presented a one-sided portrait of religion as an inevitably conservative force. This finding becomes increasingly important with the political reassertion of religious liberalism in the past few years. There is a growing chorus of public voices within evangelical Protestantism decrying what some call the “Babylonian captivity” of Christians by the Republican Party (e.g., Wallis 2005; Carter 2005) and a call to recognize the more communal dimension of religion with its concern for human suffering. The measures of communal religiosity piloted in 2006—even with measurement error—seem to enable scholars to assess this tendency.

Having shown the explanatory power of the religiosity variables in models of policy attitudes, we turn next to modeling the vote decision. Table 9 presents three logit models of the major party vote choice for the U.S. House in 2006. The dependent variable is coded 1 for the Democratic candidate and 0 for the Republican. Model 1 includes as independent variables the religiosity factor scores, plus controls for age, race, gender, educational attainment, southern residence, and religious tradition. Model 2 adds a control for liberal-conservative ideology, and Model 3 adds party identification to the right-hand side of the equation.

(Table 9 about here)

In the first model, both the religiosity factors emerge as statistically significant predictors—but again, as theory would predict, with opposite signs. It is again worth noting that these effects for religiosity persist in the presence of controls for a range of demographic characteristics as well as religious affiliation. When ideological self-identification is added to Model 2, the effect of the religiosity variables subsides. In the third model, when a control for partisanship is added, neither religion variable retains significant influence on vote choice. The fact that the religiosity factors do not reach statistical significance in Model 3 is not an indication of their impotence as explanatory variables. Rather, it indicates that their influence is mediated by partisanship and ideology. The effects of religiosity are operating through influencing political self-identifications and issue attitudes, which in turn are strongly associated with the vote choice.

The results in tables 6 through 9 give clear and consistent evidence that a communitarian dimension of religion exists apart from the standard indicators of individual piety, and that this second dimension has distinct political influences. Therefore, models of political attitudes and behavior that fail to account for this communitarian dimension will suffer from omitted variable bias. Moreover, the predictive power of models is appreciably strengthened by the addition of the communitarian religious factor. To assess the explanatory impact of the communitarian religiosity factor, the models in tables 6 through 8 were estimated for the same sub-samples without inclusion of the new religion measures from the 2006 Pilot Study, and the adjusted-R² values from the restricted and full models were then compared. The limited models included as a measure of religiosity a factor comprised only of church attendance and personal salience of religion (the two standard ANES indicators appearing on the 2006 questionnaire). Across the seven models in which the coefficient for the communitarian religiosity variable was statistically significant, the addition of the communitarian factor yielded on average a 32% increase in variance explained. Similarly, the pseudo-R² value for the vote choice equation (Model 1 in table 9) increased by 15% with the inclusion of the communitarian religiosity factor, compared to a model including only individual piety measures. In sum, the empirical results confirm our theoretical expectation that the communitarian dimension of religiosity is politically relevant in ways distinct from the effects of individual piety.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Before looking ahead to future studies, it is useful to look back at the advances made in the measurement of religion by the ANES over the past two decades. In 1989, the ANES Board empanelled a Task Force on Religiosity Measures to generate theoretically driven measures of religion for inclusion on the Pilot Study. Following an extensive assessment of the performance of these items (Leege, Kellstedt, and Wald 1990), the Board placed many of these new or refined measures on the 1990 production study. Substantively, these measures were designed to reduce over-reporting of church affiliation and attendance, generate precise information on denominational affiliation and better code both affiliation and religious tradition/movement, and capture the salience of religion. In general, the 1990 items (and their rationale) have entered the time-series, but have always been candidates for exclusion due to space limitations. In the intervening years, ANES has continued to pretest other religiosity items, particularly on the 1997 and 2006 Pilot Studies.

The scholarly yield from these efforts has been quite high. For a memo to the ANES Board, Mockabee and Campbell (2004) compiled a bibliography of more than fifty articles in professional journals and books published between 1990 and 2004 that depend on the ANES variables. Most notable and most cited are the revised models of vote choice and participation in Miller and Shanks (1996), the new theory of elite and mass partisan polarization in Layman (2001), and a cultural theory of American political campaigns and their effects on participation formulated by Leege, Wald, Krueger, and Mueller (2002). Textbooks have incorporated changes in text and tables to accommodate new understandings of religion, party identification, vote choice, and public opinion made possible by ANES.

In view of this successful past, our first recommendation is to retain the core of the ANES religion sequence. Any further cuts would severely limit future analysis, particularly regarding religious affiliation, and would make over-time comparisons problematic. Note also that although the number of variables created to capture denominational identifications appears formidable on paper, in practice computer-assisted skip patterns make this branching scheme a matter of no more than 15-30 seconds for most interviewers and respondents. In sum, while we have offered a critique of existing religiosity ANES measures, we want to be clear that we do not advocate throwing out the baby with the bathwater. As our results show, the individual piety dimension of religiosity is effectively measured by the current ANES items on church attendance, prayer, and importance/guidance of religion, and this dimension is powerfully linked to political attitudes, affiliation, and behavior. But our analysis of the new 2006 religion items also shows that the neglected communal dimension of religion has profound political consequences that have gone largely unmeasured in previous surveys.

Based on analyses of the 2006 Pilot Study data presented above, we make the following recommendations.

1. ***We strongly recommend the continued use of the items measuring individual piety versus communitarian views of Christianity (Mod11_5 and Mod11_6), as well as the item on belief in transubstantiation (Mod11_3) and the associated follow-up item asking the importance of this belief (Mod11_4).*** These items clearly contribute explanatory power beyond what is available with current ANES measures by allowing us to tap the communitarian dimension of religiosity. The follow-up question about helping others one at a time versus many at once (Mod11_7) does not appear to add significant discriminating power to the initial item, but the refinement of an item that could make distinctions within the “help others” category would be worth pursuing in future investigations.
2. ***Continued use of the new items on belief in the divinity of Christ and the importance of this belief (Mod11_1 and Mod11_2) should be a low priority.*** Although the items functioned well and loaded strongly on the individual piety factor, it does not appear that they add a great deal of new explanatory power beyond the existing ANES items.
3. The question designed to capture the dominion/stewardship divide over treatment of the environment (Mod11_8) appears to be one of the weakest of the new items, although it did show statistically significant associations with environmental policy positions. It is possible that a re-wording of the question would pick up more of the dominion viewpoint among conservative Protestants. ***In its current form, however, we do not recommend continued use of the environmental belief item.***

Taken together, the findings reported in this paper suggest the need to continue to refine the measurement of religion in surveys. Specifically, the under-measured communitarian dimension of religion deserves further attention from scholars. The new items on the 2006 ANES Pilot Study permit the analyst to glimpse this understudied aspect of religiosity. Additional efforts by the scholarly community to refine measures of communitarianism should be encouraged.

References

- Achen, Christopher H. 1982. *Interpreting and Using Regression*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Benson, Peter and Dorothy Williams. 1982. *Religion on Capitol Hill*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Carter, Jimmy. 2005. *Our Endangered Values: America's Moral Crisis*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Cohen, Adam B., Daniel E. Hall, Harold G. Koenig, and Keith G. Meador. 2005. "Social Versus Individual Motivation: Implications for Normative Definitions of Religious Orientation." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 9: 48-61.
- Ignatow, Gabriel. 2006. "Cultural Models of Nature And Society: Reconsidering Environmental Attitudes and Concern." *Environment & Behavior* 38: 441-461.
- Kellstedt, Lyman A., Green, John C., Guth, James L., and Smidt, Corwin E. 1996. "Grasping the Essentials: The Social Embodiment of Religion and Political Behavior." In *Religion and the Culture Wars: Dispatches from the Front*, ed. John C. Green, James L. Guth, Corwin E. Smidt, and Lyman A. Kellstedt, 174-192. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Layman, Geoffrey. 2001. *The Great Divide: Religious and Cultural Conflict in American Party Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Leege, David C. 1988. "Catholics and the Civic Order: Parish Participation, Politics, and Civic Participation." *Review of Politics* 50 (Fall): 704-736.
- Leege, David C. 1996. "Religiosity Measures in the National Election Studies: A Guide to Their Use, Part 2." *Votes and Opinions* Newsletter of the APSA organized section on Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior 2(July/August): 6-9, 33-36.
- Leege, David C., Stephen T. Mockabee, and Kenneth D. Wald. 2006. "Religion and Electoral Behavior." Proposal for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study, ANES Online Commons, <http://www.electionstudies.org/onlinecommons.htm>, June 15, 2006. An addendum memo of August 30, 2006, is available upon request.
- Leege, David C., Kenneth D. Wald, and Lyman A. Kellstedt. 1990. "Religion and Politics: A Report on Measures of Religiosity in the 1989 ANES Pilot Study," ANES Pilot Study Report, No. nes002281.
- Leege, David C., Kenneth D. Wald, Brian S. Krueger, and Paul D. Mueller. 2002. *The Politics of Cultural Differences: Social Change and Voter Mobilization Strategies in the Post-New Deal Period*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Miller, Warren E., and J. Merrill Shanks. 1996. *The New American Voter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mockabee, Stephen T. 2007. "A Question of Authority: Religion and Cultural Conflict in the 2004 Election." *Political Behavior* 29: 221-248.

Mockabee, Stephen, and David Campbell. 2004. Memorandum to the American National Election Studies Board, February 2. (Copy available from authors upon request).

Mockabee, Stephen T., Joseph Quin Monson, and J. Tobin Grant. 2001. "Measuring Religious Commitment Among Catholics and Protestants: A New Approach." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40: 675-690.

Olson, Daniel V. A. and Jackson W. Carroll. 1992. "Religiously Based Politics: Religious Elites and the Public." *Social Forces* 70: 765-786.

Olson, Laura R., and John C. Green. 2006. "The Religion Gap." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39: 455-459.

Wallis, Jim. 2005. *God's Politics: Why the Right Gets It Wrong and the Left Doesn't Get It*. New York: HarperCollins.

White, Lynn, Jr. 1967. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis." *Science* 155: 1203-1207.

Appendix

Factor Analysis of Religion Items, 2006 ANES Pilot Study

	<u>component 1</u>	<u>component 2</u>
Saliency of religion	.853	-.007
Importance of belief that Jesus is Son of God	.794	.155
Church attendance	.781	-.042
Try to help others more than try to avoid sin	-.177	.872
Importance of belief that bread and wine become body and blood of Christ	.450	.583

Notes: Entries are loadings from a principal components analysis with varimax rotation. Factor 1 has an eigenvalue of 2.18 and 44% of variance explained. Factor 2 has an eigenvalue of 1.16 and 23% of variance explained.

Table 1
Distribution of New Religious Belief Items, 2006 ANES Pilot Study

Mod11_1

Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God, or do you believe that Jesus Christ is not the son of God?

Is son of God	93.6%	(496)
Not son of God	5.3%	(28)
Don't know	0.4%	(2)
Refused	0.8%	(4)

Mod11_2

[If R believes Jesus Christ is Son of God]

How important is this belief to you personally?

Extremely important	58.7%	(291)
Very important	27.2%	(135)
Moderately important	9.9%	(49)
Slightly important	2.4%	(16)
Not important at all	1.0%	(5)

Mod11_3

Do you believe that for the people who take Holy Communion, the bread and wine become the body and blood of Jesus Christ, or do you believe that does not happen?

Yes, does happen	63.0%	(334)
No, does not happen	34.7%	(184)
Don't know	1.9%	(10)
Refused	0.4%	(2)

Mod11_4

[If R believes bread and wine become body and blood of Jesus Christ]

How important is this belief to you personally?

Extremely important	44.6%	(149)
Very important	34.4%	(115)
Moderately important	13.5%	(45)
Slightly important	5.7%	(19)
Not important at all	1.8%	(6)

Mod11_8

Do you believe that God gave people the responsibility to protect the natural environment, or that God gave people the right to use the environment however they choose, even if doing so does not protect the environment?

Responsibility to protect environment	82.5%	(437)
Right to use environment	12.6%	(67)
Don't know	1.5%	(8)
Refused	3.4%	(18)

NOTE: Only respondents who identified as Christians in 2004 ANES were asked the above items.

Table 2
Distribution of New Religiosity Items, 2006 ANES Pilot Study

Mod11_5

Have there been times in your life when you tried to be a good Christian, or is that not something you have tried to do?

Yes, have tried	93.8%	(497)
No, have not tried	5.7%	(30)
Don't know	0.2%	(1)
Refused	0.4%	(2)

Mod11_6

[If R has tried to be a good Christian]

When you have tried to be a good Christian, which did you try to do more: avoid doing sinful things yourself, or help other people?

Avoid sin	35.2%	(175)
Help other people	62.4%	(310)
Don't know	1.2%	(6)
Refused	1.2%	(6)

Mod11_7

[If R tried to be a good Christian by helping others]

When you have tried to be a good Christian, did you mostly try to help other people one at a time, or did you mostly join with groups of people who were helping many others all at once?

Help one at a time	67.4%	(209)
Help many at once	31.6%	(98)
Don't know	1.0%	(3)

NOTE: Only respondents who identified as Christians in 2004 ANES were asked the above items.

Table 3
Distribution of New Religion Items by Religious Tradition

	Evangelical Protestant	Mainline Protestant	Black Protestant	Roman Catholic
Believes Jesus is the Son of God	96.3%	89.6%	100.0%	96.3%
Belief that Jesus is the Son of God is...				
Extremely important	71.2%	51.5%	66.7%	47.1%
Very important	21.8%	32.0%	26.7%	31.2%
Moderately important	6.4%	8.7%	5.0%	16.6%
Slightly important	0.6%	4.9%	1.7%	4.5%
Not important at all	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	0.6%
Believes in transubstantiation of Eucharist	56.4%	51.8%	83.1%	79.1%
Belief in transubstantiation is...				
Extremely important	44.3%	33.9%	55.1%	45.7%
Very important	38.6%	39.0%	36.7%	27.9%
Moderately important	12.5%	13.6%	2.0%	19.4%
Slightly important	2.3%	10.2%	2.0%	7.0%
Not important at all	2.3%	3.4%	4.1%	0.0%
Believes God gave responsibility to protect environment	90.1%	88.2%	88.1%	82.5%
Has tried to be a good Christian	94.4%	93.2%	98.3%	95.1%
Tried to be good a Christian by...				
Avoiding sin	45.0%	27.1%	50.0%	27.3%
Helping others	55.0%	72.9%	50.0%	72.7%
Tried to help others...				
One at a time	68.3%	61.8%	66.7%	73.0%
Many at once	31.7%	38.2%	33.3%	27.0%

Table 4: Correlations among Religion Items, 2006 ANES Pilot Study

	Church Attendance	Salience of religion	Prayer	Views of Bible	Jesus is Son of God	Importance of Son of God	Transubstantiation	Importance of Transubstantiation	Protect environment	Tried to be good Christian	Help others	Help others one at a time
Church Attendance	1.000											
Salience of religion	.647	1.000										
Frequency of Prayer	.583	.628	1.000									
Views of the Bible	.477	.586	.550	1.000								
Believe Jesus is Son of God	.273	.357	.321	.419	1.000							
Importance of Jesus Son of God	.438	.596	.486	.508	-	1.000						
Believe in Transubstantiation	.150	.161	.113	.202	.289	.265	1.000					
Importance of transubstantiation	.248	.294	.181	.276	.274	.390	-	1.000				
Must protect environment	.050	.070	<i>.109</i>	.038	.087	.127	.067	.077	1.000			
Tried to be a good Christian	.196	.242	.168	.220	.388	.318	.128	.142	.088	1.000		
Try to help others more than avoid sin	-.068	-.069	-.130	-.050	.089	-.049	.165	.123	.043	-	1.000	
Help others one at a time, not many at once	-.110	-.027	-.038	-.080	.004	-.003	.010	.025	.052	-	-	1.000

Notes: Entries are Pearson's *r* correlations. **Bold** font indicates statistically significant correlation at .01 level, *italics* indicates significance at .05 level. Data for prayer and views of the Bible items are from 2004 ANES. If two or more items are part of the same branching sequence, the correlations between them are not shown.

Table 5: Correlations between Religion Items and Social-Political Attitudes, 2006 ANES Pilot Study

	7-point Party ID	G.W. Bush job approval	7-point ideology self-ID	Abortion rights (oppose)	Gay rights (oppose)	Traditional role for women in society	Christian Fundamentalists thermom.	Protect Jobs vs. Environ- ment	Environ- mentalist thermom.	Decrease spending on aid to poor	Decrease gov't spending/ services
Church Attendance	.167	.196	.331	.435	.404	.206	.387	.154	-.058	-.035	<i>.083</i>
Salience of religion	.149	.165	.299	.479	.419	.180	.453	.170	-.030	-.092	<i>.059</i>
Frequency of Prayer	.138	.185	.283	.456	.368	.130	.430	.202	-.027	-.097	<i>.062</i>
Views of the Bible	.234	.268	.371	.469	.487	.225	.544	.293	-.140	-.067	<i>.071</i>
Believe Jesus is Son of God	.116	.130	.198	.279	.219	<i>.086</i>	.238	.164	-.082	<i>.014</i>	<i>.078</i>
Importance of Jesus Son of God	.174	.190	.293	.455	.374	<i>.106</i>	.413	.183	-.074	-.008	<i>.102</i>
Believe in Transubstantiation	-.084	-.008	-.053	.121	.118	<i>.016</i>	<i>.064</i>	<i>.026</i>	-.017	-.152	<i>-.111</i>
Importance of transubstantiation	-.080	<i>.026</i>	-.022	.213	.199	-.012	.136	<i>.057</i>	-.003	-.205	<i>-.109</i>
Must protect environment	-.127	-.055	-.082	-.000	-.013	-.121	<i>.033</i>	-.175	.146	-.048	-.030
Tried to be a good Christian	<i>.047</i>	<i>.047</i>	.137	.163	<i>.091</i>	<i>.041</i>	.156	<i>.075</i>	-.024	-.004	<i>.048</i>
Try to help others more than avoid sin	-.207	-.246	-.194	-.143	-.187	-.117	-.155	<i>-.110</i>	.155	-.176	-.083
Religiosity Factor 1 (individual piety)	.146	.236	.321	.459	.457	.173	.417	.161	-.040	-.041	<i>.085</i>
Religiosity Factor 2 (communitarian)	-.172	-.176	-.183	-.045	-.093	-.124	-.118	-.082	<i>.088</i>	-.196	-.124

Notes: Entries are Pearson's r correlations. **Bold** font indicates statistically significant correlation at .01 level, *italics* indicates significance at .05 level. Data for items on prayer, views of the Bible, ideology, abortion, gay rights, women's role, Christian fundamentalists, jobs/environment, aid to the poor, and government services/spending are from 2004 ANES. Higher values indicate more conservative positions (except for the environmentalists thermometer).

Table 6: Model of Party Identification, 2006 ANES Pilot Study

	<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>	
Religiosity -- individual piety	1.646	.404	**
Religiosity -- communitarian	-.687	.308	**
Evangelical Protestant	.397	.252	
Roman Catholic	-.302	.245	
Black Protestant	-1.501	.462	**
Female	-.529	.184	**
Non-white	-.878	.341	**
Age < 40	.007	.231	
Age 60+	-.589	.215	**
Education	.836	.352	**
South	-.097	.211	
Constant	2.84	.445	**
number of cases:	465		
Adjusted R-square:	.20		

** $p < .05$

Notes:

Models estimated using OLS regression. Dependent variable is 7-point party identification scale; higher values indicate more Republican identification. Reference category for religious tradition dummy variables is mainline Protestant. Independent variables rescaled to range from 0 to 1.

Table 7: Models of Attitudes on “Culture War” Issues, 2006 ANES Pilot Study

	<u>Abortion</u>			<u>Gay rights</u>			<u>Women's role</u>		
	<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>		<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>		<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>	
Religiosity -- individual piety	1.647	0.167	**	1.803	.243	**	.726	.321	**
Religiosity -- communitarian	0.071	0.127		-.231	.182		-.672	.241	**
Party Identification	0.768	0.113	**	1.016	.165	**	.872	.220	**
Evangelical Protestant	.123	.104		.403	.151	**	.083	.197	
Roman Catholic	.088	.100		-.179	.144		-.051	.191	
Black Protestant	-.029	.196		.184	.291		-.198	.364	
Female	-.011	.075		-.248	.109	**	-.006	.145	
Non-white	-.116	.142		-.078	.214		.186	.268	
Age < 40	.170	.093	*	-.146	.136		.185	.180	
Age 60+	-.028	.088		.215	.131		.469	.169	**
Education	-.268	.143	*	-.835	.211	**	-1.138	.276	**
South	-.020	.086		.254	.127	**	.079	.165	
Constant	2.524	.190	**	3.291	.274	**	2.059	.362	**
number of cases:	428			385			465		
Adjusted R-square:	.32			.37			.11		

** $p < .05$

* $p < .10$

Notes:

Models estimated using OLS regression. Dependent variables are: 12-point abortion rights index; 5-point gay rights index; 7-point women’s role scale. Higher values on dependent variables indicate more conservative positions. Reference category for religious tradition dummy variables is mainline Protestant. Independent variables rescaled to range from 0 to 1.

Table 8: Models of Attitudes on Social Welfare Issues, 2006 ANES Pilot Study

	<u>Aid to poor</u>			<u>Welfare Spending</u>			<u>Health Insurance</u>			<u>Aid to Blacks</u>			<u>Gov't guarantee jobs</u>		
	<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>		<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>		<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>		<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>		<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>	
Religiosity -- individual piety	-.107	.129		.038	.149		.643	.361	*	-.436	.307		-.518	.347	
Religiosity -- communitarian	-.345	.097	**	-.260	.112	**	-.646	.271	**	-.580	.230	**	-.567	.264	**
Party Identification	.374	.088	**	.396	.102	**	1.065	.247	**	1.375	.210	**	1.684	.240	**
Evangelical Protestant	.057	.079		.109	.093		.088	.222		.201	.188		-.048	.217	
Roman Catholic	.030	.077		.143	.090		.001	.215		.081	.183		.017	.208	
Black Protestant	-.412	.146	**	.066	.175		-.800	.410	*	-.093	.348		-.529	.401	
Female	-.098	.058	*	-.173	.072	**	-.224	.163	*	-.034	.139		-.136	.157	
Non-white	.032	.107		.025	.128		.202	.301		-.446	.256	*	-.214	.291	
Age < 40	.142	.072	**	-.048	.083		-.032	.202		.111	.172		-.164	.195	
Age 60+	.137	.068	**	.027	.079		.363	.190	*	.262	.161		.297	.184	
Education	.090	.111		-.147	.129	**	.923	.311	**	-.897	.264	**	-.074	.303	
South	.049	.066		.027	.077		.420	.185	**	.314	.158	**	-.065	.180	
Constant	1.577	.145	**	2.176	.169	**	1.600	.407	**	4.959	.347	**	4.469	.391	**
number of cases:	460			460			375			462			428		
Adjusted R-square:	.15			.05			.13			.17			.18		

** $p < .05$

* $p < .10$

Notes:

Models estimated using OLS regression. Dependent variables are: 3-point scales for spending on aid to poor and welfare; 7-point scales for health insurance, aid to blacks, and government guaranteeing jobs. Higher values on dependent variables indicate more conservative positions. Reference category for religious tradition dummy variables is mainline Protestant. Independent variables rescaled to range from 0 to 1.

Table 9: Models of 2006 House Vote, 2006 ANES Pilot Study

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3				
	<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>	<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>	<u>coeff.</u>	<u>s.e.</u>			
Party Identification									
Ideology			-6.765	.896	**	-2.840	1.129	**	
Religiosity 1 (individual piety)	-2.147	.596	**	-.326	.728	.339	.935		
Religiosity 2 (communitarian)	1.256	.443	**	.801	.541	.510	.653		
Evangelical Protestant	-.209	.357		-.014	.429	.200	.538		
Roman Catholic	.452	.339		.603	.417	.360	.516		
Black Protestant	.898	.865		1.263	1.034	.426	1.435		
Female	.356	.261		-.147	.323	-.543	.414		
Non-white	1.563	.638	**	.789	.797	.890	1.173		
Age < 40	-.320	.362		.015	.438	.185	.531		
Age 60+	.219	.299		.363	.356	.498	.443		
Education	-.884	.526	*	-.552	.639	.442	.800		
South	-.063	.310		.208	.364	-.327	.469		
Constant	.814	.674		3.608	..869	**	3.372	1.067	**
number of cases:	310			299			298		
% correctly predicted:	71%			81%			88%		
Naglekerke R-square:	.27			.53			.70		

** $p < .05$

* $p < .10$

Notes:

Models estimated with logistic regression. Dependent variable is major party vote choice, coded Democrat = 1, Republican = 0. Reference category for religious tradition dummy variables is mainline Protestant. Independent variables rescaled to range from 0 to 1.