

## **Shades of Faith: Religious Foundations of Political Behavior among African Americans, Latinos and Whites**

Brian D. McKenzie  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Government and Politics  
University of Maryland  
3140 Tydings Hall  
College Park, MD 20742  
bmckenzie@gvpt.umd.edu

Stella M. Rouse  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Government and Politics  
University of Maryland  
3140 Tydings Hall  
College Park, MD 20742  
srouse@gvpt.umd.edu

*Draft: Please do not quote or cite without permission of the authors.*

### **Abstract**

Utilizing the 2000 Religion and Politics Study, which includes representative samples of the nation's three largest racial groups, we examine how religious beliefs, behaviors, and affiliations differentially influence citizens' political attitudes and involvement in public life. Our study demonstrates how religiosity structures opinions by serving as a moral lens for understanding politics and acting as a stimulus for activism. We discuss the factors that shape views on two anti-discriminatory topics: overcoming discrimination against women and reducing intolerance toward homosexuals, and we explore the religious-based determinants of voting, campaign work, and contributing to candidates. Our study is novel in its description of the political effects of religious theologies that operate in African-American, Latino, and white communities. We find that the often documented less tolerant aspects of conservative Christian beliefs about gender equality and gay rights are not as prevalent for African Americans and Latinos. In addition, our work shows that political participation for all groups is tied to various measures of religious beliefs, behavior, and belonging.

In recent years the influence of religion on American political life has increasingly received scholarly attention (Wald, Owen, and Hill 1988; Legee and Kellstedt 1993; Layman 1997; Guth, Kellstedt, Smidt, and Green 2006; Green 2007). We know from the research literature, for example, that religious forces provide guidance in the form of beliefs and ethical norms, and organized religion serves an important institutional function, linking the social, economic, and political lives of individuals (Leege and Kellstedt 1993). Several scholars have shown that three central areas of American politics research—public opinion, political participation, and voting behavior—are greatly influenced by citizens’ religiosity (Leege and Kellstedt 1993; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995; Layman 1997; Jelen and Wilcox 2003; Guth, Kellstedt, Smidt, and Green 2006; Green 2007). While these studies contribute to our knowledge of political behavior, one wonders if the general account of religion and politics that emerges from these works “fits” an increasingly diverse electorate.

To date, our knowledge of faith and politics comes from two sets of findings: 1) studies of the electorate that primarily focus on whites and 2) a separate body of research on specific minority groups. Unfortunately, the theories and empirical findings presented by these separate avenues of research are difficult to reconcile. We argue that the multifarious nature of the U.S. population requires us to think more deeply about religious differences among racial groups and their potential political effects. Although some aspects of religion and civic life operate similarly across races, others may not be identical for particular communities. Indeed, religiosity is understood, experienced, and expressed in a variety of ways.

Among these distinctions, black religious life is marked by its emphasis on addressing the concerns of disadvantaged persons and promoting social reform (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Billingsley 1999; Smith 2003; Harris-Lacewell 2007). White conservative Christian groups are notable for their advocacy of traditionalist social values and opposition to alternative lifestyles (Wilcox and Larson 2006). And Latino churches are exceptional in their engagement with immigration politics, domestic social issues, and local parish concerns that arise from their congregations of native and non-native worshippers from varied class and ethnic backgrounds (De La Torre and Aponte 2001; Avalos 2004; Barvosa-Carter 2004). Differences are also apparent from the varying levels of religious commitment, faith beliefs, worship service attendance, and denominational affiliations among these constituencies (Roof and McKinney 1987; Taylor et al. 1996; Gallup and Lindsay 1999; 2007 Pew Center U.S. Religious Landscape Survey). Despite this reality, few scholars develop and test theories that explain how facets of spiritual life (religious beliefs, behaviors, and affiliation) comparatively influence the political attitudes and behaviors of whites, Latinos, and African Americans.<sup>1</sup> We take up this challenge in the present study.

The importance of race, religion, and public life is highlighted by recent demographic and political data. An analysis of the November 2008 Voting and Registration Supplement of the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey indicates that the electorate who participated in the fall presidential election was the most diverse in history.<sup>2</sup> In addition, Census figures show that Latinos, currently accounting for 15.4% of the U.S. population, have recently surpassed African Americans (12.8% of

---

<sup>1</sup> See Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995) and McDaniel and Ellison (2008) for exceptions.

<sup>2</sup> Lopez, Mark Hugo and Paul Taylor. 2009. "Dissecting the 2008 Electorate: Most Diverse in U.S. History." Pew Research Center Report (April 30).

the population) as the largest minority group in the country (U.S. Census 2008).

Moreover, 2008 Pew Research Center estimates show that by 2050, Latinos will make up 29% of the population and account for the majority of the country's population growth during that time. In comparison, non-Hispanic whites, who currently make up 66% of the population, will decrease in proportion to 47%, while the size of the African-American population is expected to remain constant at 13% (Pew Research Center 2008).

The shifting demographic landscape coincides with the increasing role of racial and religious factors in state and national elections, which featured minority candidates from religious backgrounds and focused on "moral issues" such as same-sex marriage, stem cell research, and abortion. The 2004 Democratic presidential primaries, for example, included black activist and Baptist minister, Rev. Al Sharpton. And the 2008 Democratic primaries attracted national attention when Barack Obama's pastor, Rev. Jeremiah Wright, became a target of controversy after making racially divisive and seemingly unpatriotic remarks in several of his sermons.

The 2004 general election further underscores connections between racial and religious politics. George W. Bush's reelection in 2004 revealed a "religion gap" in the American electorate (Lee and Pachon 2007; Leal, Barreto, Lee, and de la Garza 2005). The "religion gap" refers to the inclination of religious Americans to embrace conservative political beliefs and support Republicans who represent those beliefs. Observers speculated that Bush's victory could, in part, be attributed to his capturing a large percentage of the Latino vote. Exit poll data estimated that as many as 44% of Latino voters cast their ballots for Bush, although these numbers have been disputed.

However, the consensus is that Bush was able to expand his Latino support from 2000 and these figures included support from Hispanic Evangelicals.

Building upon these insights, we explain how citizens' religious beliefs, behaviors, and affiliations influence their political attitudes and levels of activism. We consider how religiosity structures opinions by serving as a moral lens for viewing politics and acting as a stimulus for political involvement. In particular, our work discusses the religious factors that shape individuals' views on overcoming discrimination against women in society and reducing intolerance toward homosexuals. We also investigate the religious-based determinants of voting, working for campaigns or registration drives, and giving money to political candidates or parties. Our study is novel in its recognition of the distinct political effects of religious theologies that operate in African-American, Latino and white Evangelical communities.<sup>3</sup>

We are able to examine how religion differs across groups through the use of a unique data set (the 2000 Religion and Politics Survey). These data contain several religious and political measures and includes representative samples of the nation's three largest racial groups. One advantage of our study, compared to previous work, is that we provide a more nuanced analysis of the varied influences of religiosity on black, Latino, and white communities. Past studies only employ a few religious measures and assess their influence on single political domains (voting behavior, opinions, or political participation). We examine the multiple influences of religion on several attitudinal measures and various modes of political involvement. To begin, we discuss our theoretical framework in the context of past research.

---

<sup>3</sup> We are unable to make accurate generalizations about Asian Americans because of this group's small sample size.

## **Multiple Perspectives on Religion and Group Politics**

Rather than assuming that religion exerts uniform effects in the political sphere, an alternative approach is to account for distinctions among the electorate and incorporate this information into our theoretical and empirical models. This strategy provides a better sense of the religious factors that undergird political opinions and behaviors across a diverse public. To be sure, scholars of race, politics, and religious studies stress the importance of utilizing “interpretive frameworks” that capture the particularities of group experiences (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998; McClain and Stewart 2009). Since the meaning and life applications of faith differ among African Americans, Latinos, and whites, we would also expect to see variations in their political effects.

There are at least three ways in which religion may differentially influence the political behavior of racial groups: 1) cultural experiences; 2) theological distinctions; and 3) the populations served by churches. Because of their disparate cultural experiences, blacks, Latinos, and whites typically worship in largely homogenous religious environments (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998; Chaves 2004). This uniformity means that the religious practices and norms within churches vary from one location to another. In terms of theology, Christian teachings are often refined to fit the social location and circumstances of various populations (Hopkins 1999; De La Torre and Aponte 2001). As a result, congregations emphasize distinct themes and passages from the Bible in their worship service. African-American ministers, for example, promote black liberation theologies that stress the importance of reaching out to downtrodden individuals and achieving an equitable society for all

people. Latino theologies similarly focus on social justice issues and norms of community among their adherents (De La Torre and Aponte 2001). Moreover, all clergy must minister to a specific set of parishioners. Astute religious leaders, consequently, are keenly aware of the social and political concerns of their congregation and address these topics in their sermons. The same Christian message about conduct toward others may be explained differently to fit urban versus rural churchgoers. Together, these elements provide a foundation for connecting religious life to political behavior. Since African Americans, Latinos, and whites differ in terms of their religious beliefs, behaviors, and faith experiences, we offer the following general hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 1:** Religious differences among racial groups have distinct influences on the political attitudes and behavior of individuals.

### **Religion and African-American Political Life**

First, consider the spiritual experiences of blacks in the United States. Lincoln and Mamiya (1990) argue that the spheres of religious, social, and political life are interconnected for this group. African Americans are commonly described as very religious in most research studies (Roof and McKinney 1987; Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Taylor et al. 1996; Harris 1999; McKenzie 2004). A number of analysts note that blacks attend church regularly, read the bible often, profess strong religious beliefs, and greatly value religion (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Taylor et al. 1996; Gallup and Lindsay 1999; 2006 Pew U.S. Religion Survey). In fact, national surveys show that over half of African Americans report attending worship services at least once a week (Gallup and Lindsay 1999; McKenzie 2004; 2006 Pew U.S. Religion Survey).<sup>4</sup> Recent data from the 2008 Pew Religious Landscape Survey confirm these high levels of religious commitment,

---

<sup>4</sup> These figures likely reflect some over reporting (Hadaway, Marler, and Chaves 1993).

indicating that (87%) of African Americans report a formal religious affiliation and the 12% of non-affiliates, nevertheless, say religion is important to them. In terms of faith traditions, over 80 percent of black religious participants are affiliated with African-American denominations (Roof and McKinney 1987; Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; 2006 Pew U.S. Religion Survey).<sup>5</sup> These findings provide a basis for theorizing about the role of religion in conditioning the political opinions and levels of activism for blacks.

Of particular relevance to our research, 60% of Black Protestants state that religion is politically relevant for their lives (Green 2007). African Americans feel that religion guides their attitudes about various moral, social, and political topics. These beliefs are a primary component of individuals' political predispositions. Two issues, in particular (gender attitudes and views about homosexual rights) are subjects for which faith beliefs arguably influence citizens' worldviews. There are at least two perspectives regarding the effects of black religious life on gender attitudes. One approach holds that black churches and their primarily male leadership may privilege men's concerns over women's (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Harris 1999). Harris (1999) contends that "black women's exclusion from clerical leadership and key decision-making processes in churches sanctions the ideas and practices of male authority." On the other hand, several scholars show that political messages about equality conveyed in African-American congregations increase black support for gender concerns (Wilcox and Thomas 1992; Calhoun-Brown 2003). In light of this work, it is unclear how religious forces might influence blacks' feelings about women's rights. Our study advances this debate by

---

<sup>5</sup> This category includes the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Incorporated, the National Baptist Convention of America, Unincorporated, the Progressive National Baptist Convention, and the Church of God in Christ.

examining the effects of several religious measures on African Americans' views on this topic.

Opinions about gay rights are another area where religious beliefs might come into play. This subject matter involves ones' ideas about same-sex relationships that are frowned upon by Christian teachings. Indeed, most clergy regard homosexuality as a sin. But, from the perspective of black liberation theologies that promote social justice and equality for marginalized people, gay individuals might be considered as a group that is unfairly treated. Thus, black religious life may simultaneously condemn alternative lifestyles, while facilitating concern for gays who are disregarded by society (Shaw and McDaniel 2007). Our study explores this notion of competing spiritual forces for blacks, relative to Latinos and whites.

Much empirical work has also been devoted to understanding how religion affects African-American political participation (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Calhoun-Brown 1996; Harris 1999; McKenzie 2004). These studies show that churches provide the organizational infrastructure, social networks, and leadership capacities that facilitate political involvement. Additionally, faith beliefs and one's understanding of scriptures empower blacks to rise above their personal circumstances to challenge the status quo (Harris 1999). In political science parlance, church involvement causes individuals to feel more politically efficacious. The mobilization effects of black congregations were prominent during the civil rights era, in the 1980s as black churches aided Jesse Jackson's presidential bids, and more recently as religious institutions labor to advance black interests on a variety of social, economic, and political issues (Lincoln and Mamiya

1990; Billingsley 1999; Harris 1999; Smith 2003). Based on the religion and African-American politics literature, we posit three additional hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 2:** Blacks' religious experiences offer both positive and negative teachings about the role of women in society. Black churches emphasize traditional roles for women, but at the same time, African-American congregations espouse messages about gender equality associated with their liberation theology leanings.

**Hypothesis 3:** African Americans' religious experiences have competing influences on attitudes about gay rights. Reading Christian texts (which cast homosexual activity as immoral) is associated with opposition to gay rights, whereas equality and social justice themes in Black Protestant congregations is associated with support for gay rights.

**Hypothesis 4:** Involvement in churches increases the political activism of African Americans.

### **Religion and Latino Politics**

Although we know a great deal about the spiritual life of African Americans and whites, less has been written about the role of religion in the political life of Latinos (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998; Avalos 2004; Barvosa-Carter 2004). This neglect is lamentable given the importance of religion in the politics of Latino communities since the late 1960s (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998; Avalos 2004; Espinosa, Elizondo, and Miranda 2005). According to the 2006 Pew U.S. Religion Survey, 68% of Latinos say religion is very important to them. Recent survey data also indicates that 38-44% of Latinos report attending church regularly (2000 Religion and Politics Survey; 2006 Pew U.S. Religion Survey; Pew Hispanic Center-2006 Hispanic Religion Survey; Pew Hispanic Center-National Survey of Latinos 2008). And 38% of Latinos say their religious beliefs are very important in influencing their political thinking (Pew Hispanic Center-2006 Hispanic Religion Survey). Along these lines, most Latinos view churches as appropriate forums to address social and political issues (Pew Hispanic Center-2006 Hispanic Religion Survey). As this population has grown to become the

nation's largest minority group, researchers have begun to link religion and political behavior for this community.

Traditionally, most Latinos have identified as Catholics (Perl, Greeley, and Gray 2006) and this denominational preference has been the main focus of research. However, scholars have observed a Latino defection from Catholicism over the past two decades (Greeley 1994; Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998; Hunt 2000; Avalos 2004; Barvosa-Carter 2004). Researchers have also emphasized a growing Catholic/Protestant split among Latinos, but there is a debate about the political ramifications of such a divide. Leal, Barreto, Lee, and de la Garza (2005) find that, in the 2004 election there were differences in the preferences of Latino Catholics and Latino Protestants; Latino Catholics favored Kerry by over forty points, while Latino Protestants preferred Bush by a thirteen point margin. However, Leal and colleagues argue that this religious split was not enough to alter the election and that the reported mobilization of Latino Protestants in response to the "moral values" campaign of George Bush was overstated. Lee and Pachon (2007) demonstrate an independent effect of Latino religious identification on voting preferences. Similar to Leal et al.(2005), the authors show that Latino Protestants favor Republican candidates, and they are particularly committed to these individuals; yet, they argue that the religious cleavage among Latinos—those who are Catholic and those who are Protestant—is not enough to swing elections. Kelly and Kelly (2005) particularly note the influence of evangelicalism among non-Mexican Latinos. These authors argue that shifts from Catholicism to Protestantism among Latinos may lead to electoral changes because Protestants are more likely than Catholics to vote.

The impact of religion on Latinos' attitudes and involvement in public affairs is more apparent than vote choice (Barvosa-Carter 2004). Along these lines, Guth, Kellstedt, Smidt, and Green (2006) and Lee and Pachon (2007) reinforce the existence of a religious gap among Latinos. Guth and colleagues (2006) argue that Latino Protestants form political coalitions that align with their stances on a variety of issues. They note that "...religious groups have distinctive partisan alignments because of the specific political views those religious groups foster" (p. 235). Since Latinos are increasingly participating in Protestant (Pentecostal and Evangelical) churches, we explore the potential political ramifications of this phenomenon.

In thinking about the political relevance of religion, it is equally important to consider that Latino religious teachings are theologically distinct from their mainstream counterparts. For example, the Catholic theologies of Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans are complex blends of Latino folk culture and Anglo-American Catholicism (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998; De La Torre and Aponte 2001; Avalos 2004; Barvosa-Carter 2004). This hybrid spiritual expression permits an understanding of scriptures as they affect predominantly Latino congregations. Consequently, social justice issues, poverty and immigration policy become life application subjects that church leaders discuss with their members. The concept of justice, in particular, is a central aspect of Latino theologies (De La Torre and Aponte 2001). This theme focuses on the public actions of individuals toward others. In Spanish translations of the Bible, for example, believers are encouraged to seek justice for disenfranchised community members (De La Torre and Aponte 2001). These teachings may shape Latinos' beliefs about various groups in society.

Involvement in churches and religious convictions also positively affect Latino political participation (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995; Warren 2001; Barvosa-Carter 2004). One study observes that, “religion provides the ideological, rhetorical, and moral platform for political and social action” (Espinosa, Elizondo, and Miranda 2005). Churches in Latino communities provide an organizational and membership base that social activists utilize in empowering local areas (Barvosa-Carter 2004). This is particularly evident in the grassroots mobilization efforts of the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), a group of church-based political associations in the Southwest (Barvosa-Carter 2004). In addition, Latino political leaders and the rank and file draw upon their faith to cope with the challenges of fighting for justice and equality.

Despite these findings, there is some evidence that Catholics are less active in politics than Protestants (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995; Kelly and Kelly 2005).<sup>6</sup> The emphasis on clerical leadership in Catholic settings is thought to inhibit participation by the laity that would stimulate civic engagement outside the church. This is especially notable since 70% of Latinos are Catholic and 20% are affiliated with Protestant denominations (Perl, Greely, and Gray 2006). Given the recent growth in non-Catholic Latino churchgoers, we examine the impact of religious belonging in the present study. Drawing upon the literature on Latino religious and political life, we add three hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 5:** Latinos who are Christian conservatives and affiliated with Evangelical congregations are less supportive of policies that promote gender equality.

**Hypothesis 6:** Latinos’ religious experiences, rooted in a strong message of social justice, have no negative effect on their attitudes about gay rights.

---

<sup>6</sup> Jones-Correa and Leal (2001) disagree with this point, arguing that the civic associational role of churches is more important.

**Hypothesis 7:** For Latinos, involvement in Catholic churches decreases political activism.

### **Faith and Politics for Whites**

Since we are examining variations among racial groups, the religious experiences of whites provide an important comparison point. Much of the religion and politics literature has been devoted to understanding the nexus of spiritual beliefs and political behavior from the perspective of this population (Wald, Owen, and Hill 1988; Legee and Kellstedt 1993; Layman 1997; Guth, Kellstedt, Smidt, and Green 2006). Prominent accounts of the religious bases of partisanship and voting, along with the moral foundations of public opinion largely focus on whites (Layman 1997; Jelen and Wilcox 2003; Green 2007). Evangelical Protestants, in particular, have garnered attention for their role in recent presidential elections (Green 2007).

As an overview, 57% of whites report that religion is very important to them. This figure is even greater (81%) for white Evangelicals. National survey data indicate that 39% of whites report attending religious services at least weekly (2006 Pew U.S. Religion Survey). These rates are even higher (61%) for Evangelicals. Among whites, Evangelical hallmarks include, among other factors, beliefs that the Bible is authoritative on religious matters, and high levels of expressed devotion; evidenced by frequent worship service attendance and Bible reading (Green 2007). These dimensions of religion may result in traditional views about morality and the role of women in society. New Testament texts, for instance, are often interpreted as upholding men as the head of households and encouraging women to submit to their husbands. For example, Wilcox (1987) notes that religiosity and aspects of conservative Christian doctrine are associated

with less support for gender issues. Since Evangelicals discuss the biblical bases of the ills of homosexuality, devout individuals ought to express less favor toward these topics as well. These same Christian beliefs, however, may be understood differently by minorities, whose religious theologies sympathize with disadvantaged groups.

Conventional wisdom points to the growing trend among white evangelicals toward greater participation in politics. And after many political analysts attributed George W. Bush's narrow victory in 2004 to this growing trend, scholars more closely examine the Christian Right Thesis and "moral values" phenomenon as explanations for how religion affects political behavior and participation (Green 2007). Although these efforts produced mixed results, most scholars agree that churches play an important role as a conduit for political engagement (Kohut, Green, Keeter, and Toth 2000; Greenberg 2000; Wald, Owen, and Hill 1988). Based on this literature, we state our last hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 8:** Conservative Christian religious experiences will be associated with less support for gender equity and tolerance for gays. This effect will be especially consistent for whites, compared to other groups.

**Hypothesis 9:** Participation in churches has a positive effect on political activism for whites.

In the next section, we describe the data and techniques employed to test our hypotheses.

## **Data and Measures**

We analyze the 2000 Religion and Politics Survey (RPS), which was conducted by SRBI Associates for Princeton University.<sup>7</sup> Most importantly for our purposes, this

---

<sup>7</sup> The sampling procedure, random generation of the last two digits of telephone numbers selected on the basis of their area code, telephone exchange (the first three digits of a seven digit telephone number), and bank number (the fourth and fifth digits) ensures equal representation of all (listed and unlisted) residential households. The area code, telephone exchange, and bank number were selected proportionally by county and by telephone exchange within a county. At least ten attempts were made to reach each number and the person over eighteen with the most recent birthday was asked to participate in the interview.

unique dataset includes questions that measure various dimensions of religiosity and political behavior across multiple racial groups. Respondents are asked questions about their personal religious beliefs, private devotional activities, affiliations with various denominational bodies, and involvement in worship settings. In terms of politics, interviewees responded to queries about their party affiliation, political ideology, interest in government affairs, and participation in several varying levels of demanding and time-intensive political activities. These data also include measures of citizens' opinions about combating discrimination against women and reducing intolerance toward homosexuals.

The RPS is a nationally representative telephone survey of adults who live in the continental United States. It was fielded between January 6 and March 31, 2000. The completion rate was 0.91 and the total sample size is 5,603 cases. The survey has a margin of error of plus or minus 1.42% at the 95% confidence level. The RPS is one of the few recent surveys that contains large samples of blacks (570), Latinos (550), and whites (4,477) and includes appropriate demographic and socioeconomic status items.<sup>8</sup>

#### *Dependent Variables*

The dependent variables for our multivariate models are respondents' reported level of interest in two political issues. Interviewees were asked, "Here are some issues facing our country today. How interested are you in each one?" The topics include overcoming discrimination against women in society and reducing intolerance toward homosexuals. Responses are coded on a three-point ordinal scale from 0 (not very

---

<sup>8</sup> Descriptive statistics for the dependent and independent variables used in the analyses can be found in Appendix B1-B3.

interested) to 2 (quite interested).<sup>9</sup> The wording of the questions mirrors the political interest items in the Roper Center Public Opinion Surveys and the General Social Surveys. We also examine citizens' involvement in voting, working for campaigns or registration drives, and giving money to political candidates or parties.

## Analysis

How does religion influence the political life of African Americans, Latinos, and whites? To explore this question, we first compare the means for these groups on four measures of religious beliefs and religious behaviors—*religious conservatism, authority of the Bible, church attendance, and reading the Bible*. Because we are comparing means for more than two groups, we rely on one-way ANOVA for our analyses. Table 1 lists ANOVA F-values and *post hoc* mean comparison results for four religious items.<sup>10</sup>

[Table 1 about here]

First, the F-values from the ANOVA analyses show that the means for three of the four religious measures for the three groups are statistically different from one another. Except for *religious conservatism*, the F-ratios of the three other religious measures far exceed the 4.26 minimum value needed for each to be significantly different. All three of these measures (literal authority of the Bible, religious service attendance, reading the Bible) are significant at the .001 level. Furthermore, the null result for *religious conservatism* is not surprising. Previous research notes that blacks and whites are often similar in terms of the conservative religious beliefs they hold (Calhoun-Brown 1997).

---

<sup>9</sup> “DK/Refused” cases are coded zero. The multivariate results are identical when these cases are treated as missing values.

<sup>10</sup> Appendix C summarizes the remainder of the ANOVA results (sum of squares, degrees of freedoms, and mean square).

What differs among these groups, however, are the political effects of these sentiments, a topic we address later in the paper.

Our straightforward ANOVA analyses demonstrate that at least one population mean for three of the four religion measures differs from the others, however because we are comparing more than two groups, we are unable to establish where the differences occur. In other words, the mean for African Americans on a particular measure might be different from the mean for Latinos, but not different from the mean for whites. It is the distinctions between specific groups that are most pertinent to our study. Using the Bonferroni method, we conduct *post hoc* mean comparisons to isolate the difference in means between racial groups and determine whether this difference is statistically significant.<sup>11</sup> For our purposes, this method adjusts for the fact that we are making three comparisons per variable for each group.<sup>12</sup> From Table 1 we see that on the *literal authority of the Bible* measure, the means for all three groups, African Americans, Latinos, and whites, are statistically distinct from one another. For the *church attendance* measure, African Americans are statistically dissimilar from Latinos and whites, but whites and Latinos are not significantly different from one another. And in terms of *reading the Bible*, again, African Americans and whites, and African Americans and

---

<sup>11</sup> Some respondents in the survey identify themselves as being members of two groups- respondents indentifying as both “white” and “Latino” = 361; respondents indentifying as both “Latino” and “black” = 50. When running ANOVA analyses and *post hoc* means test, we needed to decide how to count these respondents. We compared the mean of “white Latinos” (m= .064) to “whites” (m= .806) and “Latinos” (m= .098), and the mean of “black Latinos” (m= .008) to “blacks” (m= .102) and “Latinos” (m= .098). Based on the mean comparisons of the groups, and for theoretical considerations (for white Latinos ethnicity has shown to be a stronger predictor than race), we count “white Latinos” as “Latinos.” Because the mean for “black Latinos” is so different from the other two comparison groups, and because they are so few in number, we drop these respondents from the ANOVA analyses.

<sup>12</sup> For explanations of methods for post hoc group comparisons in ANOVA see Urdan (2005).

Latinos are statistically distinct from one another, but there are no significant differences between the mean values of whites and Latinos.

Together, our bivariate analyses reveal significant religious belief/behavior differences among the three groups, particularly between African Americans and Latinos and African Americans and whites. These findings confirm Hypothesis 1. As previously noted, this dissimilarity is often masked in studies that examine the electorate at large. We believe that distinctions of this sort are consequential for understanding citizens' opinions and political behavior, a subject we explore in the next section.

We analyze the results from two ordered probit models of the determinants of citizens' interest in overcoming discrimination against women and reducing intolerance toward homosexuals.<sup>13</sup> In addition, we utilize three separate probit models to study the impact of religious experiences on voting, working for campaigns or registration drives, and donating money to political candidates or parties. The attitudinal dependent variables represent issues which the literature identifies as having moral dimensions that individuals draw upon in forming political judgments. Moreover, the participation models gauge the impact of faith experiences on voting and more demanding forms of activism. Because we believe different processes influence opinions and behavior, we use separate regression models for each racial group. Our analyses also compare results across collectives, focusing on differences that arise from theological practices.

Tables 2-4 reveal a number of notable findings. In terms of gender equality attitudes, the religious items exert no direct effects on blacks' opinions.

---

<sup>13</sup> We conducted multicollinearity tests for each model. None of the VIF values exceed 1.94 and the mean VIF is 1.38.

[Tables 2-4 about here]

For Latinos, however, individuals who are affiliated with Evangelical Protestant churches express less interest in overcoming discrimination against women. In practical terms this means that a typical non-Evangelical Latino would have a higher probability (0.85) of being quite interested in combating gender discrimination, compared to an Evangelical's lower probability (0.69). This result fits what we know about the traditional gender role teachings and emphasis on male leadership in Evangelical religious communities.<sup>14</sup> As expected, among whites, evangelical church affiliation has a similar negative impact on opinions about gender equality. Thus, for Latinos and whites only, the influence of conservative religious traditions on gender attitudes works in the same fashion. For blacks, however, no religious-based gender attitude effects are observed.

The diverse effect of religion on political opinions, however, is particularly evident for citizens' interest in reducing intolerance toward gays. African Americans' association with Black Protestant and Mainline Protestant congregations facilitates concern for this marginalized segment of the population. A typical Black Protestant's probability of being quite interested in reducing intolerance toward homosexuals (0.41) is higher than their counterparts in the sample (0.32). It appears that black theologies, which promote equality for disadvantaged people, produce awareness for another community that is unfairly treated in society. African-American religiosity is not without faults, as the most devout readers of the Bible (probability=0.28) are much less interested in policies that reduce homosexual intolerance than individuals who spend little time reading scriptures (probability=0.45). This duality characterizes the positive and negative

---

<sup>14</sup> This does not minimize Latinas' roles as members of congregational organizations, lay religious leaders, and transmitters of values in families (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998).

influences of contemporary black religion on gay rights (Shaw and McDaniel 2007).

There are no discernable religious effects on Latino's concern for reducing intolerance, a finding that further highlights group-based political distinctions among racial groups.

Interestingly, for whites, we find that each measure of religiosity consistently depresses interest in mitigating intolerance toward gays. This striking pattern only occurs for this group. We believe the robustness of these effects is attributable to strict Christian teachings against immoral behavior that are a hallmark of white conservative religious experiences.

Moving to citizens' engagement in politics, our findings demonstrate that church attendance positively affects blacks' involvement via participation in campaign work and voter registration drives. Frequent church attendance increases a person's probability of participating in these acts by about 0.10. Indeed, about one third of Black Protestants attend congregations that have registration initiatives and invite candidates to give speeches (Chaves 2004). An exception to this beneficial religious role is apparent for black Catholics, who are less likely to vote (probability=0.71) than their counterparts (probability=0.86). Among Latinos, there is a positive relationship between religious activities and political involvement. Latinos who regularly read the Bible, for instance, are more likely to vote in presidential elections (probability=0.48) than individuals who rarely study (probability=0.26). This finding is consistent with Espinosa (2005) who shows that Bible readers engage in social action and participate in active congregations. Latino Catholics, on the other hand, are less likely to contribute money to candidates or parties. This result, along with the finding for voting among black Catholics, comports with previous literature which finds that Catholics in general are less politically engaged

than other groups (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995). For whites, the conventional positive influence of church attendance on voting is confirmed by our analysis.

However, white Christians who believe in the high authority of the Bible and its supreme accuracy are less likely to vote than their counterparts. This result deserves further attention to discern if devout individuals ignore politics in favor of spiritual pursuits.

### **Discussion and Conclusions**

Recall that the primary goal of this project is to account for the distinct political effects of group-specific religious experiences. We argue that religiosity is understood, practiced, and expressed differently by various segments of the population, and a comparative approach is necessary to understand this disparate influence. While previous studies illustrate the role religion plays in shaping citizens' opinion and participation in civic life, few accounts have examined this topic cohesively across multiple groups. To relatively examine how religion affects the political attitudes and behaviors of African Americans, Latinos, and whites, we presented nine hypotheses. Our first hypothesis underscores the importance of accounting for religious variation among groups and its distinct effect on political behavior. We find support for this hypothesis based on the strength and significance of various religious measures for each group.

Our next three hypotheses (H2-H4) concern the effects of African-American religious experiences on this population's attitudes and behaviors. Of particular note is the strength of two competing (and conflicting) factors—reading scriptures and belonging to Black Protestant congregations—for shaping opinions about gays. Our comparative perspective shows that these dual negative and positive influences are not prominent in Latino and white communities. Hypotheses 5-7 address the religiosity of Latinos and its

impact on their political attitudes and behaviors. We find that, overall, less of our religious measures have explanatory value for Latinos than for African Americans and whites. Nevertheless, our hypotheses for Latinos are supported by the model. Our last hypotheses (H8-H9) examine how religious experiences play out in the political lives of whites. Here we emphasize the consistency and strength of the measures that capture the conservative Christian experiences and their effect on policies aimed at gender equality and tolerance for gays.

Overall we show that a general theory of religion and politics does not fit all racial groups. If we want to accurately understand the politics of a diverse public, then our theoretical models should reflect this reality. Given the complexities of faith within specific populations, religion naturally plays out differently in multiple ethnic communities. Accounts of Evangelical politics more consistently explain the traditionalist effects of religion for whites, compared to blacks and Latinos. What occurs in conservative white congregations may differ from the experiences in minority religious settings. Our findings indicate that the less tolerant aspects of Evangelical beliefs about gender equality and homosexual rights are not as prominent for blacks and Latinos.

An example of this difference was observed during the 2008 presidential election. In this contest, support for Barack Obama among African Americans was well documented, but less obvious was the role played by Latino Evangelicals. Espinosa (2009) explains that Obama was able to capture the Latino Evangelical vote because he realized that morality issues such as abortion and gay marriage do not entirely define Latinos' religious experiences (as our results show). Rather, Latino Evangelicals take a holistic approach in their vote choice by considering multiple issues including

immigration reform, civil rights, social justice, jobs, and the economy (Espinosa 2009). Obama did a better job than McCain at appealing to the overall concerns of Latino Evangelicals. The political implications of these group-based distinctions, warrant more scholarly attention.

We further recognize that subgroup diversity among Latinos may have both religious and political implications beyond those we discuss in this paper. The 2000 Religion and Politics Survey classifies respondents using a single Latino category, so we are unable to separate Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cuban Americans, Dominicans, or Central Americans. There is good reason to believe, nonetheless, that variation exists among the Latino population. Indeed, the political effects of religion may manifest differently for Mexican Americans in the Southwest, compared to Dominican communities in New York and Boston (Avalos 2004; Barvosa-Carter 2004). The relative autonomy (or lack of freedom) that local Catholic parishes are permitted in a region may account for variations in the politicization of Latino congregations. The involvement of priests in local community affairs is another factor that varies across predominantly Latino churches. The research literature (Wald, Owen, and Hill 1988) suggests that contextual differences of this type ought to have significant effects on the political attitudes and behaviors of parishioners. These issues deserve further study.

Given the shifting demographics of the polity, future research should continue to explore between-group differences in religiosity and its influence on political attitudes and behavior. We believe this can be accomplished using a comparative perspective to explain group specific variations. Our findings hopefully will encourage other scholars to think more about how religious diversity may manifest in the political realm.

## References

- Avalos, Hector. 2004. *Introduction to the U.S. Latina and Latino Religious Experience*. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Barvosa-Carter, Edwina. 2004. Politics and the U.S. Latina and Latino Religious Experience. in Hector Avalos Ed. *Introduction to the U.S. Latina and Latino Religious Experience*. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers (pp. 261-279).
- Billingsley, Andrew. 1999. *Mighty Like a River: The Black Church and Social Reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Calhoun-Brown, Allison. 2003. "No Respect of Persons? Religion, Churches, and Gender Issues in the African-American Community." in R. Drew Smith, Ed. *New Day Begun: African-American Churches and Civic Culture in Post-Civil Rights America*. Durham: Duke University Press (pp. 142-158).
- Calhoun-Brown, Allison. 1997. "Still Seeing in Black and White: Racial Challenges for the Christian Right." in Corwin E. Smidt and James M. Penning, Eds. *Sojourners in the Wilderness: The Christian Right in Comparative Perspective*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield (pp. 115-138).
- Calhoun-Brown, Allison. 1996. "African-American Churches and Political Mobilization: The Psychological Impact of Organizational Resources." *Journal of Politics*, 58: 935-53.
- Chatterjee, S., A. S. Hadi, and B. Price. 2000. *Regression Analysis by Example*. Third Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Chaves, Mark. 2004. *Congregations in America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- De La Torre, Miguel A., and Edwin David Aponte . 2001. *Introducing Latino/a Theologies*. Maryknoll, NY:Orbis Books.
- Diaz-Stevens, Ana Maria, and Anthony M. Stevens-Arroyo. 1998. *Recognizing the Latino Resurgence in U.S. Religion*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Espinosa, Gaston. 2009. "Obama Threaded the Moral Needle of Latino Evangelicals in '08." *Religion Dispatches* (June 28).  
<http://www.religiondispatches.org/archive/politics/1591/>
- Espinosa, Gaston. 2005. Latino Clergy and Churches in Faith-Based Political and Social Action in the United States. In Gaston Espinosa, Virgilio Elizondo and Jesse Miranda (eds.), *Latino Religions and Civic Activism in the United States*, pp. 279-306. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Espinosa, Gaston, Virgilio Elizondo, and Jesse Miranda (eds.) 2005. *Latino Religions and Civic Activism in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gallup, George, Jr., and D. Michael Lindsay. 1999. *Surveying the Religious Landscape: Trends in U.S. Beliefs*. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing.
- Greeley, Andrew M. 1994. "The Demography of American Catholics: 1965-1990." In *The Sociology of Andrew Greeley*. Ed., Andrew M. Greeley, Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Green, John C. 2007. *The Faith Factor: How Religion Influences American Elections*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Greenberg, Anna. 2000. "The Church and the Revitalization of Politics and Community." *Political Science Quarterly*, 115: 377-94.
- 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: 223-42.
- Harris, Fredrick C. 1999. *Something Within: Religion in African-American Political Activism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harris-Lacewell, Melissa. 2007. From Liberation to Mutual Fund: Political Consequences of Differing Conceptions of Christ in the African-American Church. In J. Matthew Wilson Ed., *From Pews to Polling Places: Faith and Politics in the American Religious Mosaic*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Press (pp. 150-180).
- Hopkins, Dwight N. 1999. *Introducing Black Theology of Liberation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Hunt, Larry L. 2000. "Religion and Secular Status among Hispanics in the United States: Catholicism and the Varieties of Hispanic Protestantism." *Social Science Quarterly*, 81: 344-362.
- Jelen, Ted G., and Clyde Wilcox. 2003. "Causes and Consequences of Public Attitudes Toward Abortion: A Review and Research Agenda." *Political Research Quarterly*, 56:489-500.
- Jones-Correa, Michael A. and David L. Leal. 2001. "Political Participation: Does Religion Matter?" *Political Research Quarterly*, 54:751-770.
- Kelly, Nathan J. and Jana Morgan Kelly. 2005. "Religion and Latino Partisanship in the United States." *Political Research Quarterly*, 58:87-95.

- Kohut, Andrew, John C. Green, Scoot Keeter, and Robert C. Toth. 2000. *The Diminishing Divide: Religion's Changing Role in American Politics*. Washington, D.C: The Brookings Institution.
- Layman, Geoffrey C. 1997. "Religion and Political Behavior in the United States: The Impact of Beliefs, Affiliations, and Commitment from 1980 to 1994." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61: 288-316.
- Leal, David L., Matt A. Barreto, Jongho Lee, and Rodolfo O. de la Garza. 2005. "The Latino Vote in the 2004 Election." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 38:41-49.
- Lee, Jongho and Harry Pachon. 2007. "Leading the Way: An Analysis of the Effect of Religion on the Latino Vote." *American Politics Research*, 35: 252-72.
- Leege, David C., and Lyman A. Kellstedt. 1993. *Rediscovering the Religious Factor in American Politics*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Lincoln, C. Eric, and Lawrence H. Mamiya. [1990] 1999. *The Black Church in the African-American Experience*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- McClain, Paula, and Joseph Stewart, Jr. 2009. "*Can We All Get Along?*" *Racial and Ethnic Minorities in American Politics*. 5<sup>th</sup> Edition. Boulder: Westview Press.
- McDaniel, Eric L., and Christopher G. Ellison. 2008. "God's Party? Race, Religion, and Partisanship Over Time." *Political Research Quarterly*, 61: 180-191.
- McKenzie, Brian D. 2004. "Religious Social Networks, Indirect Mobilization, and African-American Political Participation." *Political Research Quarterly*, 57:621-632.
- Perl, Paul, Jennifer Z. Greely, and Mark M. Gray. 2006. "What Proportion of Adult Hispanics are Catholic? A Review of Survey Data and Methodology." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 45: 419-36.
- Pew Research Center 2007. *Changing Faiths: Latinos and the Transformation of American Religion*. Washington D.C: Pew Hispanic Center and Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life.
- Pew Research Center. 2008. "U.S. Population Projections: 2005-2050." *Social and Demographic Trends*. Washington D.C: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Roof, Wade Clark, and William McKinney. 1987. *American Mainline Religion: Its Changing Shape and Future*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Shaw, Todd C., and Eric L. McDaniel. 2007. "Whosoever Will": Black Theology, Homosexuality, and the Black Political Church." *National Political Science*

- Review*, 11:137-155.
- Smith, R. Drew (Editor). 2003. *New Day Begun: African-American Churches and Civic Culture in Post-Civil Rights America*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Steensland, Brian, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces*, 79:291-318.
- Taylor, Robert J., Linda M. Chatters, Rukmalie Jayakody, and Jeffrey S. Levin. 1996. "Black and White Differences in Religious Participation: A Multisample Comparison." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 35:403-410.
- Urdu, Timothy. 2005. *Statistics in Plain English*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2006. "U.S. Hispanic Population 2006." *Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement*.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wald, Kenneth D., Dennis E. Owen, and Samuel S. Hill. 1988. "Churches as Political Communities." *American Political Science Review*, 82:531-48.
- Warren, Mark R. 2001. *Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wilcox, Clyde. 1987. "Religious Orientations and Political Attitudes: Variations Within the New Christian Right." *American Politics Quarterly*, 15:274-96.
- Wilcox, Clyde and Carin Larson. 2006. *Onward Christian Soldiers: The Religious Right in American Politics*. Third Edition. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Wilcox, Clyde, and Sue Thomas. 1992. "Religion and Feminist Attitudes among African-American Women: A View from the Nation's Capitol." *Women and Politics*, 12: 19-40.

**Table 1. ANOVA F-Values and Post Hoc Group Comparisons: Multiple Comparisons of Group Means for Religious Items**

---

**Religious Conservatism**

Between Groups ANOVA F-Value: 0.91

	Whites	African Americans
African Americans	.023	----
Latinos	.015	-.008

**Literal Authority of Bible**

Between Groups ANOVA F-Value: 129.27\*\*\*

	Whites	African Americans
African Americans	.291***	----
Latinos	.198***	-.092***

**Religious Service Attendance**

Between Groups ANOVA F-Value: 33.62\*\*\*

	Whites	African Americans
African Americans	.639***	----
Latinos	-.021	-.660***

**Reading Bible**

Between Groups ANOVA F-Value: 103.87\*\*\*

	Whites	African Americans
African Americans	.815***	----
Latinos	.044	-.771***

---

\*\*\* The mean difference is significant at the .001 level  
Bonferroni method used for post hoc group comparisons

**Table 2. Influences on African-American Political Behavior**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Gender Equality</b>	<b>Tolerance of Homosexuals</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Campaign Work and Registration Drives</b>	<b>Money to Candidates or Parties</b>
Religious Conservatism	0.09 (0.15)	-0.10 (0.14)	0.27 (0.17)	0.09 (0.18)	0.04 (0.18)
Authority of Bible	-0.04 (0.14)	-0.03 (0.11)	-0.18 (0.15)	0.10 (0.18)	-0.05 (0.16)
Attendance	0.04 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.05)	0.12**(0.06)	0.10**(0.05)
Read Bible	-0.09 (0.06)	-0.11**(0.05)	0.04 (0.07)	-0.04 (0.08)	0.01 (0.07)
Catholic	0.03 (0.22)	0.25 (0.20)	-0.52**(0.22)	-0.09 (0.29)	-0.02 (0.30)
Black Protestant	0.15 (0.14)	0.24**(0.12)	0.14 (0.15)	-0.08 (0.18)	-0.05 (0.17)
Evangelical	-0.17 (0.20)	0.08 (0.20)	0.29 (0.27)	-0.24 (0.30)	-0.34 (0.30)
Mainline	0.42 (0.30)	0.52**(0.22)	-0.44 (0.28)	-0.39 (0.38)	-0.35 (0.36)
Jewish	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Org. Member	0.02 (0.23)	0.23 (0.18)	0.03 (0.25)	1.22***(0.22)	0.57***(0.22)
Democrat	0.04 (0.13)	0.09 (0.12)	0.29**(0.14)	0.06 (0.18)	-0.13 (0.17)
Republican	-0.40 (0.23)	0.12 (0.22)	0.59**(0.28)	-0.36 (0.33)	-0.13 (0.33)
Liberal	0.02 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	0.02 (0.05)	0.02 (0.05)
Follow Govt.	0.21***(0.05)	0.25***(0.05)	0.11 (0.06)	0.15 (0.09)	0.17 (0.10)
Age	0.00 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.00)	0.02***(0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Female	0.46***(0.12)	0.44***(0.11)	0.14 (0.13)	0.05 (0.16)	-0.22 (0.15)
Education	0.06 (0.06)	0.06 (0.05)	0.10 (0.07)	0.16**(0.08)	0.14**(0.07)
Employed	0.05 (0.07)	0.06 (0.07)	0.03 (0.08)	-0.06 (0.10)	0.17 (0.10)
Constant			-1.07***(0.40)	-2.74***(0.50)	-3.02***(0.53)
Cut1	-0.41 (0.35)	0.93 (0.32)			
Cut2	0.47 (0.34)	1.59 (0.33)			
N	561	561	561	561	561
Prob>chi2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
Pseudo R2	0.07	0.06	0.13	0.17	0.12

**Source: 2000 Religion and Politics Survey. Entries are probit coefficients and robust standard errors. \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\*p < .01**

**Table 3. Influences on Latino Political Behavior**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Gender Equality</b>	<b>Tolerance of Homosexuals</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Campaign Work and Registration Drives</b>	<b>Money to Candidates or Parties</b>
Religious Conservatism	-0.21 (0.14)	-0.24 (0.14)	-0.06 (0.15)	0.24 (0.24)	0.20 (0.22)
Authority of Bible	-0.10 (0.12)	0.02 (0.12)	-0.14 (0.14)	-0.20 (0.22)	0.20 (0.19)
Attendance	0.08 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	-0.08 (0.05)	0.02 (0.07)	-0.07 (0.07)
Read Bible	-0.02 (0.06)	-0.10 (0.06)	0.14**(0.07)	0.03 (0.08)	0.11 (0.10)
Catholic	0.05 (0.15)	-0.03 (0.14)	-0.17 (0.17)	-0.38 (0.25)	-0.54**(0.22)
Black Protestant	-0.63 (0.35)	0.39 (0.35)	1.26 (0.68)	n/a	n/a
Evangelical	-0.55***(0.19)	-0.16 (0.21)	0.04 (0.24)	-0.01 (0.30)	-0.38 (0.28)
Mainline	0.16 (0.32)	0.02 (0.32)	-0.29 (0.37)	-0.37 (0.64)	-0.85 (0.50)
Jewish	-0.17 (0.69)	-0.33 (0.69)	-0.85 (0.77)	n/a	n/a
Org. Member	-0.06 (0.19)	0.14 (0.20)	0.28 (0.22)	0.69***(0.25)	0.76***(0.24)
Democrat	0.06 (0.12)	0.11 (0.11)	0.28**(0.14)	0.08 (0.22)	0.11 (0.19)
Republican	0.33 (0.17)	0.07 (0.16)	0.41**(0.18)	0.64***(0.25)	0.33 (0.23)
Liberal	0.07 (0.04)	0.07**(0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.01 (0.06)	-0.07 (0.06)
Follow Govt.	0.12***(0.05)	0.11**(0.05)	0.19***(0.05)	0.23***(0.08)	0.23***(0.08)
Age	0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	0.03***(0.00)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.02**(0.01)
Female	0.52***(0.11)	0.36***(0.11)	-0.22 (0.12)	-0.03 (0.19)	-0.12 (0.17)
Education	-0.05 (0.06)	0.16***(0.05)	0.28***(0.07)	0.15**(0.08)	0.18**(0.07)
Employed	-0.01 (0.07)	-0.00 (0.06)	-0.07 (0.08)	-0.29**(0.11)	0.05 (0.10)
Constant			-1.89***(0.34)	-2.31***(0.54)	-2.84***(0.49)
Cut1	-0.50 (0.32)	0.95 (0.31)			
Cut2	0.42 (0.31)	1.61 (0.32)			
N	540	540	540	529	529
Prob>chi2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pseudo R2	0.06	0.06	0.20	0.20	0.22

**Source: 2000 Religion and Politics Survey. Entries are probit coefficients and robust standard errors. \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\*p < .01**

**Table 4. Influences on White Political Behavior**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Gender Equality</b>	<b>Tolerance of Homosexuals</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Campaign Work and Registration Drives</b>	<b>Money to Candidates or Parties</b>
Religious Conservatism	-0.09 (0.05)	-0.15***(0.05)	-0.01 (0.07)	-0.09 (0.09)	-0.01 (0.07)
Authority of Bible	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.10**(0.05)	-0.19**(0.06)	0.02 (0.08)	0.02 (0.07)
Attendance	0.00 (0.01)	-0.03**(0.01)	0.07**(0.02)	0.04 (0.03)	0.00 (0.02)
Read Bible	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.08*** (0.02)	0.02 (0.03)	0.00 (0.04)	0.01 (0.03)
Catholic	0.01 (0.05)	-0.13**(0.05)	-0.04 (0.07)	0.01 (0.10)	-0.08 (0.07)
Black Protestant	0.95*** (0.34)	-0.08 (0.33)	0.15 (0.43)	0.17 (0.50)	0.28 (0.39)
Evangelical	-0.14**(0.06)	-0.22*** (0.06)	-0.01 (0.07)	0.12 (0.09)	-0.04 (0.08)
Mainline	0.03 (0.06)	-0.09 (0.06)	0.10 (0.09)	-0.08 (0.10)	0.02 (0.08)
Jewish	0.03 (0.13)	0.18 (0.12)	0.33 (0.26)	0.27 (0.19)	0.24 (0.15)
Org. Member	0.07 (0.06)	0.07 (0.06)	0.07 (0.09)	0.58*** (0.08)	0.47*** (0.07)
Democrat	0.19*** (0.05)	0.18*** (0.04)	0.24*** (0.06)	0.18** (0.08)	0.18*** (0.06)
Republican	-0.19*** (0.04)	-0.15*** (0.04)	0.35*** (0.07)	0.11 (0.08)	0.33*** (0.06)
Liberal	0.09*** (0.01)	0.11*** (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.02)
Follow Govt.	0.12*** (0.02)	0.13*** (0.02)	0.33*** (0.03)	0.22*** (0.05)	0.26*** (0.04)
Age	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)	0.03*** (0.00)	0.01** (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)
Female	0.47*** (0.04)	0.40*** (0.04)	0.01 (0.05)	-0.00 (0.06)	-0.24*** (0.05)
Education	0.04** (0.02)	0.13*** (0.02)	0.20*** (0.03)	0.17*** (0.03)	0.16*** (0.02)
Employed	0.05** (0.02)	-0.04 (0.02)	0.16*** (0.03)	0.08 (0.04)	0.06 (0.03)
Constant			-2.31*** (0.16)	-3.41*** (0.26)	-3.10*** (0.20)
Cut1	-0.21 (0.12)	0.58 (0.12)			
Cut2	0.83 (0.12)	1.41 (0.12)			
N	4336	4336	4336	4336	4336
Prob>chi2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pseudo R2	0.05	0.08	0.23	0.10	0.12

**Source: 2000 Religion and Politics Survey. Entries are probit coefficients and robust standard errors. \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\*p < .01**

## **Appendix A: 2000 Religion and Politics Survey-Questions and Response Categories**

*Religious Measures:* Respondents provided their religious views on a scale from 1 (very conservative) to 6 (very liberal). This scheme was utilized for the multivariate models.

For the ANOVA procedure this item was recoded as 1 (to identify the most religiously conservative individuals-categories 1 and 2) and others are labeled 0. Beliefs regarding the authority of the Bible are coded 1 for individuals who believe everything in the book should be taken literally, word for word, and 0 for persons who do not hold this view.

The church attendance measure asks, “Aside from weddings and funerals, how often do you attend religious services?” Answers are coded from 0 (never) to 5 (more than once a week).<sup>15</sup> Individuals are also asked, “How often do you read the Bible in your daily life?” Responses are coded from 0 (never) to 4 (every day). Religious affiliation measures are separate dummy variables for individuals’ reported association with six religious tradition categories that follow (Steensland et al. 2000). Catholic, Black Protestant, Evangelical Protestant, Mainline Protestant, and Jewish are labeled 1. “Other” identifiers are the comparison category and are coded as ones.

*Civic Group Member:* The item asks, “During the past twelve months, have you been a member of an organization or service club that meets regularly and does projects to improve the community.” Yes responses are coded one, No’s are coded zero.

*Dissatisfaction with Society:* Individuals are asked, “How satisfied are you with the way things are going in our society today?” Responses are coded 1(very satisfied) to 4(very dissatisfied).

---

<sup>15</sup> “DK/Refused” cases are coded as zero. The multivariate results are identical when these cases are treated as missing values.

*Political Measures:* Dummy variables are used for Democrats (1 if Democrat) and Republicans (1 if Republican). The comparison category (Independents and others) is coded 0. The RPS does not ask respondents about their degree/strength of partisanship. Reports of political views are measured on a scale from 1 (very conservative) to 6 (very liberal). And participants were asked how often they follow “What's going on in government and public affairs.” Responses are labeled 0 (never) to 4 (most of the time).

*Demographic and Socioeconomic Variables:* Age is coded in years from 18 to 97. Women are coded one, men are coded zero. Married individuals are coded one, others are coded zero. Education level is coded in ordinal categories from 1 (less than high school graduate) to 5 (post-graduate work/degree).<sup>16</sup> Employment status is coded from 0 (not employed) to 2 (employed full-time).

---

<sup>16</sup> “DK/Refused” responses are recoded to the modal education group (high school graduate). The multivariate results are identical when these cases are treated as missing values.

**Appendix B1: Variables and Summary Statistics for African Americans**

---

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Religious Service Attendance	2.968	1.651	0	5
Reading Bible	2.588	1.184	0	4
Religious Group				
Conservatism	.246	.431	0	1
Literal Authority of Bible	.532	.499	0	1
Catholic*	.093	.290	0	1
Black Protestant*	.410	.492	0	1
Evangelical*	.089	.285	0	1
Mainline Protestant*	.062	.242	0	1
Jewish*	0	0	0	0
Reducing Homosexual Intolerance	.774	.851	0	2
Overcoming Gender Discrimination	1.702	.580	0	2
Money to Political Candidate	.116	.320	0	1
Worked for Pol. Campaign	.111	.314	0	1
Voted in 1996 Election	.809	.394	0	1
Democrat	.637	.481	0	1
Republican	.074	.261	0	1
Liberal	3.628	1.590	1	6
Follow Government	2.960	1.116	0	4
Member of Service Organization	.082	.275	0	1
Female	.621	.486	0	1
Age	40.64	14.78	18	87
Education Level	2.798	1.133	1	5
Employment Status	1.384	.862	0	2

N= 570; \*N= 561

---

**Appendix B2: Variables and Summary Statistics for Latinos**

---

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Religious Service Attendance	2.367	1.619	0	5
Reading Bible	1.885	1.142	0	4
Religious Group				
Conservatism	.238	.426	0	1
Literal Authority of Bible	.447	.498	0	1
Catholic*	.626	.484	0	1
Black Protestant*	.015	.121	0	1
Evangelical*	.128	.334	0	1
Mainline Protestant*	.024	.153	0	1
Jewish*	.006	.074	0	1
Reducing Homosexual Intolerance	.782	.849	0	2
Overcoming Gender Discrimination	1.522	.695	0	2
Money to Political Candidate	.095	.293	0	1
Worked for Pol. Campaign	.067	.251	0	1
Voted in 1996 Election	.585	.493	0	1
Democrat	.376	.485	0	1
Republican	.158	.365	0	1
Liberal	3.655	1.689	1	6
Follow Government	2.482	1.337	0	4
Member of Service Organization	.084	.277	0	1
Female	.529	.500	0	1
Age	37.28	14.62	18	93
Education Level	2.495	1.142	1	5
Employment Status	1.355	.864	0	2

N= 550; \*N= 540

---

**Appendix B3: Variables and Summary Statistics for Whites**

---

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Religious Service Attendance	2.372	1.699	0	5
Reading Bible	1.817	1.223	0	4
Religious Group				
Conservatism	.222	.416	0	1
Literal Authority of Bible	.264	.441	0	1
Catholic*	.274	.446	0	1
Black Protestant*	.004	.061	0	1
Evangelical*	.284	.451	0	1
Mainline Protestant*	.164	.370	0	1
Jewish*	.023	.149	0	1
Reducing Homosexual Intolerance	.854	.833	0	2
Overcoming Gender Discrimination	1.442	.707	0	2
Money to Political Candidate	.153	.360	0	1
Worked for Pol. Campaign	.068	.251	0	1
Voted in 1996 Election	.821	.384	0	1
Democrat	.268	.443	0	1
Republican	.302	.459	0	1
Liberal	3.374	1.492	1	6
Follow Government	3.143	.991	0	4
Member of Service Organization	.106	.308	0	1
Female	.548	.498	0	1
Age	46.362	17.891	18	97
Education Level	3.118	1.158	1	5
Employment Status	1.290	.898	0	2

N= 4477; \*N= 4336

---

### **Appendix C. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Religious Items**

---

	SS	DF	MS
<u>Religious Conservatism</u>			
Between Groups	.316	2	.158
Within Groups	894.944	5133	.174
<u>Literal Authority of Bible</u>			
Between Groups	51.375	2	25.688
Within Groups	1020.003	5133	.199
<u>Religious Service Attendance</u>			
Between Groups	192.412	2	96.206
Within Groups	14688.681	5133	2.862
<u>Reading the Bible</u>			
Between Groups	307.645	2	153.823
Within Groups	7601.707	5133	1.481

---

SS= sum of squares; DF= degrees of freedoms; MS= mean square

Summary of scores and measures for each group are available from the authors upon request.