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This paper investigates the relationship between church attendance amongst different religions and voting behavior in the 2000 presidential election. Several socio-demographic variables are controlled in this analysis, which used data from the 2000 National Election Study.

INTRODUCTION

For over two hundred years, religion has played a significant role in the functioning of American democracy. In 1835, Tocqueville stated, “Religion in America…must be regarded as the foremost of the political institutions of the country.” Religion is an important social institution that conveys fundamental truths and values to its members. Institutions, especially those advocating value systems, define what is socially acceptable. Thus, religion often forms the basis of an individual’s belief system. These beliefs and values are not solely present within the private individual but remain with the public citizen as well. President Eisenhower once said, “Our government makes no sense unless it is founded on a deeply felt religious belief.” Hence, religion tends to have a direct or indirect effect on government affairs.

Religion has been a part of American culture for a long time. During the course of this relationship, however, religious values have often conflicted with cultural practices. These social or cultural battles have always made their way into the political circle. Yet, religiously based conflict has appeared to dramatically increase in the last decade or so to the surprise of many observers of American politics (Wald 1987). Recent political and religious issues such as gay marriage, the constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance, faith-based initiatives, school voucher programs, abortion, and cloning illustrate this contentious environment. “Our political and social quarrels now partake of the savagery of religious wars because, at bottom, they are religious wars” (Buchanan 1988).

At the heart of the issue here are voters. Religious voters represent an overwhelming amount of support and constitute one of the largest voting blocs in American politics. After all, almost ninety percent of Americans believe in a Supreme Being or God. Both parties campaign tirelessly for these votes, and in every election, they form strategies to court these voters. Due to recent political developments such as those mentioned above, the support of religious voters can hand a candidate a victory on election night. After the historic 2000 presidential election, Karl Rove, President Bush’s chief political advisor, remarked, “Just over 4 million [religious conservatives] failed to turn out and vote. And yet they are obviously part of our base,” he said. At least in his view, religious voters made the election as close as it was.
The Republican and Democratic parties take somewhat different approaches when it comes to matters relating to religion. Religious voters still support both parties in significant ways but many have noted a trend. In recent years, it seems as though the Republican Party aligns itself with religious causes while, comparatively speaking, the Democrats take more secular positions. These new alliances should be taken in the historical context of religious voters of all denominations.

In the last decade or so, the distribution of white Catholic votes have been split down the middle – neither favoring one political party over another. Historian William B. Prendergast (1999) traced the Catholic desertion from the Democratic Party since the election of President Kennedy in 1960. During the same time period last decade, white Evangelical Protestants and Mormons voted for the Republican presidential candidate three-fourths of the time while black Protestant and Jews voted for the Democratic candidate at least eighty percent of the time. Consequently, this paper will focus on how religion affects voting behavior.

If it is true that the Republican Party tends to take positions which welcome religion, then one would expect to see strong support for Republican candidates among religious voters. Gary Bauer, a former domestic policy advisor to President Reagan acknowledged, "At this point, I don't even think of evangelicals or Christian conservatives as being a segment of the Republican Party. They are the Republican Party." Recent polls performed by the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life suggest that thirty-seven percent of all Republicans are white evangelicals. The nonpartisan group's data also found that religious voters who attend church frequently tend to vote for Republicans by a 2-1 margin also. Herein, lies the focal point of this paper.

This thesis will study the effect church attendance has on voting preferences between the two major electoral coalitions in the 2000 United States presidential election. This information will help the reader determine whether voters who have high levels of religiosity or commitment vote differently in relation to how frequent they attend religious services. The paper focuses not only on the effect church attendance has on voting behavior but also how this effect changes when other political variables are controlled.

Over the years, extensive literature has been written regarding the voting behavior of religious groups. Despite this, modern-day scholars remain divided over one clear explanation as to why religious groups vote the way they do. Conflicting research has been performed on the effect church attendance has on religious group voting behavior. Furthermore, many political scientists wonder whether Catholics have shifted their support to the Republican cause. The purpose of the paper is to shed light on this topic by studying voting behavior as a function of attending church services within the three most prevalent religious groups in the United States, namely, Roman Catholics, Evangelical Protestants, and Mainline Protestants.

**Review of the Literature**

The following pieces of literature present the reader with an overview of the contributions made to the study of religion and politics. The progression of scholarship that has been performed on religious commitment as it relates to voting behavior begins
with religion affiliation and foundational beliefs. It then proceeds to correlate religious commitment to political and voting behavior. Finally, it concludes with arguments that church attendance is linked to voting for Republican candidates.

In recent years, religion has entered the spotlight in social sciences as an important variable in the study of political attitudes and behavior (Jelen 1998). Some literature suggests that religious services have an influence on an individual’s political self. In 2003, Brewer, Kersh, and Petersen, concluded that political references and messages are often expressed during religious services. Perhaps more importantly, religion usually advocates an active, participatory role in social life. In fact, some scholars argue that parishioners are more likely to view political activity as intertwined to or as an extension of religious activity (Djupe and Grant 2001). The development of civic skills, which give followers a greater ability to partake in politics, is embedded within church teaching.

Fundamental to the interaction between religion and politics is group membership. In practice, “the socialization experiences of group members... may lead to the growth of orientations considered favorable to democratic practices.”1 Beyerlein and Chaves (2003), for example, emphasize that religious congregations are engaged in politics at substantial levels. This political participation is also positively correlated to membership in church associations (Jones-Correa and Leal 2001). Group identification has always been a strong determinant of how people think and act. Political behavior and religious identity is no exception to the rule. It also would be exceedingly difficult for those who do not attend church to experience group interaction, cohesiveness, and shared interests (Kellstedt 1986).

Religion has shown great potential to shape American politics throughout history. Churches have formed the bedrock of unprecedented social and political movements including temperance, civil rights, and the Christian conservative movement (Djupe and Grant 2001; Putnam 2000). The success and efficacy of these movements underscores the remarkable capacity religion has to mobilize a particular group of people to support a given cause. In 1999, Williams asserted that churches can provide movements with “members, money, leadership, communication networks, and local organization.” Surely, one need only to attend the annual March for Life rally in Washington, D.C. to witness the capabilities of religious organizations. The fact that African-American church members have high participation rates in politics despite having a limited amount of socioeconomic resources highlights this point further (Verba 1995).

The political behavior of church members varies, however, according to which religious institution they are affiliated with. For example, Protestants are more likely than Catholics to receive civic training via their churches (Verba 1995). Some religions are closely tied to ethnicity and culture such as Roman Catholics and African Methodists. Beginning in the late nineteenth century and continuing on into the twentieth century, Catholics immigrated into Protestant America. This background and identity naturally made Catholics more eager to embrace social positions that were accommodating to immigrants and Catholics. Since these groups were mostly comprised of manual laborers and were isolated from society because of language and cultural barriers, many Catholics joined labor unions for political and economic representation. On the other hand, Baptists and Methodists who were mostly African American largely supported racial
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equality due to the civil rights movement. It goes without saying that religions themselves also influence political behavior. Thus, there are many reasons why a given religion might not advocate the same political or social preferences as another. Qualitative differences in political activity and voting behavior do exist between various religions.

There are three recognized religious differences that inspire political alignments: denominational traditions; within denominations, such as ideological disagreements between theologically orthodox and unorthodox factions; and between believers and non-believers (Wuthnow 1988; Guth and Green 1990). Denominational membership not only has a substantial effect on religious beliefs, but it also contributes to the expression of those beliefs in politics (Layman 1997). Layman asserts that differences among certain denominations may be growing "more politically important over time, while others [are] becoming less important." In other words, the political effect of denominational differences may be growing within Protestantism. In contrast to Mainline Protestants, Evangelical Protestant denominational members may be becoming more Republican. This schism, although not exclusively a denominational phenomenon, amongst Protestants denominations has received a great deal of attention (Reichley 1985).

Leege and Welch (1989) measured the effect different variables had on the political attitudes and ideologies of Catholics in the United States. These variables included political generation, regionalism (political culture), gender, and foundational beliefs. Data were gathered from 2,667 registered Catholic parishioners in 1983-1984. According to Leege and Welch, the distinct difference in foundational beliefs among Catholics leads to foreseeable differences in political ideology. The authors' findings suggest that theories of partisanship among Catholic are better predicted by measuring the foundational religious beliefs of parishioners. The results suggest that the religious roots of political orientations are real and should be addressed.

Thus far, the discussion has only mentioned religion's effect on political behavior. More central to this thesis is the relationship that religion has on vote choice. Recent scholarship by Geoffrey Layman (1997) has suggested that even when controlling for a wide range of variables, the influence of doctrinal orthodoxy on partisanship and vote choice is growing over time. This author recognizes that the relationship between orthodoxy and time is positive and statistically significant indicating that deeply committed, religious individuals are increasingly more likely than their less religious counterparts to vote for the Republican candidate in an election. According to Layman, the correlation between religious orthodoxy and voting for the Republican Party can be observed since 1980. This author also analyzed the effect Catholicism had on party identification in the presidential elections between 1980 and 1994. He concluded that the traditional Catholic support for the Democratic Party weakened as Catholics became more inclined than Mainline Protestants to vote for Republican presidential candidates.

Some have questioned whether religious identification or affiliation is by itself sufficient to have a true causal impact on political behavior. Recent data specify the importance of including religious commitment as a variable to test the sincerity of self-reported affiliations stated by survey respondents. As James Penning surmised, "There is a good deal of evidence that political differences among members of religious groups tend to be greatest among those who are most involved in their respective groups" (Knoke 1974; Wald 1987). Identifying with, or belonging to, a particular religion is one
thing, but being an actual follower of that religion is a completely different matter. In short, the relationship between religion and politics is defined more and more by religiosity rather than particular religious traditions (Guth and Green 1990).

Political scientists have recently included various forms of religious commitment measures to differentiate between committed and uncommitted members. Several studies testify to “the extraordinary power of just one measure of religious participation: frequency of religious service attendance” (Ladd 1997). Thus, church attendance is generally accepted as an indicator of a person’s religiosity or commitment. It is also a way in which the aforementioned commitment issue can be addressed. Furthermore, church attendance gives researchers insight into how committed a person is to the institutional aspect of religion rather than just the ideology or worldview. This is not to say that the two are completely, mutually exclusive.

Petrocik (1987) was one of the first scholars to underscore the importance church attendance has on voter demographics. Harris (1994) showed that church attendance has psychological mobilization effects which are directly and positively linked to voting. The political and religious beliefs of frequent church attenders differ from infrequent attenders, which ultimately affect political behavior. Lately, it seems as though the frequency of church attendance sharply divides the electorate in ways similar to other independent variables such as race and political ideology.

Notably, the methodologies in collecting church attendance figures vary in their accuracy. This paper will use data collected from survey data, which has serious limitations when it comes to measuring behavior accurately. Hadaway (1993) presented evidence that church attendance statistics based on self-reported surveys substantially overstate actual attendance rates in the United States. One reason for this overstatement is that attending church is seen as socially desirable – it makes people look good. It is also possible that non-attenders are underrepresented in these surveys. It remains to be seen whether all self-reported surveys misrepresent actual church attendance as Hadaway found in his study. Nevertheless, surveys can still provide key information about the relationship between reported attendance and reported voting.

Henry Kenski (1995) uses church attendance as a means to study the effect it had on a sample of religious voters in the 1992 presidential election. In a sample of 15,490 Catholic, Protestant, and evangelical (born again) voters, this author finds that all three broad religious groups, non-white and weak church attenders are the voter demographics that favor the Democratic Party. Kenski observes a pattern for voters overall and for all three religious groups: for presidential voting, all non-white and non-weekly church attenders vote Democratic, while whites and weekly church attenders vote Republican. The data sample recognizes that Catholics voted for Democrats in all categories; however the author gave “special attention” to this religious group because the lowest margins of Democratic support were for whites and non-weekly church attenders. According to this research, it is unclear whether or not the results point toward a realignment of Republican support concentrated on weekly church attenders in general.

The literature discussed in this section should be seen in the context of recent controversies between religion and politics. Wald (1987) outlined three explanations for why the contemporary culture is fraught with religio-political conflict. The presence of a new political agenda, new methods of political organization, and demographic changes all have contributed to this hostile environment according to Wald. A new set of intense
disputes in the political agenda arising from secularization has served as one possible explanation (Guth and Green 1990). Technology has given way to new methods of organizing and mobilizing religious activists and organizations. The internet and television have made it easier for groups like the Christian Coalition to contact members. Finally, the recent upward mobility of blue-collar workers has reinforced the traditional upper class while modernization has inspired liberal activists whose world views and lifestyles directly threaten traditional values.

HYPOTHESES

Table 1, which displays the percentage of votes in the 2000 presidential election in relation to different levels of church attendance, lays the foundation for the first hypothesis. This table clearly shows a shift in voting behavior as church attendance levels increase. Most of Al Gore’s votes came from voters who minimally, if at all, attended religious services, while George W. Bush’s backing came from more frequent attenders. The division starts for those individuals who attend church almost every week.

**TABLE 1**

**PERCENTAGE OF VOTES IN THE 2000 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN RELATION TO DIFFERENT LEVELS OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>A FEW TIMES A YEAR</th>
<th>ONCE OR TWICE A MONTH</th>
<th>ALMOST EVERY WEEK</th>
<th>EVERY WEEK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GORE</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American National Election Study, 2000

**Notes:** N = 1,112 for the entire sample. 584 people voted for Gore whereas 528 voted for Bush.

The first hypothesis is based on prior scholarship and the results shown in the above table. If it is true that groups are stimulated under hostile settings, and the United States was in such a setting during the time of the 2000 presidential election, then evidence should exist to show how committed members responded to this environment. Essentially, this paper accepts vote choice as an appropriate gauge for how these religious voters reacted. The paper assumes that Wald is correct in identifying recent religious-political conflicts and that those religious groups are affected by these conflicts in ways similar to secular organizations.
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This may be viewed as a sweeping claim considering the numerous factors that influence voting behavior. Yet, those individuals who display a high degree of commitment in terms of church attendance to any religious institution should be more likely to vote for Republican candidates in light of the threats faced by religious organizations in the culture war. This argument also relies heavily on the viewpoint that the Republican Party takes policy positions which are more favorable to the interests of religious institutions.

**Hypothesis #1**: High levels of church attendance should have a significant positive effect on voting for a Republican presidential candidate when church attendance is used by itself as an explanatory variable.

If the first hypothesis is confirmed, then the analysis proceeds to the second hypothesis. Tables 2 and 3 lay the foundation for the basis of this paper's second hypothesis. Table 2 shows the breakdown of church attendance amongst the three main religious groups studied in this paper. It reveals a high similarity of church attendance levels in each of the three religions. The only notable differences are that Evangelical Protestants seem to attend church every week more often than the other two religions. Catholics are slightly more likely to never attend church services than the Protestant sects. Table 3 shows the breakdown of votes in the 2000 presidential election with respect to the three religious groups. Striking similarities exist among these groups. Catholics, Mainline Protestants, and Evangelical Protestants all split their votes between the two presidential candidates.

**Table 2**

**Breakdown of Church Attendance Levels Amongst Catholics, Evangelical Protestants, and Mainline Protestants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Church Attendance</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>A Few Times A Year</th>
<th>Once or Twice A Month</th>
<th>Almost Every Week</th>
<th>Every Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catholics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evangelical Protestants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainline Protestants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American National Election Study, 2000

**Notes**: N = 1,299 for the entire sample. 459 Catholics, 489 Evangelicals, and 351 Mainline Protestants were sampled. See Appendix for categorization of Protestants.
### Table 3
**Breakdown of Votes in the 2000 Presidential Election With Respect to Religion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGIONS</th>
<th>CATHOLICS (N)</th>
<th>EVANGELICAL PROTESTANTS (N)</th>
<th>MAINLINE PROTESTANTS (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CANDIDATE</strong></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORE</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>319</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American National Election Study, 2000

**Notes:** N = 855 for the entire sample of those who voted. See Appendix for categorization of Protestants.

The theory in the second hypothesis is that devout Catholics, Evangelicals, and Mainline Protestants are more inclined to vote for a Republican presidential candidate than for the Democratic alternative when high levels of church attendance interacts with their religious affiliation. Since Table 2 and 3 show remarkable similarities amongst the three religious groups, it does not appear as though these religious preferences will hinder the effect of church attendance on voting behavior. Furthermore, the claim is that higher church attendance produces a higher probability that members of the three religious groups will vote Republican regardless of other demographic variables such as ethnicity, geographic location, or income and education. The study might also explain why the Catholic electorate has a divided vote distribution between political parties if there is evidence that church attendance results in voting for a particular party.

**Hypothesis #2:** The interaction between high levels of church attendance and religious group affiliation should have a significant positive effect on voting for a Republican presidential candidate.

Henry Kenski made the connection between church attendance and voting Republican. This is the extent to which prior work contributes to the idea that higher church attendance produces a higher probability that religious members will vote Republican regardless of other demographic variables such as ethnicity, geographic location, or income and education. Kenski's conclusions do not provide us with a sufficient understanding of the hypotheses since his conclusions regarding voters are weak. They represent only a small sampling of voters, confine their data reference to only one election, and they fail to analyze church attendance narrowly in relation to different demographic variables. In a sense, the thesis argument presented in this paper begins where Kenski's argument leaves off and will attempt to validate the hypotheses through an extensive, detailed analysis of the issues he fails to address.
DATA AND METHODS

To examine the relationship between church attendance and presidential vote choice, survey data from the 2000 National Election Study (NES) is used. The NES was selected because it is a reliable political science survey, which includes data that is appropriate for the purposes of the paper. This survey represents a nationally representative sample of voters and it provides valuable background information on the respondents who voted in the 2000 presidential election. Measures of religious affiliation and religiosity are detailed as well as other highly relevant demographic information. Compared to other surveys such as Gallup polls and election day exit polls, the NES has less over-sampling and over-reporting of data regarding religious activity.

Logistic regression models were run to determine the effect certain variables and interactions have on vote choice. This paper concentrates not only on the effects of these religious variables on vote choice but also with their outcomes when other political variables are controlled. Thus, the analysis includes a set of control variables detailed below.

Dependent Variable

The primary purpose of this paper is to ascertain how voting behavior changes with or without the presence of certain variables. The dichotomous dependent variable defined in this paper will be which candidate, George W. Bush or Albert Gore, the respondent voted for. The voters who selected Al Gore were coded as 0, while those who said they voted for George W. Bush were coded as 1.

Independent Variables

As mentioned previously, it is expected that different religious denominations and church attendance rates should have different influences on voting behavior. Church attendance was the primary independent variable used in the logit models. Five different levels of church attendance were coded consisting of voters who never attend (0), attend a few times a year (1), attend once or twice a month (2), attend almost every week (3), and those who attend religious services every week or more (4).

The second independent variable was religious tradition. Three religious traditions were distinguished based on previous literature: Catholic, Mainline Protestant, and Evangelical Protestant. Black Protestants and Jews were excluded due to the low amount of observations in the data.

Interaction Terms

In order to provide the reader with an accurate estimation of the true relationship between voting behavior and church attendance, the second model will test whether an interaction exists between religion and church attendance. Interaction terms in models will help explain more of the variation in voting behavior. Furthermore, the inclusion of interactions is a “low risk strategy” (Friedrich 1982) and can prevent omitted variable bias errors. The interaction terms used in the second model are intchcat, intchevangel,
and intchmainline which stand for the interaction between the particular religion and church attendance.

*Control Variables*

Since it is likely that vote choice reflects the political preferences and ideologies of various kinds of voters, it is crucial to control for variables known to affect political behaviors among individuals. Researchers have long reported that voting behavior is related to individual and demographic characteristics such as age, gender, race, education, income, and party affiliation. Therefore, these five factors are included in the equations as control variables. The coding for these variables are: age (in years), gender (female = 1 and male = 0), race (black, Hispanic, or white), education (in years), income (in dollars), and party affiliation (Republican, Democrat, and Independent). A more detailed listing of the coding can be found in the appendix of this paper.

**RESULTS**

Table 4a addresses the first hypothesis and shows the results from the logit model explaining the voting behavior of churchgoers. Perhaps the most anticipated finding in the first model was the relationship that party identification had with voting behavior. Being a Republican or an Independent as opposed to being a Democrat had a considerable effect on voting for George W. Bush. Logically, Democrats were significantly and negatively correlated with voting for the Republican.

As the general voting behavior literature would also predict, the race variables in this regression were highly significant statistically. Relative to blacks, whites and Hispanics were positively associated with voting for the Republican candidate, while blacks showed a significantly positive relationship with voting Democratic. Even though the Hispanic variable produced a higher coefficient than it did for whites, the standard of error was much greater for Hispanics. The remaining control variables illustrated typical relationships for socio-demographic variables. Education was negatively linked to the Republican vote. Hardly any relationship was found with the age and gender variables. Furthermore, income had an insignificant positive link with Republican voting.

The religious denominational variables in Table 4a had noteworthy effects on the respondents’ vote choice. Out of the three religious groups, Mainline Protestants, Evangelical Protestants, and Catholics all had statistically significant yet different outcomes. Compared to one another, Mainline Protestants and Catholics revealed a negative relationship with Republican vote choice, while Evangelicals tended to vote heavily for Bush. With relation to Protestants, Catholics were not as likely as Mainline Protestants to vote for the Democratic candidate. However, they were far from the Bush-backing Evangelical Protestants.

With respect to the first hypothesis, the results pertaining to the church attendance variable were most important. Frequent church attendance was both significant and positive according to Table 4a. George W. Bush gained a sizable amount of support from those voters who attended religious services frequently. Table 4b used
### Table 4A

**LOGISTIC REGRESSIONS OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE EFFECTS ON VOTING BEHAVIOR IN THE 2000 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote2000</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Attendance</td>
<td>0.1856*</td>
<td>0.0906</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>-0.6466*</td>
<td>0.3418</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Protestant</td>
<td>-0.7713*</td>
<td>0.3811</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL VARIABLES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.0021</td>
<td>0.0080</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.0105</td>
<td>0.2744</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.4499**</td>
<td>0.6871</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.5844**</td>
<td>0.9165</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.0160</td>
<td>0.0391</td>
<td>0.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.0837</td>
<td>0.0613</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>5.6049**</td>
<td>0.4319</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2.6633**</td>
<td>0.3198</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-3.6738**</td>
<td>1.1118</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American National Election Study, 2000

Notes: All regressions performed in this paper compare the following: Catholics and Mainline Protestants to Evangelical Protestants, whites and Hispanics to Blacks, and Republicans and Independents to Democrats. Dependent variable is presidential vote choice coded 1 for Bush, 0 for Gore. N = 628 for the entire sample of those who voted. The coefficients and standard errors were truncated to the fourth decimal place and the p-values were rounded to the third decimal place.

* Significant at p < .05 level  
** Significant at p < .01 level

the same variables in Table 4a but conditions them for those respondents who were younger than 51 years old. Under these circumstances, the church attendance effect on voting behavior grew in importance and noticeably increased positively. In Table 4b, party affiliation was still a strong indicator for vote choice in this case. Those voters who identified themselves as Republicans or Independents were significantly and positively associated with the Republican choice even though it was to a lesser degree. The education, race, and religious group variables hardly changed from the first model. Although the coefficient did not reach a significance level, age became more of a factor for choosing Gore instead of Bush. In contrast, income became more positive.
### Table 4b
**Logistic Regressions of Church Attendance Effects on Voting Behavior in the 2000 Presidential Election When Age < 51**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote2000</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Attendance</td>
<td>0.4364**</td>
<td>0.1452</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>-0.9245*</td>
<td>0.5006</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Protestant</td>
<td>-1.2486*</td>
<td>0.5469</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL VARIABLES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.0324</td>
<td>0.0230</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.2875</td>
<td>0.3904</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.8327**</td>
<td>0.7568</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.3918*</td>
<td>1.0481</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.0828</td>
<td>0.0585</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.1578</td>
<td>0.1047</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>5.4278**</td>
<td>0.6017</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2.1992**</td>
<td>0.4272</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.0623</td>
<td>1.6373</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American National Election Study, 2000

**Notes:** All regressions performed in this paper compare the following: Catholics and Mainline Protestants to Evangelical Protestants, whites and Hispanics to Blacks, and Republicans and Independents to Democrats. Dependent variable is presidential vote choice coded 1 for Bush, 0 for Gore. N = 334 for the entire sample of those who voted. The coefficients and standard errors were truncated to the fourth decimal place and the p-values were rounded to the third decimal place.

* Significant at p < .05 level
** Significant at p < .01 level

among younger American voters.

The second hypothesis is tested in Table 5, which lists the results from the logit model explaining voting behavior when certain independent variables interact with each other. In this model, church attendance and the three religious groups interact in order to better understand the conclusions based on Table 4a. Compared to Table 4a, all eight control variables maintained practically the same p-values and exactly the same coefficient signs. The mainline protestant variable remained unchanged as well. There were several key changes however. The church attendance and catholic variables each lost their statistical significance.
### Table 5
**Logistic Regressions of Interaction Effects on Voting Behavior in the 2000 Presidential Election**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote2000</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Attendance</td>
<td>0.0983</td>
<td>0.1674</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>-0.6222</td>
<td>0.5931</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Protestant</td>
<td>-1.5488*</td>
<td>0.6825</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Terms:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Att. x Catholic</td>
<td>-0.0095</td>
<td>0.2130</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Att. x Mainline</td>
<td>0.3298</td>
<td>0.2405</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.0017</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.0148</td>
<td>0.2754</td>
<td>0.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.4189**</td>
<td>0.6893</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.4470**</td>
<td>0.9223</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.0184</td>
<td>0.0392</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.0845</td>
<td>0.0618</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>5.6539**</td>
<td>0.4376</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2.6227**</td>
<td>0.3194</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-3.4487**</td>
<td>1.1916</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American National Election Study, 2000

**Notes:** All regressions performed in this paper compare the following: Catholics and Mainline Protestants to Evangelical Protestants, Whites and Hispanics to Blacks, and Republicans and Independents to Democrats. Dependent variable is presidential vote choice coded 1 for Bush, 0 for Gore. N = 628 for the entire sample of those who voted. The coefficients and standard errors were truncated to the fourth decimal place and the p-values were rounded to the third decimal place.

* Significant at p < .05 level.
** Significant at p < .01 level

Until the recent work of Gary King, Jason Wittenberg, and Michael Tomz (2000), political scientists were limited to the above models for their depiction of relationships between explanatory and binary dependent variables. Their software estimates uncertainty and precise quantities of interest through simulations. The author of this
paper used this method to better understand the results in Table 5. The estimations computed by their software can be found in this paper’s appendix. The graphs in Figures 1, 2, and 3 illustrate the generated probabilities for voting Republican amongst the interaction between three religious groups and increasing levels of church attendance frequency. Since party affiliation was very significant in the previous regressions, the following three graphs classify the results for Republicans, Independents, and Democrats. The results for all three religious groups are highly informative.

Figure 1 shows how the interaction affected Catholic voting behavior in the 2000 presidential election. The church attendance interaction for Catholics was equivalent for those who identified as Republicans and Democrats. For Republican voters, the probability of voting for Bush increased 1 percent for Catholics who attend Mass every week compared to those who do not attend at all. Likewise, the probability grew to 3 percent for Catholic Democrats. Independents produced the highest change in voting behavior, reaching 8 percent.

**Figure 1**

![Graph showing the probability of voting Republican given the interaction between Catholics and church attendance.](image)

Note: Vertical bars represent the mean standard of errors. 1000 simulations were run.
Figure 2 displays voting behavior as a function of the interaction between Evangelical Protestants and church attendance. This interaction mirrored the results in Figure 1 in that they both had nearly the same probabilities with respect to the three different electoral coalition affiliations. Figures 1 and 2 depict slopes and relationships that resemble each other.

**Figure 2**

Probability of Voting Republican Given the Interaction Between Evangelical Protestants and Church Attendance

![Graph showing the probability of voting Republican given the interaction between Evangelical Protestants and church attendance.](image)

Note: Vertical bars represent the mean standard of errors. 1000 simulations were run.

The interaction between church attendance and religion remains to have a positive effect on voting for Bush when applied to Mainline Protestants. However, there is one difference that is evident. As the frequency of church attendance increases, the probability of voting Republican also increases but at a much greater rate for Mainline Protestants than for Catholics or Evangelical Protestants. The results illustrated in Figure 3 demonstrate the near significant impact that the interaction term had on voting behavior. The voting probability was 0.10 for Democrats and Republicans whereas it was
only 0.01 for their two religious counterparts. The most compelling outcome was for Mainline Protestants who identified themselves as Independents. These voters who never attended religious services had a 0.26 probability of voting for Bush. Once again, as the frequency of church attendance grew higher, so did the voting probability. For weekly church attenders, the figure reached 0.64 making the difference between the two commitments levels 0.38 or 38 percent.

**DISCUSSION**

**Explanations**

On the whole, the results reported in this thesis provide compelling evidence to support the premise that church attendance has a significant influence on voting for a Republican presidential candidate. The first hypothesis was confirmed by Table 4a and
4b. Frequent church attendance was found to be both significant and positive when used as an independent variable especially for voters younger than fifty-one. At the very least, church attendance matched the impact that religious groups have on vote choice. Thus, the significance of church attendance as an explanatory variable is an important determinant of voting behavior. But why do high levels of church attendance correlate to voting Republican?

David Truman (1971) posited that policy environments affect the way in which groups operate in the political arena. He theorized that when interest groups are in hostile environments, threats toward the goals of the group should stimulate growth and responsiveness within the membership. The fundamental notion behind this claim is that members will cooperate and mobilize to prevent the disappearance of the group's goals when a perceived environment threatens to do so. The basic argument relies on the premise that people change their risk attitudes when a threat becomes too great. "When the potential costs for inaction increase in the face of such large potential risks... people become risk seeking" (Cigler and Loomis 2002). In other words, group consciousness and solidarity are raised within the group. This scenario also has the effect of motivating free riders to take more active roles in the group's operations for the sake of the collective interests. Many argue that these factors triggered the mobilizing successes of the National Rifle Association in the 1990s.

As discussed in the introduction to this paper, some social scientists and commentators have identified a "culture war" being fought in this country over the last several years. James Davison Hunter is one such sociologist who vividly depicted culture wars polarizing religious communities because of social issues such as abortion and gay rights as well as the Monica Lewinsky affair. The salience of these conditions and the presence of religio-political conflict, both of which existed before the 2000 election, explain the findings in this paper.

Since membership in religious groups is differentiated from membership in secular organizations, Truman's theory needs modification. The main difference between the two is that religious institutions are more hampered by free-riding members. In other words, there is a profusion of members who claim religious affiliation but are not involved or committed to their religion nor do they practice, believe, or adhere to the tenets of their faith. Such members impede collective action and mobilization for the entire religious group. Thus, the application of Truman's claim must be at the exclusion of these members.

The members who are most likely involved and committed to their religious institutions are those members who attend religious services. Some scholars (Mockabee, Monson, and Grant 2001) use prayer and bible reading as an alternate measure of religious commitment. However, private, spiritual acts such as these were omitted in this thesis because they do not appraise an individual's commitment to their religion as a group organization. Instead, members who attend religious services show a commitment to their religious institution by reinforcing shared values through group interaction and heeding the messages of the group's leaders. Frequent church attenders naturally make up the overwhelming majority of active participants within religious institutions as they are ones there when the group meets.

Therefore, with regard to the "culture wars," religious institutions are mainly defended by those who regularly attend church services. They will counter the perceived
threats because it is easier for them to mobilize support and respond effectively. Also, they are more inclined to do so because they have the most at stake, for the institution that serves as the basis of their belief system is in danger. Their response exhibits itself in voting preferences whereby frequent church attenders will favor the political party or candidate most conducive to their interests. Heretofore, the assertion was made that the Republican Party has taken positions favorable to the interests of religious institutions. To summarize, the confirmation of the first hypothesis gives credence to this paper’s argument that frequent church attenders defended their institutions by voting for Bush.

The second hypothesis is verified in that it suggests that the effect of church attendance on vote choice varies among denomination and party identification. Although the hypothesis was not fully confirmed by Table 5, Figures 1, 2, and 3 emphasize the importance of the interaction between church attendance and religion. For Catholics and Evangelical Protestants, the term had the least effect on Republicans and Democrats. This is most likely the case because these Republicans and Democrats were already set in their voting preferences and so church attendance did not sway their vote. The church attendance interaction did affect Independents, however, who had a 0.08 probability of voting Republican. Independents tend to be more undecided thus allowing numerous factors to influence their vote.

If the Catholic vote is split between the two parties but Evangelicals tend to vote for Republicans, why did the interaction term net practically the same results? Church attendance might not have a significant effect on Evangelicals because they already lean Republican. It is also conceivable that church attendance does not strengthen religious commitment. In other words, Evangelicals may be more religious and church attendance does not change their religiosity. Indeed, a 2001 poll conducted by the Pew Research Center, found that nine-in-ten Evangelicals viewed religion as very important compared to a slight majority of Catholics and Mainline Protestants who agreed. In view of the fact that Evangelical Protestants attend church more often than other Christians, Lege and Kellstedt (2001) hypothesized that voting behavior might be influenced with evangelical tradition rather than church attendance.

The interaction between Catholics and church attendance could have been offset or reduced by other factors. Even though Catholics are not as Democratic as they once were, they still vote Democratic as much as they do Republican. Coincidentally, the Catholic church attendance interaction had the smallest effect in the entire model for Democrats. Rational choice theory might explain why frequent church attendance does not lead to a significant positive relationship. This theory asserts that one can be a “good” Catholic who goes to Mass every week but chooses to disagree with certain Church teachings. These attitudes and behaviors would seriously diminish a person’s actual commitment to the Catholic Church. Thus, when new political issues jeopardize the interests of the Catholic Church, these Catholics will most likely be more tolerant and refuse to actively counter such challenges. Consequently, group cohesiveness and resolve is severely impaired and fractionalized.

The second hypothesis was nearly verified when church attendance interacted with Mainline Protestants. The relationship was all but significant. Figure 3 displayed a powerful correlation between the probability of voting for Bush and high levels of

---

church attendance for Mainline Protestants. Republicans and Democrats each had a 10% voting probability as church attendance moved from never to weekly. This information suggests that church attendance substantially shifted vote choice to the Republican candidate even for partisan voters. Yet, the most unprecedented finding was for Independents. As church attendance went from never to once a week, the probability increased 38 percentage points to 65 percent. In other words, two-in-three Mainline Protestants who were Independents voted for Bush if they attended church every week.

These findings coincide with demographic and political shifts amongst Mainline Protestants. In 1960, Mainline Protestants represented 41.7 of the U.S. population according to the National Election Study. It then sharply declined to 24.1 percent in 1990 and has lowered church attendance rates. Kellstedt and Noll (1990) have demonstrated that Mainline Protestants have become less solidly Republican. This exodus from the pews and the decline in church membership among Mainline Protestants has apparently increased the importance of church attendance as a source for Republican voting. As long as membership declines, fewer Mainline Protestants will vote Republican.

Alternate Explanations and Limitations

There are several other explanations that might explain the positive relationship that church attendance has with voting Republican. Frequent church attenders might have a propensity to be more traditionalist and therefore have conservative tendencies which sympathize with the Republican ideology. Committed members may be more traditional for the simple reason that they partake in their religion's traditions and rituals and that they hold traditional beliefs in line with their religion such as the protection of the sacred institution of marriage, for example.

Another possible explanation is that there was some influence from issue-based political attitudes. This paper did not account for the policy preferences of the respondents in its analysis of their behavior. It is possible that certain preferences influenced the voting behavior of the respondents. For instance, a Catholic who solely votes according to abortion issues might vote for a Republican candidate because the candidate prides himself or herself as pro-life. These policy preferences might be reinforced to the voter if he or she attends church often. Literature has already been cited in this thesis that attests to this occurrence. Additionally, it could be that certain political beliefs or ideologies encourage high levels of church attendance.

The inclusion of attitudinal variables that measure a respondent's view of moral traditionalism may be particularly useful when analyzing Catholics. Such variables can help control for the rational choice Catholics who dilute the possible effect church attendance has on voting. In fact, a variable that involved those who oppose moral relativism was originally included in this analysis but had to be eliminated due to the low number of observations. At first, opposition to moral relativism had a negative relationship to the Republican vote, but when the variable interacted with church attendance, the coefficient switched signs and had a p-value of 0.07. The author of this paper contended that this occurred because the variable filtered out rational choice Catholics. Thus, future research dealing with larger samples should test this theory.
It would have also been interesting to compare seculars to the members of the three major religious groups. Unfortunately, the logistical regressions in this study limited the analysis to three religion variables and prevented the addition of a fourth variable. Nonetheless, if seculars were integrated into the analysis, the author of this thesis would expect to find seculars favoring Al Gore instead of George W. Bush. This would be consistent with the secularization developments in contemporary culture.

The findings of this paper were based solely on data from the 2000 presidential election, but the effect of church attendance on vote choice seems likely to continue into the next election. Future research should test whether these findings hold up over time. It would be useful to identify when frequent church attenders started voting for Republicans because it could help determine when the "culture wars" sparked a response from religiously committed members. A thorough investigation over time would also indicate whether this paper's findings were manipulated by the perceived indiscretions of President Clinton and Monica Lewinsky two years prior.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the analyses presented in this thesis demonstrate that religious commitment affects voting behavior. By including both church attendance and its interaction with the three most prevalent religious groups, this paper has acknowledged disparities between the least and most committed members in a common religious tradition. The results support the supposition that committed members adhere more closely to group norms than people who never attend church. Those voters who frequently attended religious services were significantly more prone to voting for George W. Bush in the last presidential election. Hence, the first hypothesis was confirmed.

The interaction between church attendance and religious affiliation was an important predictor of vote choice, even when controlling for various demographic factors. Although the second hypothesis generated mixed results, voting differences were found between religious affiliations and within them as well. This corroborates the work of other scholars (Wuthnow 1988; Guth and Green 1990).

The interaction term for Mainline Protestants achieved the most remarkable outcome. As church attendance moved from never to once a week, the probability of voting for Bush was 10 percent for Republicans and Democrats, while Independents experienced a 38 percent surge in Republican vote preference. Catholics and Evangelical Protestants experienced slighter correlations for different reasons but their results exhibited striking similarities respectively. Religious voters who identified as Independents had the largest probabilities of voting for Bush in each religious group.

The primary explanation given to elucidate these results is based on the recent secularization of the Democratic Party and the ambivalence toward religion in contemporary culture. The Republican Party has allied itself with religious causes in its policy positions thus causing religiously committed voters to defend the interests of their religious institutions by voting for the more preferable candidate. It remains to be seen to what extent the Democratic Party alienated religious voters. While the conclusions presented in this paper do not suggest that the Democratic Party lost religious voters in
the 2000 election, it does point to the impact religious commitment had on the Bush vote.

As the 2004 election approaches, these issues will continue, if not intensify. What makes matters more interesting is the fact that the Democratic nominee, John Kerry, is the first Roman Catholic presidential candidate to run on a major party ticket since John F. Kennedy. It should be interesting to observe how committed Catholics vote and react to his candidacy. Furthermore, the fact that Kerry disagrees with his church on several important issues will impact differently on the committed and non-committed Catholic's vote choice. In the last few years, President Bush has not shied away from using the language of good and evil as the basis for some of his policy decisions. This should also have an effect on frequent church attenders. As evident in this paper, future scholarship should examine the voting behavior of the two kinds of religious voters: those committed and those non-committed in order to advance the study of religion and politics.

The author wishes to thank Professor Beck and Professor Dickson for their helpful comments, criticisms, and guidance. The author would also like to thank Tse-hsin Chen, who assisted with some of the initial logistical regressions.
APPENDIX A
CATEGORIZATION OF PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS

Evangelical Protestants

Baptist
Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod
African Methodist Episcopal
Christian Reformed Church
Brethren
Evangelical United Brethren
Church of Christ
Church of God
Assembly of God
Holiness
Pentecostal

Mainline Protestants

Episcopalian
Evangelical Lutheran Church
United Methodist Church
Presbyterian
The Reformed Church in America
Christian
United Church of Christ
Disciples of Christ
Congregationalist

Sources: Kellstedt, et al. 1996. pp. 188-89

APPENDIX B
THE MEAN VALUES FOR THE QUANTITY OF INTEREST WHEN THE
CHURCH ATTENDANCE INTERACTION SHIFTS FROM NEVER TO EVERY WEEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGIOUS GROUPS</th>
<th>REPUBLICANS</th>
<th>INDEPENDENTS</th>
<th>DEMOCRATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATHOLICS</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVANGELICAL PROTESTANTS</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINLINE PROTESTANTS</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: For each simulation, the values for education, income, and age were set to the mean, while female and Hispanic were set to 0. For the purposes of attaining the largest sample, the calculations are limited to white males.
APPENDIX C

VARIABLE CODING

**Dependent Variable**
recode v001249 (1=0) (3=1) (5 6 7=.)
gen vote2000 = v001249

**Independent Variables**
recode v000879 (5=0) (4=1) (3=2) (2=3) (1=4)
gen church = v000879

gen catholic = .
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 1
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 1
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 8
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 9
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 1
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 15
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 16
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 18
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 19
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 22
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 8

replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 1
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 6
replace catholic = 0 if v000891 == 2
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 10
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 13
replace catholic = 0 if v000884 == 14
replace catholic = 1 if v000884 == 2
replace catholic = 1 if v000884 == 2

replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 1
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 1
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 1 if v000891 == 1
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 8
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 9
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 1
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 15
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 16
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 18
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 19
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 22
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 6
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 10
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 13
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 14
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 17
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 1
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 1
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 1
replace evangel = 1 if v000891 == 1
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 6
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 10
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 13
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 14
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 17
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 1
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 1
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 1
replace evangel = 1 if v000891 == 1
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 6
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 10
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 13
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 14
replace evangel = 1 if v000884 == 17

replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2
replace evangel = 0 if v000884 == 2

**Control Variables**
gen age = 2000 - v000907

gen income = v000994

gen education = v000910

gen black = .
replace black = 0 if v001006a == 1
replace black = 1 if v001006a == 10

replace hispanic = .
replace hispanic = 0 if v001006a == 1
replace hispanic = 1 if v001006a == 10

replace white = .
replace white = 0 if v001006a == 1

replace white = 1 if v001006a == 50

replace female = v001029
recode female (1=0) (2=1)

replace republican = .
replace republican = 0 if partyid == 1
replace republican = 0 if partyid == 2
replace republican = 1 if partyid == 2
replace republican = 1 if partyid == 3

replace democrat = .
replace democrat = 0 if partyid == 2
replace democrat = 0 if partyid == 3
replace democrat = 1 if partyid == 2

replace independent = .
replace independent = 0 if partyid == 1
replace independent = 0 if partyid == 2
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