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**Variable Coding**

**Political participation** Additive scale of 1 point per activity, introduced with: “Of the following ways of participating in politics, which have you done in the past two years?” Vote in the 2010 elections, Give money to a candidate or party, Write a letter to an elected official, Protest or march for a political cause, Give money to a political cause, Attend a rally for a candidate or cause, Volunteer time to a political campaign (ranges from 0 to 7).

**Civic skills** “In the past year, have you done any of the following activities in any organizational setting: as part of your job, in school, or in a group or organization? (check as many as apply)” Written a letter, Given a speech/presentation, Planned a meeting, Studied a political issue with a group, Discussed a political issue with a group, Held a leadership position (ranges from 0-6).

**Worship attendance** “Lots of things come up that keep people from attending religious services even if they want to. Thinking about your life these days, how often do you attend religious services, not including occasional weddings, baptisms or funerals?” 5=More than once a week, every week , 4=Almost every week, 3=Once or twice a month , 2=A few times a year, 1=Never.

**Church group activity** “I am involved in at least one small group or activity in my house of worship.” 0=no, 1=yes.

**End times belief** “Jesus will return to earth one day soon.” 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree.

**Religious guidance** “How much guidance does religion provide you in your daily life?” 1=No guidance at all, 2=Some guidance, 3=Quite a bit of guidance, 4=A great deal of guidance.

**Devil exists** “The devil actually exists.” 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree.

**God has a plan for me** “God has a plan and I have a part to play in it.” 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree.

**Course of life is directed by God** “The course of our lives is decided by God.” 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree.

**Providence** Averages responses to the prior two variables.

**Inclusive values** Averages across two items, both coded from 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree: “It is important to “love the stranger as yourself; “ and “It is important to invite others to my house of worship even if it begins to change as a result.”

**Exclusive values** Averages across two items, both coded from 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree: “It is important to shop as much as possible at stores owned by people of my faith;” and “It is important to keep company with other people of my faith.”

**Church engaged in outreach** “My house of worship is involved in providing social services to the community.” 0=no, 1=yes.

**Clergy encourage political activity** “My clergyperson encourages us to participate in politics.” 0=no, 1=yes.

**People I disagree with in church** “There are people I disagree with at my house of worship.” 0=no, 1=yes.

**Attended political adult education session** “I've attended a small group session in my house of worship that addressed a social or political issue in the past year.” 0=no, 1=yes.

**Female**=1, 0=male.

**Openness to experience** Each semantic differential item is coded 1-7, introduced with, “As you examine each of the following pairs of words, which comes closest to describing you? The better a word describes you, choose a button closer to that word. If both words describe you equally well, then click the middle button.” Openness combines scores on the following pairs, with the first label the low number (1; some were reversed for scaling): unimaginative-imaginative, unanalytical-analytical, uncreative-creative, uncurious-curious, and unintellectual-intellectual.

**Conscientiousness** Combines scores for the following pairs: unsystematic-systematic, lazy-hardworking, sloppy-neat, carefree-careful, irresponsible-responsible.

**Extraversion** Combines scores for the following pairs: introverted-extroverted, quiet-talkative, timid-bold, shy-outgoing, inhibited-spontaneous.

**Agreeableness** Combines scores for the following pairs: cold-warm, harsh-gentle, unkind-kind, rude-polite, unsympathetic-sympathetic.

**Leadership in church** “I've held a leadership position in my house of worship.” 0=no, 1=yes.

**Income** “Which of the following categories best captures your total family income for the 2011 tax year?” 1=$0-25,000, 2=25,001-40,000, 3=40,001-55,000 , 4=55,001-70,000, 5=70,001-85,000, 6=85,001-100,000, 7=100,001-115,000, 8=115,001-130,000, 9=Over 130,001.

**Education** “What is the highest level of education you have received?” 1=Less than a high school/GED, 2=High School graduate/GED, 3=Some college/associate’s degree, 4=Four year college degree (BA, BS, BFA, etc), 5=More than 4 year college degree (e.g., classes toward a master’s), 6=Master’s or doctoral degree.

**Political Knowledge** “For each of the political figures on the left please try to identify the political office they hold and enter it in the box:” John Boehner, Joe Biden, John Roberts, David Cameron, Angela Merkel, Eric Holder.

**Age** in years.

**Mainline Protestant** White, non-born again Protestants or “other Christians”=1, 0=otherwise.

**Evangelical Protestant** White, born again Protestants or Other Christians=1, 0=otherwise..

**Black Protestant** Black Protestants or Other Christians=1, 0=otherwise.

**Other religion** Includes for statistical purposes only Jews, Muslims, Hindus, “other non-Christians,” and Latter Day Saints.

**Religious None** Includes “no religious group” and “atheist, agnostic, humanist”=1, 0=otherwise.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A1** – The Interactive Effect of Gender and Conscientiousness on Religious Guidance in the Presence of Controls. |
|  | β\* | (SE) | *p* |
| Female | -1.06 | (.99) | .29 |
| Conscientiousness | -.65 | (.81) | .43 |
| Female\*Conscientiousness | 1.05 | (1.20) | .39 |
| Mainline Protestant | -.05 | (.22) | .81 |
| Evangelical Protestant | .51 | (.23) | .02 |
| Black Protestant | .69 | (.35) | .05 |
| Other | .30 | (.29) | .31 |
| None | -1.24 | (.23) | .00 |
| Education | .09 | (.06) | .12 |
| Age | .00 | (.00) | .47 |
| Constant | 1.08 | (9.84) | .31 |
| N=376, Adj. R2=.17, RMSE=1.42. Catholic is the excluded reference category. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A2** – Poisson Estimates of Political Activities Engaged |
|  |  |  |
|  | β\* | (SE) | *p* |  |  |  |
| Mainline Protestant | -.27 | (.16) | \* |  |  |  |
| Evangelical Protestant | -.29 | (.16) | \* |  |  |  |
| Black Protestant | -.09 | (.24) |  |  |  |  |
| Other | -.18 | (.19) |  |  |  |  |
| None | .27 | (.19) |  |  |  |  |
| Openness | .07 | (.50) |  |  |  |  |
| Conscientiousness | .47 | (.53) |  |  |  |  |
| Extraversion | .38 | (.33) |  |  |  |  |
| Agreeableness | -.34 | (.48) |  |  |  |  |
| End times | .03 | (.06) |  |  |  |  |
| Providence | .02 | (.05) |  |  |  |  |
| Inclusive values | .14 | (.07) | \*\* |  |  |  |
| Church attendance | .07 | (.04) | \* |  |  |  |
| Female | -.28 | (.14) | \*\* |  |  |  |
| Civic skills | .07 | (.05) |  |  |  |  |
| Female \* Skills | .15 | (.07) | \*\* |  |  |  |
| Clergy mobilize | .11 | (.13) |  |  |  |  |
| Disagree in church | .20 | (.12) | \* |  |  |  |
| Small group activity | .25 | (.14) | \* |  |  |  |
| Leadership in church | -.13 | (.16) |  |  |  |  |
| Income | .02 | (.03) |  |  |  |  |
| Education | .04 | (.04) |  |  |  |  |
| Political knowledge | .09 | (.03) | \*\*\* |  |  |  |
| Age | .01 | (.00) | \*\*\* |  |  |  |
| Constant | -2.08 | (.55) | \*\*\* |  |  |  |
| Model Statistics | N=358; χ2=124.26\*\*\*; pseudo R2=.12  |
| Note: Catholic is the excluded reference category. \*\*\**p*<.01, \*\**p*<.05, \**p*<.10 (two-tailed tests) |

Endnote 8: “See the online appendix for additional results for these relationships.”

Hoffman and Bartkowski (2008) make the argument that women are more religious (adopting more literalist interpretations of the faith) in order to compensate for being denied leadership positions in church. That is, there are multiple ways to show piety and being foreclosed to organizational leadership, such as in evangelical churches, leaves a path of religious strictness in belief and behavior.

The data we use does not support this claim. First, it is notable that women have exercised just slightly, but insignificantly, less leadership in churches – men=.20, women=.16 (p=.33). Figure A1 below shows the distribution of holding leadership positions across the included religious traditions. None of the differences are even close to significant, and none of the religious traditions differ from the others, though it is likely that with higher Ns that significant differences would emerge. In each, save Black Protestants (for whom the N is quite small, hence the wide CIs), more men report holding leadership positions than women, but none at a distinguishable rate. But the results also show in a suggestive way that religious traditions that do not allow women to serve as clergy, which would apply to the evangelicals in the sample, also allow women to exercise leadership at sample average rates. This calls for tighter measurement of key concepts than making assumptions about foreclosure to leadership based on definitions of the pastorate.

**Figure A1** – Holding Leadership Positions by Religious Tradition and Gender



The key test, however, is whether women (and men) who do not exercise leadership in church are both more reliant on religion (guidance) and attend more frequently to compensate. Shown in Figure A2 below, we find evidence for the exact opposite – those holding leadership positions demonstrate higher levels of both guidance and attendance (though for women leadership is insignificantly related to attendance). This relationship also holds for other belief items like believing that the Devil actually exists. It holds when we control for guidance in the attendance model and vice versa. It partly holds among evangelicals. Evangelical women who hold a leadership position indicate more guidance (it is insignificant for attendance), while the effect of leadership on guidance is insignificant for men, though significant for attendance. Though it is insignificant, the result is suggestive that evangelical female leaders are more likely to agree that the Devil exists.

**Figure A2** – The Positive Marginal Effect of Holding a Leadership Position in Church on Religious Guidance and Attendance (90% CIs)



Our evidence suggests that religiosity is not compensatory in the way that Hoffman and Bartkowski (2008) argue. But this still leaves open the question of how women appear to develop an understanding of conscientiousness that involves valuing religiosity. Though some argue that favoring religion is dispositional (working through risk aversion – Miller and Stark 2002), our view of how conscientiousness works is amenable on socialization or other forces that would condition what is valued. Certainly looking to early family life is an important avenue of investigation, as is examination of the composition of social networks that may shape what is valued presently.